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NAARAH (1 '22), na'arah; B, a kewa a-tha^n, hoi kowai a-ta^n, A, Naara^a, Naara^ah; AV Na-arah: A town in the territory of Ephraim (Josh 16 7). It appears as "Naaran" in 1 Ch 7 28 (B, Naara^a, Naararn, A, Naara^, Naaran). Onom (s.v. "Naarah") places it 5 Rom miles from Jericho. The name has not been recovered, and no identification is certain. The position would agree with that of el-Ahijeh, about 5 miles N.E. of Jericho.

NAARAI, n'a-ar'i (1 '29), na'aray: Son of Ezba, one of David's heroes (1 Ch 11 37). In the passage (2 S 23 35), he is called "Paaarai the Arbite." The true forms of the name and description are uncertain (see Biddle, Richter u. Samuel, and Curtis, Chronicles).

NAARAN, n'a-ar-an, NAARATH, n'a-ar-rath (1 '24; na'ar'da'n, 1 '22), na'Rar. See NAARAH.

NAASHON, na'a-sh'on, NAASON, na'a's-on, NAASSON, na'a's-on (Naarason, Naason): AV Gr form of "Naashon" (thus RV) (Mt 1 4; Lk 3 32).

NAATHUS, na'a-thus (Nâthes, Nathon): One of the sons of Addi who put away his foreign wife (1 Esd 9 31). It apparently corresponds to "Adana" of Ezr 10 30, of which it is a transposition. B reads Addo^s, Lîthos, probably confusing A and Æ.

NABAL, n'a-bal (1 '27), nabal, "foolish" or "wicked": Na'â, Nabâl: 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 solict gifts of food for himself and his small band of warriors. Nabal not only refused any assistance, but denounced 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-ri'as (Naapa^a, Nabarâs, B, Naapa^a, Nabaraleus): One of those who stood upon Ezra's left hand as he expounded the law (1 Esd 9 44). Encyclopaedia Brit. gives 6 noses whereas Nehemiah (8 4) gives 7. It is probable that the last (Messhulem) of Nehemiah's list is simply dropped and that Nabarias = Hashbaddanah; or it may possibly be a corruption of Zechariah in Nehemiah's list.

NABATEANS, nab-a-t'ez-an, NABATHAEANS, nab-a-th'e-anz (NaParatoi, Nabataloi; in 1 Mac 5 25 & reads these as plural of anabathoi hoi, V, 'A^n, the Nabataei, Anabathaeoi; AV Nabathites, more correctly "Nabateans"): 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 be- tween the Red Sea and the Euphrates was called Nabateene (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, Quest in Gen 25 13, following the hint of Jos (Ant, I, xii, 4), ascerts they were identical with the Ishmaelites, tribe of Naboth, which is probable, though Nebaioth is spelled with β and Nabataeans with θ. They were apparently the first allies of the Assyrians in their invasions of Edom (cf Mal 1 1 ff). They were later subdued by Aretas IV (Sayce, New Light from the Ancient Monuments, I, 430), but before long regained their independence and resisted Ashurbanipal (Rawlinson, note, ad loc.). According to Alexander Polyhistor (Fr. 18), they were included in the Macedonian army by David. Their history is more detailed from 312 BC (Diod. Sic. xix), when Antigonus I (Cyclops) sent his general Aetheneus with a force against them in Petra. After an initial advantage, the army of Aetheneus 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 109 BC. They were friendly to the early Macce- beeers in the anti-Hellenistic struggle, to Judas in 164 BC (1 Macc 5 25) and to Jonathan in 160 BC (9 35).

Toward the end of the 2nd cent. BC on the fall of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Kings, but still back insulating the Nabataeans under King Eutromus fell in.

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 Hasmonian 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 Obadas I, king of the Nabataeans, but suffered a severe defeat E. of the Jordan (Jos, Ant, XIII, iv, 3, 4). Antiochus IV and Seleucus IV of Coele-Syria next led an expedition against the Nabataeans, but was defeated and slain in the battle of Kana (Jos, Ant, XIII, iv, 1-2; BJ, I, iv, 7-8). Consequently, Aretas III seized Coele-Syria and Damascus and gained another victory over Alex- ander Jannaeus at Adida in 85 BC. The Naba- taeanas, led by Aretas (III ?), espoused the cause of Hyrcanus against Aristobulus, be-

3. Conflicts sieged the latter in Jerusalem and provoked a reference of the Romans, by whom under Scærus they were defeated (Jos, Ant, XIV, i, 4; BJ, I, vi, 2). 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 as a territory possessed into the hands of Antiochus (2 Cor 11 32). In 55 BC Gabinius led another force against the Naba-
Nabatites, nab’a-thi: AV=RV “Nabataeans.”

Naboth, nā’both, nā’bōth (נַבֹּהֵת, nāḇōḥēṯ, from נָבָה, nāḇāh, “a sprout”); Naboukh, Naboukhād (נָבוּקָח, Naboukhād): 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 into her own 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 him for his vile act and pronounced judgment on him and his 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 cf). In both cases the circumstances recalled the foul treatment of Naboth.

Henry Wallace

Nabuchodonosor, nāb-u-kō-don’ōsor (נָבוּעוֹדָכְנואָסֶר, Naboukodesher): LXX and Vulg form of “Nebuchadnezzar” (“Nebuchadrezzar”) found in AV of the Apoc in 1 Esd 1:40. 41:45.48; 2 10, 5 7; 6 26; Ad Est 11 14; Bar 9:11.12. It is the form used in AV of the Apoc thorough. RV of 4th and Tob 14:15, the form “Nebuchadnezzar” is given.

Nacho, nāk’on, THE THRASHING FLOOR OF (נַחוֹךְ, nāḵōḵ; AV Nachon): The place where Uzzah was smitten for putting forth his hand to steady the ark, hence called afterward “Perezuzzzah” (2 S 6:8); in the | passage (1 Ch 13:9) we have תַּחְו, ṭāḥōn, and in Jos (Ant., VII, iv, 2) Χαζαρ, Χαζαιπν. In 1 S 23:23 the word nakhōn occurs, and is tr of a certainty, m “with the certainty” or “to a set place”; also in 1 S 24:4 it is tr of a certainty, m “to a set place.” It is uncertain whether 1 S 6:1 is a place-name at all, and no successful attempt has been made to identify either Nacon or Chidon; possibly they are both personal names.

E. W. G. Masterman

Nachor, nākōr (Naṣṣ̂ūr, Nachōr) AV; Gr form of “Nahor” (thus RV). Grandfather of Abraham (Lev 3:34).

Nadab, nā’dab (נַדָּב, nāḏāḇ; “noble”; Naṣṣ̂ūb, Nadob; Nabōb):

(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 Yahweh” (Lev 10:1,2). However, the LXX interprets this latter verse: “This is the sentence pronounced upon them—this is the sentence pronounced against them, and their destruction has gone far from clear. The word rendered ‘strange’ seems in this connection to mean no more than ‘unauthorized by the Law’” (see ἔξω, ἐξω, in BDB, and of Ex 30:9). The proximity of the prohibition of the offering to officiating priests (Lev 10:9) 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 I, after him for two years king of Israel (1 K 14:20; 15:23). While Nadab was investing Gibbethon, a Philistine stronghold, Baasha, who probably was an officer in the army, as throne-robbbers were usually, conspired against him, slew him and seized the throne (1 K 15:18–31). 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. Lats

Nadabath, nā’dā-bath (Naṣṣ̂ūbāth, Nadabáth; AV Nadabatha, na-dab’a-tha): A city E. of the Jordan from which the wedding party of Jambri and Zerubael were coming; then 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 Nadabatha have been suggested as identical with Nadabath. Clermont-Ganneau would read rhabatha, and identify it with Rabbath-ammon. There is no certainty.

Naggai, nag’āi, nag’ā’t (Naṣṣ̂ûy, Naggaï; AV Naggai, Naggai): In Lk 3:25, the Gr form of the Heb name Noah (q.v.).

Nahalal, nā’hal-al (נָהֲלָל, naḥalal; B, Bat-pa’ar, Bat-anon, A, Naṣṣ̂al, Na’alol, 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; Jgs 1:30, “Nabalol”). In the Talm. Jesus (Meg., i,1) it is identified with Mahlu. This name might correspond either with ‘Aṣa Māḥel, or with Māḥal. The former lies about 3½ miles N.E. of Nazareth on a hill near the eastern boundary of Zebulun. The latter is situated about 8½ miles W. of Nazareth,
near the southern border of Zebulun. The change of n to m is not unusual. W. Ewing

NAHALIEL, na-ha‘l-él, na-ha‘l-el (נַ֣הַלֵ֥ל, nahal'el, "torrent valley of God"); B. Manah, Manah, A. Naaliful, Naalif. A place where Israel encamped on the way from Armon to Parnaim, named with Mattsamah and Bameith (Nu 21 19). Onom places it near to the Armon. It is natural to seek for this "torrent valley" in one of the tributaries of the Armon. It may be Wady Wadel, which drains a wide area to the N.E. of the Armon; or perhaps Wady Zerka Ma'ta to farther to the N.

NAHALALL, na-ha‘l-al, NAHALOL, na-ha‘l-ol. See Nahalal.

NAHAM, na‘ham (נָ֣הַם, naham, "comfort"): A Judahite chieftain, father of Keilah the Garmite (1 Ch 4 19); the passage is obscure.

NAHAMANI, nâ-ha-mâ‘nî, na-ham'ânî (נַ֣הַמָּנִי, nahamâni, "compassionate"): One of the twelve heralds who prophesied with Nahum ( Neh 7 17). The name is wanting in the list (Ezr 2 2). In 1 Esd 5 8 he is called "Eneneus" (RVn "Enenius").

NAHARAI, nâ-hâr-î (נַ֣הָרֵי, naharay), NAHARI, nâ-hâr-î (נַ֣הָרֵי, naharay): One of David's heroes, Josiah's armor-bearer ( 2 S 23 37, AV "Nahari"); 1 Ch 11 39).

NAHASH, na‘hash (נָ֣הַשׁ, nahash, "serpent"); Na‘o, Na‘o. (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 1). 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 f), and, according to Jos, killed King Nahash (Ant, VI, v, 3).

If the Nahash of 2 S 10 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 writers go so far 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-Jordanian 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, nâ-hath (נָ֣הַת, nahath): (1) A grandson of Eun (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 Hozekiah, assisted in the oversight of "the oblations and the tithes and the dedicated things" (2 Ch 31 13).

NAHBI, nâ‘bi (נָ֣בִי, nabhî; in the NT NAβΩΡ, Nachôr): The representative of Naphthali among the 12 spies (Nu 13 14).

NAHOR, nâ hor (נָ֣חוֹר, nahôr; in the NT NAξΩΡ, 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; Josh 24 2). A city of Nahor is mentioned in Gen 24 10; the God of Nahor in Gen 31 53. In AV Josh 24 2; Lk 3 34, the name is spelled "Nacher."

NAHSHON, nâ‘shôn (נַ֣שְׁוֹן, naßhôn; LXX and NT Ναασπός, Naaspos): 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, nâ‘hum (נָ֣هوּמ, Na‘um; AV Naum): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk's genealogy, the 9th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lk 3 25).

NAHUM, nâ‘hum, THE BOOK OF: I. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE 1. The Name 2. Life and Home of Nahum 3. Date, as Related to Assyrian History (a) The Revolt of Shamash-shumukin (b) The Invasion of 625 B.C. (c) The Final Attack (d) Probable Date II. THE BOOK 1. Contents (Chs 1-3) 2. Style 3. Integrity III. TEACHING 1. The Character of Jehovah 2. Nahum's Glee over the Ruin of Nineveh 3. Universality of Jehovah's Rule 4. The Messianic Outlook LITERATURE I. Authorship and Date.—The name Nahum (נָ֣هوּם, na‘hum; LXX and NT Ναασπός, Naaspos; Jos, Naaspos) 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 Lk 1 1 he is called "the Elkoshite," that is, an inhabitant of Elkosh. Un fortunately, the location of this place and home is not known. One tradition, which cannot be traced beyond the 16th cent. AD, identifies the home of Nahum with a modern village Elkosh, or Abosh, 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 cent., locate Elkosh in Gallite, at a place identified by many with the modern Elkazel, near Ramieh. 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
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 kingdom, so that the last-mentioned tradition seems to have more of 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, no certain evidence 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 the prophet speaks of the capture and destruction of Nineveh, as an accomplished fact. The expedition of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, against Egypt, which resulted in the fall of Thebes, occurred about 663 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 brother, the king of Assyria, 660-655 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 Chaldean and Babylonian 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 breach open, the Chaldean 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 (+2 2) contains the decree of Nineveh's destruction. Jeh is a God of vengeance and of mercy (vs 2–3); he has no need to impress upon the inhabitants, 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). Nahum, though, when the present, enemy is doomed (vs 9–14), will mean the exultation 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 5–6), 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 are different. The prevalent point of view is that the prophecies of the ancient Hebrews were impressed with the intense force and picturesque elements 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 also A. Smith: "The language is strong and brilliant; his rhythm numbers and wil, laps 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 is considered to be some question as to whether the prophecies are Nahum's own. It is possible that he could have compiled his book from other sources; also there is the possibility that the bulk of Nahum's prophecy dates from a time later than the prophet himself. The second view is not supported by any evidence. Nahum is a Seer of a very early date, the result of the evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.

3. Integrity. The preserved contents of the book is a solid whole, with no free interpolation by Nahum himself. It is possible that Nahum introduced a new verse here and there, but the question of interpolation is a very difficult one. It is not possible to say that Nahum's prophecies have ever been altered or added to.

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. This view is based on the fact that the alphabet was not used at this time in Hebrew poetry. The latest alphabetic examples are the psalms 111, 119, and 150. In support of the view it is pointed out that the prophecy in ch 1 is vague, while the utterances in chs 2 and 3 are definite. This is taken as evidence that the prophecy was composed as a general introduction to the more specific denunciation in chs 2 and 3. A detailed examination shows that this is not the case; the attack on Nineveh is much more general in ch 1 than later on.

The early alphabetic character of the book is given in the context of the context of the poem; the poem is a late addition. The evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.

The problem of the date of the book remains to be solved. It is possible that Nahum's prophecies have been preserved for a long period of time. The book is generally considered to be a late work, and the evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.

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. This view is based on the fact that the alphabet was not used at this time in Hebrew poetry. The latest alphabetic examples are the psalms 111, 119, and 150. In support of the view it is pointed out that the prophecy in ch 1 is vague, while the utterances in chs 2 and 3 are definite. This is taken as evidence that the prophecy was composed as a general introduction to the more specific denunciation in chs 2 and 3. A detailed examination shows that this is not the case; the attack on Nineveh is much more general in ch 1 than later on.

The early alphabetic character of the book is given in the context of the context of the poem; the poem is a late addition. The evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.

The problem of the date of the book remains to be solved. It is possible that Nahum's prophecies have been preserved for a long period of time. The book is generally considered to be a late work, and the evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.

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. This view is based on the fact that the alphabet was not used at this time in Hebrew poetry. The latest alphabetic examples are the psalms 111, 119, and 150. In support of the view it is pointed out that the prophecy in ch 1 is vague, while the utterances in chs 2 and 3 are definite. This is taken as evidence that the prophecy was composed as a general introduction to the more specific denunciation in chs 2 and 3. A detailed examination shows that this is not the case; the attack on Nineveh is much more general in ch 1 than later on.

The early alphabetic character of the book is given in the context of the context of the poem; the poem is a late addition. The evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.

The problem of the date of the book remains to be solved. It is possible that Nahum's prophecies have been preserved for a long period of time. The book is generally considered to be a late work, and the evidence of style and the subject-matter is in harmony with the date of Nahum.
The fierceness of Nahum, and his glee at the thought of Nineveh’s ruin, may not be in accord with the injunction, “Love thine 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 Jech’s sway over the whole universe, and emphasizes the duty of nations as well as of individuals to own their 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 Driver, is “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 wills a nation’s welfare.”

3. Universality of Jehovah’s Rule

4. The Messianic Outlook

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.”

NAIDUS, na-dus (A, Ναυδος, Νάιδος, B, Ναδος, Νανδος): One of those who had taken “strong walled Ecd 9 31, apparently = Be-nainh” of Ezr 10 30, of which it is probably a corruption or the latter part.

NAIL, nāl: (1) As denoting the finger-nail, the Heb word is נָּלָן, נָלָן, נָלָן (Dt 21 12), the captiv- woman “shall shave her head, and pare her nails.” The latter 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. ܢܠܐ, ܢܠܐ, ܢܠܐ (Dan 3 33), “his nails like birds’ claws”, (2) As pin in peg (for tents, or driven through walls). Jgs 4 21 RV “tent-pin”; in Isa 22 23, “a nail in a sure place” is a peg firmly driven into the wall on which something is to be hung (ver 24); of Ecd 12 11, where the word is מָשָׁמְרָה, cognate with מָשָׁמְרָה below. (3) For nails of iron (1 Ch 22 2) and gold (2 Ch 3 9), and in Isa 41 7 and Jer 10 4, the word is מָשָׁמְרָה, מָשָׁמְרָּה. (4) In the NT the word is φλος, ἅλος, used of the nails in Christ’s hands (Jn 20 25), and “to nail” in Col 2 14 (“nailing it to the cross”) is πλαστεῖν, πλαστεῖν.

In a figurative sense the word is used of the hard and 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).

NAIN, nā’n (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 in the form of Nain, is found in villages on the northeastern slope of Jebel ed-Dubay (“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 Dubay, and the village nearby is identified with the town. 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 time of 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 glister in the sun. To the S. are the heights of the uplands of Samaria. The village, once prosperous, has fallen on evil days. It is said that the villagers received such good prices for sinamnet 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.

NAIOTH, nā’yo-th, nī’th (נַּאוֹת, נֹאֹת; B, Ναοθ, Ναώθ, Ναωθ): 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, “As Saul among the prophets?”

NAKED, nak’d, NAKEDNESS, nāk’d-nes: “Naked” in the OT represents various derivatives of נָּכָר, נָכָר, נָכָר, נָכָר, נָכָר, נָכָר, נָכָר (Gen 2 21, 25; Job 38 4, 7; Eccl 7 9; Isr 22 15, etc.), and hept in Jgs 4 21 RV, “tent-pin”; in Isa 22 23, “a nail in a sure place” is a peg firmly driven into the wall on which something is to be hung (ver 24); of Ecd 12 11, where the word is מָשָׁמְרָה, cognate with מָשָׁמְרָה below. For nails of iron (1 Ch 22 2) and gold (2 Ch 3 9), and in Isa 41 7 and Jer 10 4, the word is מָשָׁמְרָה, מָשָׁמְרָּ. In the NT the word is φλος, ἅλος, used of the nails in Christ’s hands (Jn 20 25), and “to nail” in Col 2 14 (“nailing it to the cross”) is πλαστεῖν, πλαστεῖν.

In a figurative sense the word is used of the hard and 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).
NAME, nâm (בָּם, shôn; ἄτωμα, ónoma; Lat nomem [2 Esd 4:1]; vbi, ὀνόμα, ónoma; Lot nominum [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, 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, ónoma 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 šāmâh (obs.), "to set a mark"; shôn 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 "race" which must be "blotted out," i.e., destroyed (Dt 7:21; etc); 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 denoted.

"To name" is sometimes ṣāmar, "to say" (1 S 16:3); doḇbar, "to speak" (Gen 23:16); nāḇab, "to mark out" (Nu 1:17); bāḏar, "to call" (Gen 48:16; Isa 61:6).

2. The Divine 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 name of the God of their fathers)—Jehovah (n.φ.), (Yahweh)—the nature of which should be shown by His manifestations on their behalf (Ex 3:13-16; 13:18). 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 9:16; Joel 4:13; Jer 4:15). The "name of Jehovah" was promised to Moses on Mt. Sinai. "Jeh, Jehovah, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness and truth" (Ex 34:6-7). The name Jehovah (so revealed) was (Ex 3:15) His "memorial name" (so, often, in ARV, see Memorial). He made Jehovah the "name" which was the "man of the Lord" (Ex 3:5). The name Jehovah is the equivalent of the name that Dt 6:4 was termed the "Shinema" (from shēm, "shar," the first word in ver 4), the first article of Israel's faith, taught to all the children, written on the tablets, and still recited as the first act in public and private worship by every adult Jew. Where Jehovah is said to record His name, or to put His name in a place (or person), some special Divine manifestation of His was signified that He was "in" that place, or person, or was to be "found" or "sacred to Him" (Ex 20:24; 1 K 8:16). His "name" was in the angel of His Presence (Ex 23:20); what He does is "for His great name sake" in order to exalt and vindicate His revealed character and covenant relations. Jehovah's great name is a designation of Things. He should do would be "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 Jehovah is "to be his people" (2 Ch 7:14; Isa 43:7); it implies "protection" etc (Isa 65:19; Jer 14:8); a "honor" and a "claim" upon the "name of Jehovah" as (Gen 21:33; 26:25; etc.); "to confess" His name, to "acknowledge" it (1 K 8:16); to act in, etc., "the name," was to love, trust, etc. Jehovah (Ps 5:17; 17). Very frequently, esp. in the Ps and prophecies of Isaiah, Joel, etc. "the name of God" is used for "God himself"; to forget his name was "to depart from him" (Gen 23:16; 24:7); to manifest, exhibit, declare, etc., (in His name signified Divine appointment, inspiration, authority (Jer 11:1; 14:15, etc.); we have "swearing by" or "in the name of Jehovah (D 6:13); to take His name in vain was to swear falsely (Ex 20:7; Lev 19:12; etc.): to "bless," to "curse" (K 2:24). In Lev 24:11, we have the case of one who "blasphemed the Name, and cursed," the penalty here was death by stoning (Lev 24:16).

In later Jewish usage (of Wsd 14:21) the sacred name Jehovah was not pronounced in reference to the Jews, the name, Jehovah ("my lord") being substituted for it (the vowels belonging to Jehovah were written with the consonants of the same name), hence the frequent term "the Lord" in AV, for which ARV substitutes "Jeh."
claiming them for Christ and as their acknowledgment of Him or of faith in Him—becoming his disciple; similarly, baptism into (the) name of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, 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 10:37; ver 41 to disciples, RV "because ye are Christ's") or "as flying," as "in Christ," as "in Christ" (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 means to ask anything in His name; to ask in the name of Jesus, is to receive that for which it is asked.

2. In His name, according to His promises, to pray "whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, shall be done to you." (Jn 16:24, is merely to add to our prayers (as is so often unhindingly done): "we ask all in the name of Jesus," or "through Jesus Christ our Lord," etc., but to pray or ask as His representative, as His vicar, as His mouth and standard, in His spirit and with His aim; it implies union with Christ and abiding in Him, in us and in us. In the name of the phrase, as "being one with me even as I am revealed to you." Its two correlative are: (Jn 14:16; 14:20; Lk 12:33; cf 1 Jn 5:20), and the Pauline "in Christ" (Westcott, The Gospel according to St. John).

W. L. WALKER

NAMES OF GOD. See GOD, NAMES OF.

NAMES, PROPER:

I. THE FORM OF HEBREW NAMES

1. Various Types

(1) Not Exclusively Descriptive

(2) Drawn from a Wide Field

(3) Influences Leading to Choice

(4) Meaning of Name to Determine

2. Geographical Names

3. Names of Biblical References

A. Derivation of Names Manifest

B. The Narrator's Only Concern

C. Lengthening of the Name: God is a name which not only exhibits the common archaism in the retention of the vowel i, but the name Eliahm also shows the characteristic lengthening of the second vowel in the form, so common in the name. The forms Eliphlet, Eliphelet, Eliphelet, Eliphelet, Elipheletelet, Elipheap, etc., meaning "God is deliverance." these varieties represent the vowels of the Hebrew, the vowels: and the vowel sh, and the vowel sh. In the beam the first long vowel is retained by a secondary accept, marked by methyq; kathayh and yeshayh, etc., Jephthah. Deuah shows the customary apocope of the imperfect of Lamedheh vbs.; the names of Persian origin, and a form of names, and not thus in these vbs. with a following element. The short vowel in the prefixed final closed syllable, or the final consonant is elided, if the final consonant is permitted to begin the syllable of the next element of the name, as Jearel, Egekezeh, Jearel, Egekelel, Egekel, Egekel, Egekel, etc. (see form of these names); but it is not elided in Ishmael, although the last consonant is attached to the last syllable, and elision is avoided, as in Jiphthah-el, by keeping the ultimate and penultimate syllables distinct. Deuah, a Hebrew imperfect, is formed by lengthening the vowel in the accentual final syllable, when the vb. is used as a personal name.

2. Vocalization

(1) A common noun used as a name undergoes a type of pronunciation due to the custom of lengthening a short vowel in praise and to the laws which control the pronunciation of consonants, liquids, and palatals. Thus the name Perez, "breach," which appears also as second person in AV of the OT, occurs in the Heb text in the four forms peres, pares, phares and pharse (Ruth 4:18; Neh 11:4-6). (2) In a name consisting of a phrase the normal advancement of the accent as usual causes the loss of a prothetic vowel, as is indicated by the suspended letter in Judah, "beloved of Jehovah," or Jeophthah, "he openeth." Occasionally the predicate contains an object of the vb., as Shecaliel, "I have asked God" (Ex 3 2), or a prepositional phrase, as Hephzibah, "my delight is in her" (2 K 1 1). The sentence-name is usually a declaration, but may be an exhortation or a prayer, as Jerubbab, "let Baal strive," and Hoshea, "sawel!" (Nu 13 16), or it may be a question, as Micahah, "who is like Jehovah?" All of the foregoing illustrations have been taken from the Books of Jgs and S, unless otherwise noted.

The proper name is treated as one word, whether on analysis it consists of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence; and as such it is subject to the laws of accent and conjugation, as well as to the Heb word. (1) A common noun used as a name undergoes a type of pronunciation due to the custom of lengthening a short vowel in praise and to the laws which control the pronunciation of consonants, liquids, and palatals. Thus the name Perez, "breach," which appears also as second person in AV of the OT, occurs in the Heb text in the four forms peres, pares, phares and pharse (Ruth 4:18; Neh 11:4-6). (2) In a name consisting of a phrase the normal advancement of the accent as usual causes the loss of a prothetic vowel, as is indicated by the suspended letter in Judah, "beloved of Jehovah," or Jeophthah, "he openeth." Occasionally the predicate contains an object of the vb., as Shecaliel, "I have asked God" (Ex 3 2), or a prepositional phrase, as Hephzibah, "my delight is in her" (2 K 1 1). The sentence-name is usually a declaration, but may be an exhortation or a prayer, as Jerubbab, "let Baal strive," and Hoshea, "sawel!" (Nu 13 16), or it may be a question, as Micahah, "who is like Jehovah?" All of the foregoing illustrations have been taken from the Books of Jgs and S, unless otherwise noted.

The proper name is treated as one word, whether on analysis it consists of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence; and as such it is subject to the laws of accent and conjugation, as well as to the Heb word. (1) A common noun used as a name undergoes a type of pronunciation due to the custom of lengthening a short vowel in praise and to the laws which control the pronunciation of consonants, liquids, and palatals. Thus the name Perez, "breach," which appears also as second person in AV of the OT, occurs in the Heb text in the four forms peres, pares, phares and pharse (Ruth 4:18; Neh 11:4-6). (2) In a name consisting of a phrase the normal advancement of the accent as usual causes the loss of a prothetic vowel, as is indicated by the suspended letter in Judah, "beloved of Jehovah," or Jeophthah, "he openeth." Occasionally the predicate contains an object of the vb., as Shecaliel, "I have asked God" (Ex 3 2), or a prepositional phrase, as Hephzibah, "my delight is in her" (2 K 1 1). The sentence-name is usually a declaration, but may be an exhortation or a prayer, as Jerubbab, "let Baal strive," and Hoshea, "sawel!" (Nu 13 16), or it may be a question, as Micahah, "who is like Jehovah?" All of the foregoing illustrations have been taken from the Books of Jgs and S, unless otherwise noted.

The proper name is treated as one word, whether on analysis it consists of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence; and as such it is subject to the laws of accent and conjugation, as well as to the Heb word. (1) A common noun used as a name undergoes a type of pronunciation due to the custom of lengthening a short vowel in praise and to the laws which control the pronunciation of consonants, liquids, and palatals. Thus the name Perez, "breach," which appears also as second person in AV of the OT, occurs in the Heb text in the four forms peres, pares, phares and pharse (Ruth 4:18; Neh 11:4-6). (2) In a name consisting of a phrase the normal advancement of the accent as usual causes the loss of a prothetic vowel, as is indicated by the suspended letter in Judah, "beloved of Jehovah," or Jeophthah, "he openeth." Occasionally the predicate contains an object of the vb., as Shecaliel, "I have asked God" (Ex 3 2), or a prepositional phrase, as Hephzibah, "my delight is in her" (2 K 1 1). The sentence-name is usually a declaration, but may be an exhortation or a prayer, as Jerubbab, "let Baal strive," and Hoshea, "sawel!" (Nu 13 16), or it may be a question, as Micahah, "who is like Jehovah?" All of the foregoing illustrations have been taken from the Books of Jgs and S, unless otherwise noted.

The proper name is treated as one word, whether on analysis it consists of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence; and as such it is subject to the laws of accent and conjugation, as well as to the Heb word. (1) A common noun used as a name undergoes a type of pronunciation due to the custom of lengthening a short vowel in praise and to the laws which control the pronunciation of consonants, liquids, and palatals. Thus the name Perez, "breach," which appears also as second person in AV of the OT, occurs in the Heb text in the four forms peres, pares, phares and pharse (Ruth 4:18; Neh 11:4-6). (2) In a name consisting of a phrase the normal advancement of the accent as usual causes the loss of a prothetic vowel, as is indicated by the suspended letter in Judah, "beloved of Jehovah," or Jeophthah, "he openeth." Occasionally the predicate contains an object of the vb., as Shecaliel, "I have asked God" (Ex 3 2), or a prepositional phrase, as Hephzibah, "my delight is in her" (2 K 1 1). The sentence-name is usually a declaration, but may be an exhortation or a prayer, as Jerubbab, "let Baal strive," and Hoshea, "sawel!" (Nu 13 16), or it may be a question, as Micahah, "who is like Jehovah?" All of the foregoing illustrations have been taken from the Books of Jgs and S, unless otherwise noted.
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 sitter in the Chaim is God," and Elum, "God is Constituent" (2 Chr 21:15; 1 Ch 5:9; 1 Ch 3:9).

Parts and similarly, in letters written from Pal to the king of Egypt in the 14th cent. BC, Hiimalki is also called Mikkili, the name in either form signifying "God is king." The name of Jehoschiah, king of Judah, is called Kassida as well as Jehoshah (2 K 24:1; 26:1), a legitimate transposition of the vb. and subject, and meaning in each case, "Jeh hath held 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 Jehoshachin (2 K 24:6; Jer 52:31) was known also as Jeconiah (Jer 24:1; 28:4) and Coniah (22:24; 29:37). The two names Jehoschichon and Coniah have exactly the same meaning. The Divine name which begins Jehoschichon is transferred to the end in Coniah and Coniah; and the Hiipil imperfect of the vb. ka'n, which is seen in Jehoschichon, has been replaced by the Qal imperfect of the vb. kis'ah, Coniah, and by the construct infinitive of the same species in Coniah. Parallel cases occur in Assyri and Bab lit., among which the form corresponding to Coniah is: 1. Kish-shashu, and Zimmah-nadin-shum, exhibit both the transposition of constituent parts and an interchange of prototome and participle.

Twin forms like Abiner and Abner, Absalith and Absalom, Elizaphan and Eliphasan, are not the full name and its abbreviation by 4. Methods of syncopation, but are merely two of the abbreviations of a variant, equally legitimate, modes of viation combining the constituent parts. The common methods of shortening were: (1) contraction by the rejection of a weak consonant or omission of a final unaccented vowel, notably in the Divine title of Jehovah, and for the Divine messenger, yah
dh and yah, at the beginning and ending of proper names: hence Jehovah became Josiah (2 K 12:1), and Amaziah became Amaziah (2 K 14:1; 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" (2 K 15:6); Baal or Baasha (Josh 18:10; cf. 2 S 8:6), Bezech-baal, "house of Baal"; of Asphalt, to Asharoth; Beth-leboth, "house of sioness," to Lebooth; Beth-azmaveth to Azmavoth; Beth-rehab to Rehob; Beth-banot to Banoth; Beth-shan to Shanotte; and Beth-shemesh to Shemesh, all of which names were in the same custom existed among the Mosobites who spoke this town indifferently as Beth-shemesh and Beth-par (M S, I. 27; with Nu 21:19); Beth-baal-meshon to Baal-mesopot, etc. (M, S, II, 17), and the same custom existed among the Mosobites who spoke this town indifferently as Beth-baal-meshon and Baal-meshon (M, S, II, 9, 30); (3) abbreviation by the omission of the Divine name: thus the name of the idolater Micahah, which means, "who is like Jehovah?" (Jgs 17:14 [Heb]), was shortened to Micah, "who is like?" (vs 58); and similarly in the case of three other men, namely the prophet (Micah, Jer 26:18 ERV, and Micah, Mic 1:1), the Levite musician, and with 11:26, and the father of Abdon (2 K 22:22 with 2 Ch 34:20).

The king of Judah, Yahuhaaz, as he was known to the Assyrians, i.e. Jehoahaz, "Jeh hath hold laid hold," is called simply Abinahaz: "the thing that God hath done." The town of Jahneel, "God doth cause to be built," was shortened to Jahneel, "he doth cause to be built." (Josh 15:11; 21:16; 1 Mes 4:15). Jabez, "deliverer of the face of God," was curtailed to Palit, "deliverance." "Jehovah-tsiyah, "Jehovah holds," to Aid (2 Ch 30:1, with 2 K 18:23), and Banicked, "high places of Baal," to Banoth (Josh 13:17 with Nu 21:19). Ab had not a few other similar names which probably represent curtailment of this sort. The omission of the Divine title has parallels in Assyri and Bab lit., such as Nabonid-azi and Nabonidu-nahlum-uni were called Nadunnu and Shutum-uni respectively (Dynastic Tablet no. 2; col. iv, 4, S, with Bab Chron., col. 1, 10).

(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 yeqheni and chayyiqheni, and lkezih, which means, "Jeh is strength." The name was shortened many times in 2 Ch 29:23. Similarly, Jeconiah was shortened to Coniah, as has already been noticed, the name of the town Jekabzeel, "God bringeth together," to Abhore. (2) Gath, "God is together" (Neh 11:25 with Josh 15:21; 2 S 23:20), Meshelemiah, "Jeh is compensating," to Shelemiah, Jebs's compensating," to Shelumiel, "Jeh is compensating." (1 Ch 26:12 with ver 14). Meshullam, "compensated," to Shallum, "compensated." (1 Ch 9:11; Neh 11:1 with 1 Ch 6:12; Ezr 7:2).

II. The Range of Proper Names.—(1) Not exclusively descriptive.—Simonis in his Onomasticum, published in 1741, and Gesenius in his

1. Personal Thesaurus, issued during the years 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 took Malechi by "rex Dei, h. e. a Deo constitutus," and the name Kiriath-baal, "city of Baal," by "aazulium, i.e. auxiliaria salus regi patri praestitit." Amazjzabad was rendered by Gesenius "famulus largitoris, h. e. Jehovea," and by Simonis "populium (i.e. copiosissimam liberorum turbam) donavit." Gesenius translated Gedaliah, "quem Jehova educavit vel roboravit," Zerahiah, "qui Jehova ortum dedit," Jehozadak, "quem Jehova justus fecit," and Joel, "qui Jehova est Deus, i.e. cultor Jehovea." But Simonis rendered Joel by "Jehova (est) Deus . . . vel (cui) Jehovae Deus." Now Malachi means God's king, Malechi-sha, "the king, i.e. God is salvation" (cf Joshua). Amazjzabad, "the Kinsman hath endowed," Gedaliah "Jeh is great," Zerahiah, "Jeh hath risen in splendor," Jehozadak, "Jeh is righteous," and Joel, a compound name, "Jeh is God." A moment's reflection makes clear that these names do not describe the persons who bear them, but in every case speak of God. They emphasize the important facts that personal names might be, and oftentimes were, historical and doctrinal, and that personal names were a part of the ordinary speech of the people, full of meaning and intelligible to all, subject to the phonic laws of the Hebrews, and obedient to the rules of grammar.

(2) Drawn from a wide field.—Parents named their children, and contemporaries dubbed people, from physical and spiritual traits, whether a beauty or a blemish; thus Robni, "pertaining to the fist," Japhia, "gleaning," Ikkeveh, "pervasive," Ira, "watchful," Gareh, "rough-skinned," and Hiddai, "joyful." Children were called by the names of natural objects, as Peninnah, "coral," Rimmon, "pomegranate," Tamar, "palm tree," Nahash, "serpent," Edna, "heller," Aish, "bird of prey," and Laish, "lion," or after kinsfolk or remoter members of the clan, as Absalom, "father's beautiful sister," and as the parent Phinehas took his strange name from the noted Phinehas, who belonged to the same father's house in earlier days. Or the name given to the child furnished a memorial of events in the national history, like Ichabod, "the glory is not" (1 S 4:21), and probably Obed-edom, "Edom is serving" (I S 14:47; 21:7); or it told of circumstances attending the child's birth, as Saul, "asked," and Joab, "asked," and Simonis in his Malechah, "who?'s embodied an article of the parent's creed, as Joab and Abijah, "Jeh is a father," Joel, "Jeh is God"; or it expressed a hope concerning the child or bore witness to a prophecy, as Jelidiah, "beloved of Jeh," and Solomon, "peaceable." (2 S 12:35; 1 Ch
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.

2. The covenant relation with God, 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. It is, 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 Jeh to be His viceroy on the throne of Israel (2 Sam 7:14) found expression in the royal names that by 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 Jehoshaphat Abijah grew in importance. 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 Jeh as its subject. The only exceptions among the 16 successors of Asa on the throne were Manasseh and his son Amon, both of whom were notoriously apostate from Jeh. The full name of Ahaz was Jehoahaz. Josiah's son Shallum as king was known as Jehoahaz; and his brother Eliakim, when placed on the throne by Ahaz, took the name Jehoiakim (2 Kings 23:30). (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 sacredness of priestly office and the ever present hope that it served. It is evident that it was not confined to the kings, and it frequently led to the choice of an ecclesiastical name containing the word God or Jeh. 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 Jeh as subject, and another is a sentence with El as subject. The materials for investigation of this latter class are 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 Jeh'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 society it is impossible 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 acquiring themselves the names of certain persons, and the personal names current in the families of farmers, shopkeepers, and soldiers obtained a place in the religious history of another time, when the activities of the court are of paramount importance, It is mainly names that were current in official circles which are recorded. in other periods, when the records do not reach the earlier periods of the national worship, we may often find the name of a soldier or a farmer in the written form of the name of a soldier or a farmer.

Very few names outside of the particular circle concerned are preserved in the records. It is unwaranted, 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 official upheavals 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 mingled circles with the number of the same names among ecclesiastics, in order to learn whether these names were less common among the people as a whole in the one period than in another.

The brine of its waters led the ancient Hebrews to call the Dead Sea the Salt Sea. Bethsaida was "house of mercy," received its name from the belief in the healing virtue of its waters; Lebanon, "white," from the appearance of its snow-topped peaks; Sidon on the Mediterranean Sea and Bethsaida on the Sea of Galilee, from their fisheries; 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; and from the acacia groves of the eastern terrace of the Jordan valley; and Jericho, from the fragrance of its palms and balsams. The "erage of the wild goats" and En-gedi, "kid spring" (1 S 24:12), were in a deo-late, 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, "pleasance," and Ramah, "peace," and, the "silence," 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 fortified, and the sea was called Serion and Senir. The sanctuary of a deity might give name to a town, hence Beth-dagon, Beth-shean, and Ashhtaroth. Sometimes the name of a place commemorated a victory, as rock Oreb, rock Zeboiim, and Eden-azer (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 1:23-28); sometimes the name of a river or stream, of 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 Gibeah, Gibeah-samuel, Gibeah-gideon, and Gibeah-sparshieus. 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 15:20). The practice was common among the various names of towns contemporaries of Israel as it is to this day. Dar-shararoun, "Sargonsburg," and Kar-shalmanashardi, "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 the notice of the geographer. The names of the tribes under discussion, in the absence of the historical form of the name. In an inquiry after the origin of a geographical designation the first consideration is due to the cause 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 etymology. The problem might, indeed, with rare exceptions be successfully solved if the text would lend itself to accurate transcription; but the letter w in the midst of the name Samuel would itself prevent the Semite from imagining such an etymology. The derivation and meaning of Samuel were not obscure. The name was common, and was especially connected with the peculiar idea of "face of God." (Gen. 32:30). Samuel means "name of God." (Gesenius). As Jacob, upon his return from Padan-aram, in fulfillment of his vow erected an altar at Beth-el as a memorial of God’s bestowment of the promise made and the protection conceded, "The God of Beth-el" (Gen. 35:1-3.7), so Hannah having by vow dedicated to Jeh the son for whose birth she was praying, now that her prayer has been answered and the son given, calls him "Jeh Shalom"; the 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 just and Shalom and sh’alim in 1 S. 1:20 was unsought, for these words were later interpolated in the LXX, and the emphasis is placed on the giving of the child. The history of the discussion concerning this name shows how far astray criticism has been led by the false theory that the purpose of the narrator was to analyze the names and declare their meaning.

Reuben affords evidence to the same effect. The name was known to the early Hebrews in this form exclusively. It is spelt by them not as R’abehn but as Reuben (Gen. 29:32; 50:14; Jps 5:15.16), by the LXX, by the Gr tr (A and B and Lucian), by the Tgs, and by the MS Heb. (Rev 17). Yet in the 1st cent. Jos. added name, which later termination, wrote Reubelos; and later the Syr version has the name Ruhbél and the Arabic version as Rúbel and Sibél. The late variations are reasonably explained as a softening of the pronunciation, which had come into vogue in the household of Rehoboam. In speaking particularly regarding Reuben, the liquids š and l sometimes interchanged, giving rise to two forms in a word in the same language or in kindred languages (Gesenius, Thesaurus, 727; Wright, Comp. Grammar, 67; Zimmermann, Vergleichende Grammatik, § 117). Notwithstanding the evidence furnished by the literature, the name is given to Reuel as the original form by which the "the only plausible explanation of the etymology," given in Gen. 29:32 is "It is based on the form R’abehn—R’ahb’al (Gesenius, Jps 386). An exhibition of the etymology was needless, however, and was not the end which the writer had in view. His purpose was to explain the etymology of the particular name upon the child; and in stating it he does not deal with the meaning of the word but with the meaning of the name Reuben. The name signifies either "vision of a son" or "eye of gold, y’al a son." In either case the emphatic word is "son." As Hannah, loaded with the burden of her barrenness, besought God to look upon her affliction and bestow a child which should be able to return to the name of the child. In the words of verse 27, the answer was given, "If the Lord will provide me a child." Good or bad, y’al a son. A male child was to be her proof of God’s regard for her marriage 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 such names mean properly, ‘See how God has been good to me’ but the sacred writer in Gen. 32:32 explains it as for rabb’al (rab’hal). 'provided in my affliction' (Leroyen, Thesaurus). This was a serious piece of criticism may be regarded as an example of the reduction ad absurdum of the hypothesis that the Hebrew writers intended to give the derivation of the origin of the proper names. The result of endeavoring to force the derivation of one etymology into an intentional etymology compels the assumption that the Hebrew writer misunderstood some of the simplest phrases of his own language and proposed a construction impossible of itself and utterly foreign to the principles which underlie Hebrew 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 between the name and the character and name of the person. These are among the most technical and difficult problems connected with the study of the Bible. Names are variously connected with the experience of its bearer, or of attaching to the name an idea, or of linking 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 called 'Hebrewized' from nouns and vbs., and have the force of adjs., dimin-
utives, or abstract nouns, and are sometimes used as
concrete nouns (Stade, Lehrbuch der hebräischen
Grammatik, § 296). The Israelites at once recog-
nized the meaning of a form, for instance the name Sime-
on, 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 he includes the name within the reason for
the choice of this particular name for Leah's second son: "[Leah] said, Because Jeh hath
heard that I am hated, he hath therefore given me
this son also; and she called his name Simeon." The
root of the name is used as a vb. in the state-
ment of the motive. It was conventional and natural
to do so, since the vb. shama' was the proper word
to express the idea and was one of the most common
words in the language. There would be no reason
to suppose that identity with the root of the name
would indicate that the reason given by the
narrator in the case of the other sons of Jacob to
maintain a similar correspondence. Accordingly,
that form of paronomasia is employed where a word
is used that is one with the name in derivation, but
differs in form and grammatically is a different
part of speech.

In the case of Cain a cognate root is used. The
name is a segolate noun from the root kân, which
means "to form," and then specifically to form at
the ear. This form may actually be the root noun
and denote formation, or a concrete noun
denoting a forged weapon, or the agent in the
work, namely a smith. In stating the reason for
giving this name to the child, it was not feasible
to use the vb. kân, because of the technical mean-
ing which had become attached to it. To avoid
misunderstanding the cognate vb. kânâth is
employed, which has radically the same significance,
but is without the technical implications (Gen
4 1). The result is that kind of paronomasia which
exists when the sound and cognate
origin, but difference of meaning.

In the case of Noah a root unrelated to the name in
origin, but containing a similar sound, is used. The
Bib. name Noah is derived from Noah the son
of Shem. The root shem is the transpersonation of a foreign word or is its tr into Heb;
he merely declares that as given it expressed the father's
high opinion of him because he saved his life from
the ancient curse upon the ground. If the name is
Heb., its root may be observed. At any rate it
promptly suggested to the ear of the Hebrew the idea of
rest. But the vb. nish is used in Heb., as is the corre-
sponding vb. "rest" in Eng., to express the two ideas of
relief and cessation. Lamech did not mean that his
son would cause men to cease from work; but that he
would secure for them complete relief from toil due to God's
curse on account of sin (Gen 5 29, with a reference to
3 17-19). The writer does not use the ambiguous word.
To avoid ambiguity, yet with a view to preserving assis-
tance with Noah, he employs the vb. shemâ, which has
as one of its meanings the sense of comfort or relief.

(2) The indication of a coincidence between the
character or experience of a person and his name;
not 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 Sadder; for the
Lord hath made me very bitterly 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 mean-
ing that his name has in Heb was seen, and called
forth the bitter word-play: 'Is he not rightly
named Heifer? for he is a herd of seven years; and
these two times' (Gen 27 36). Isaac, so far as the
formation is concerned, may be an abstract noun
meaning "laughter," or a concrete noun, "laughing
one," or a vb., in the imperfect, "he laughs" or "one
that laughs" (cf. in the name Shams, "sun")
(Stade, hebraischen Grammatik, § 295a). 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 speak-
ing of laughter the name was a constant reminder
to the parents of the laughter of unfuss 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 laughter, unfuss, with which
the promise was signed, "smile," she says, "I hav-
epreparad for me laughter [of joy], everyone
that heareth [of the event] will laugh [with joy]
for me" (21 6; cf Ps 136 2).

(3) Attachment of a prophecy to a name. Par-
onomasia in this form is used for this purpose.
A meaning of the name, or a sound heard in it, or
a contrast suggested by it may be played upon. In
these several ways the prophet Micah plays upon
successive names in one paragraph (Mic 1 10-18).
In answer to the question whether a promise is
given concerning the lad, which is introduced
by a play upon his name: "As for the boy
[named] "God heareth," I have heard thee" (Gen
17 18-20). To Gad a prophecy is attached in Gen
49 19. Two cognate roots are employed: godhâkh, which
underlies the word rendered troop or maraud-
ing band, and gâdâd, which means "to pass." In
the use not only of the root of the name Gad, but of
a different root also that is similar in sound, it is evi-
dent that the purpose is simply to play upon the
name. The brief oracle is uttered almost exclu-
sively by means of variations in the vocalization of
the two roots, producing one of the most successful
word-plays in Hebrew literature.

Juda is a noun corresponding to the Hophal
imperfect, and means "bearing burdens," "offering
praise." In bestowing this name upon her child the
mother signifies that she will bear with strug-
gle after she said: "Now will I praise Jeh." (Gen
29 35). In Gen 49 8 a prophecy is spoken concerning Judah. The
same etymology and meaning are recognized as before,
but the application is different. The birth of Judah
had made God an object of praise, the great deeds of the tribe of Judah were destined to make that tribe an object
of praise. To quote the oracle: "Object of praise,"
declares the Lord to His brother praise. In this difference of refer-
ence and in the repetition of the significant word con-
stitutes the play upon the name.

Dan is played upon in much the same way. The
name may be a participle, used as a noun, and be rendered
judgment's"; but it is probably related to that numerous
class in which the names are vbs. in the perfect, and
signifies, "he hath judged." His adoptive mother had
called his name Dan, because God had heard her com-
plaint and decided the cause in her favor (Gen 30 6).
In attacking the prophecy the name is played upon by
changing the subject and, in order to refer to the future,
by substituting the imperfect for the perfect of the vb.: "He hath judged," shall judge the tribes of Israel" (Gen 49 16). See also God, Names of;
Name.

JOHN D. DAVIS

NANAA, na-na'a (Naval, Nano; AV Nanea): A female deity worshipped by the Assyrians, Babyloni-
ans and Persians and other Asiatic peoples, the Nana or Nanae of the Babylonians, as
the "lady of the Babylon." The name means "the
undied," 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 Ashorth in Phoenicia by the Greeks as Aphrodite (Clem. Alex. Prodr., 19), but sometimes as Artemis the huntress (Paus. iii.16.8; Plut. Artax. xxvii). Strabo (xv. 733) identifies her with Anaitis (= Anahita), the Asian Artemis. She was the Venus, but sometimes the Diana, of the Romans. There are many variants of the name: Anaie (Strabo xvi.738), Aneisita (Plut. Artax. xxvii), Tanaia (Clem. Alex. loc. cit.), also Tanath, sometimes in Phoen inscriptions, Tanata, Anta (Egypt). In 2 Mac 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 real site, she "like thunderbolts" from above, killed the king and his suite and then cut off their heads. But 1 Mac 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. In the account of 2 Mac 1 13 ff must be more leged, as far as Epiphanes is concerned, but may have been suggested or colored by the story of the death of Antiochus the Great, who met his death while plundering a temple of Belus near Elymais (Strabo xvi.118; Diod. Sic. 573; Justin, xxiii.2). The temple of Nanaea referred to in 2 Mac 1 13 ff may be identified with that of Artemis (Polyb. xxxi.11; Jos, Ant. XII, ix, 1) or Aphrodite (Appian, Syr. 66; Rawlinson, Speaker's Comm.).

S. ANGUS

NAOMI, nā'ō-mī, nā'-ō-mī, nā'-ō-mī (נָּאֹמִי), no'omi, probably = "pleasantness"; LXX B, Ναο-μέι, Νοημέλην, A, Νοημέλην[u], Νοημελήν[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'omi ("pleasantness"), but nārāh ("bitterness"), "for," she said, "the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me." She advised Ruth in her dealings with Boaz, and assured her childless her child. The name may mean "my joy," "my bliss," but is perhaps better explained according to the traditional interpretation as "the pleasant one."

D AVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

NAPHTHALI, nā'pa-thālī (נָּפַתָלִי), naph'talī; Nef-θαλֵי, Naphthalaim):

I. The Patriarch
1. Name
2. Circumstances of His Birth
3. Historical and Traditional Details
II. Tribe of Naphtali
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.

1. Name
2. Circumstances of His Birth
3. Histori
4. Traditional
5. According to Tg Pseudojon, he was a
cal and
d multiplier of

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

1. Relative
2. Distribution
3. According to the Pseudojon, the people of the tribe 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 Jewish tradition, was a serpent, or basilisk, as 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 Amniah 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 Jeromoth ben Aziel (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 3 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, IV, i, 22); but there is nothing to support this. The southern boundary probably ran from the point where Wady el-Birch enters the Jordan, northward along the northern side of the valley to Mt. Tabor. The western border may have gone up by way of Halittin (Zildam) and Yāḥkōk (Hukkok) to Kefr ‘Anān (Hammath), 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 Litāyān (Leontes), taking in the larger part of what is called the Arabs Belad Beqārāh and Belad es-Shubkī. Nineteen cities in N. are named in Josh 19 52ff. Among them was the famous city of refuge, Kedesh-Naphtali (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-Or 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 38, 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 incursion 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 rich 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, fig, pomegranate, orange, lemon and vine are cultivated, to good purpose. The grape 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 toil 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 opportunity 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 captains “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 16 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 GALILEE.

The largest town in Mt. Naphtali 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 Wādy Līmān, rises Jēbel Jermuk, the highest mountain in Pal proper (e. 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).

6. Labors of N. included in the New Testament. See the following.

NAPHTALI MOUNT (נַפְתָלִי מִנְתוֹן, har naphtalīh; in τοῦ ὅρα τῆς Ναφθαλί, en to őrei tēs Nēphtali), Mount Naphtali: 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. Naphtali (Josh 20 7 AV, RV replaces "Mount" by "the hill country of").

NAPHTHIAH, na’thā’r (AV): RV “Naphthor.”

NAPHTHAIM, nap’tā’him (בַּנְתַּהִים, naphtāhim; LXX Ναφθαήμον, Ναφθαήμου): A son of Mizraim (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: Napthaim = (1) Nephiha (Nepthá, Νεϕήθα), in the N.E. of Egypt; (2) Na‘ptaḥ, i.e. the people of Ptah, the dwellers in the neighborhood of Memphis; (3) Natha (according to Herodotus, Ναθα, Nathō), which occurs in Assurbanipal’s Annals as the name of a part of Lower Egypt; (4) Erman (ZATW, X, 118), the change of a letter, reads Penthaim, 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 Gez).

NAPKIN, nap’kin (ῥοδάπον, rodāpon; 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.
Narcissus
Natural, Nature

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

NARRISSLUS, nar-eis'us (Naporiosos, Narcissos): 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 the writer 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. Both were put to death by Caligula (Dio Cass. Ixiv.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 Caligula 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. xix.44). I. 54 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 “Cæsar’s household” as Narcissus.

S. F. Hunter

NARD, nárd. See SPINENARD.

NASBAS, nas'bas (Naśbs, Nasbá, N, Naśbd, Nabbd, read by Fritzsche); A name otherwise unknown. It occurs only in Tob 11 18, “And Achicharsus, 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 Achicharsus. AV gives the suggestion of Junius. “Achicharsus who is also called Nasbas,” thus identifying Nasbas with Achicharsus, which might gain support from 1 22 where Achicharsus is mentioned as “brother’s son” of Tobit. See ACHICHARSUS; AMAN. N reads “Achicharsus and Nabbad his brother’s son,” which is corrected by another hand to “brother’s son” (ἐξαδελφος, ecdelphos). The Itala gives “Nabba ancunus [“maternal uncle”] illius;” the Vulg “Nabath consobrinus [“cousins”] Tobiae;” Syr “Laban his master’s son is properly identical with the “Aman” of Tob 14 10 (see variety of readings under AMAN) and the nephew in Harris’ Story of Ahišar and His Nephew.

S. Angus

NASI, ná'si (B. Nasē, Nasēi, A. Nasēi, Nasith; AV Nasith): The head of one of the families which went up with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 32) = “Nehemiah” of Ezr 2 54; Neh 7 56.

NASOR, nā'sor. See HAZOR.

NATHAN, nā-than’ (navigation; “gift”); Našôw, Nathan): 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 1-7 = 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 chasen 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 ver 12 is collective and so throughout the passage, so that the prophecy does not refer to one individual, but, like Dt 17, belongs to the group of generic prophecies. Nor is it Messianic, for ver 14 could not be reconciled with the ministrations of Agrippa to the infant Jesus (cf. Acts 4 27), nor with the greater grace of the ever-merciful providence of God in dealing with David’s family. See, however, A. Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, 126 ff.) Budge, who says that the section belongs to the 7th cent. and is certainly preexilic in the subject, in the prophecy something of the idealism of Amos and Hosea, for the prophet teaches that Jehovah’s throne shall be firm, and the assurance of Solomon’s Alexander’s parrhesia, and the application of it to David’s conduct. But several difficulties arise when we ask exactly what Nathan’s message to David was: vs 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 vs 1-15a. But there is no indication of 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 all the apocalypse” (H. P. Smith, OT Hist, 153, n. 2). It narrates the part that Nathan played in the events that led to Solomon’s accession. David was getting old and feeble, and the succession Adonijah had not been settled. When Adonijah, who was probably the younger 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 remonstrate. David’s 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 suggested that it is only Nathan who interprets Adonijah’s feast as a claim to the throne, but this contradicts vs 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 opportunity to induce David’s presence at the very time that Bathsheba has an audience with the king. The | narrative of 1 Ch 28 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 Zahah, 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
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 8 32).  
(3) Father of Igil, one of David’s heroes (2 S 23 36). In 1 Ch 11 38, we have “Joel the brother of Nathan”; LXX B has “soon” in this verse, but it is impossible to say whether Igil 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’e-al (Nathanas, Nathanal):  
(1) One of the “captains over thousands” who furnished the Levites with much cattle for Josiah’s Passover (1 Esd 1 9) = “Nethaniel” of 2 Ch 35 9. (2) When Peter, Nathanael, B A om); One of the priests who had married a “strange wife” (1 Esd 9 22 = “Nethaniel” of Ezr 10 22.  
(3) An ancestor of Judith (Jth 8 1).  
(4) One of the Twelve Apostles. See next article.  

NATHANIEL (Ναθανελ), n’th-an’el, “God has given”; Nathanael, 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 Clopas, 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 fact that he had been called 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 insignificant 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 removed 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, where he is one of the seven who witnessed the appearance of the risen Jesus (in the Sea of Tiberias (Jn 21 2)), it is evident that the connection and companionship of N. with Jesus must be seen as the closest of the 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 (cf Matt 28 24-29; Mark 16 7); (2) in the Synoptists, Philip is closely connected with Bartholomew (notes of the apocrypha), and in John with N. (cf Jn 1 45ff); (3) the fact that most of the other apostles bear two names. Arguments are also adduced to identify him with Simon the Cananaean (of Syros). N. has also been identified with Matthew the tax-gatherer (based on the similarity of name; “Simon, son of Zechede, with Stephen, and even with Paul.”  

C. M. KERR  

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

NATHAN-MELECH, nath’an-mel’ek (ταυταμελής, nathan-melekh, “king’s gift”): A Judean official, to whose chamber King Josiah removed “the horses of the sun” (2 Kgs 22 11). LXX X, Nath’melekh, “Nathan, the king’s eunuch” (Nathan basileos tou evonouch).  

NATIONS, n’shunz. See Gentiles; Goim; Heathen; Table of Nations.  

NAVI, n’a-v’th. OF MARY, GOSPEL OF THE. See Apocalypse.  

NATURAL, n’a-tur-al, NATURE, n’a-tur’; leb’; ψυχικός, psuchikos, φυσικός, phusikos, φύσις, physis): “Natural” is the tr of leb’h, “freshness or vigor” (Dt 34 7). It is not as though his heart was no dim, nor his natural force abated.  

1. As Used “Nature” in the sense of a system or order in which the world and men, each individual, were conceived as the direct creation of a supra-mundane God, and conserved by His power and Spirit. The later conception of “nature” came in with Greek thought.  

In the Apoc, we find “nature” in the sense of innate character or constitution (Wis 7 20, “the natures [phusias] of living creatures”; 13 1, “Surely vain are all men by nature” [phaisel], 3 Mac 3 29, “mortal nature” [phusias]). In the NT “nature” (phusis) is frequently found in the latter sense (Rom 1 26, “against nature”; 2 14, “by nature”; 27; 11 24, also.  

2. As Used “contrary to nature”; 1 Cor 11 14, in the NT “Doth 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 “Gr nature,” also “mankind” (ver 7), RVm “Gr the human nature”—“Natural” (Rom 11 21-24) is the tr of kal’ phusis, “according to the nature” 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” (psuchh), the animal, natural, principle, as contrasted with that which he expected to be 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 psychic and soul-nature, the “spiritual body” corresponding to the Spirit
E. of the Jordan—Dead Sea—Arabah depression, to the whole of which the name Ghaur (Ghôr) is applied by the Arabs, is a great table-land sloping gradually to the E. from the sharp edge which overlooks the Ghaur. It has no conspicuous peaks. What appear to be peaks when viewed from the Ghaur are irregularities of its western contour, which are invisible or appear as slight mounds to the observer who looks westward from any point some miles to the E. Mt. Nebo, for instance, when seen from Medeba is not readily distinguishable. This is because it really does not rise above the general 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 Negeb, 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, ʿashdāhāt, 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 Judean hills to the Ghaur. In Dv 3 17; 4 49; Josh 12 3; 13 20, we have “the slopes of Pisgah” (ʿashdāhāt ʿarabah), “spring of Piwhah,” 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 Sinaitic 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 Judea between Jerus and the Jordan. See CHAMPAIGN; COUNTRY; DESERT; EAST; HILL; LOWLAND; SOUTH.

See NAUTICAL HISTORY, his 'ārî. See ANIMAL; BOTANY; BIRDS; FISHES; INSECTS; ZOOLOGY.

NAUTICAL HISTORY. See NAUTICAL, Nature.

NAUGHT, nà, NAUGHTY, nà'ti, NAUGHTINESS, -nes: In the sense of bad, worthless, weakness, the words in AV represent the Heb ʿārâ‘, ra‘, changed in RV to “bad” (2 K 2 19; Prov 20 14; Jer 24 2); ʿārâ‘, retained in AV “naughtiness” (1 S 17 25), ʿârâ‘, homework rendered 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 kaxía, kaxiā) becomes in RV “overflowing of wickedness,” in “malign,” and in Wsd 12 10 AV’s “naughty generation” (τὰμνοι, pontoro) is made into “by birth . . . evil.”

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, MOLTEN.

NAVE, nāv‘è (NAVY, NAUD): Gr form of the Heb proper name “Nun” (so RV), found only in AV of Sir 46 1.

NAVEL, nāv‘èl (ʿeww, shôr [LXX in Prov 3 8 suggests a different reading, viz. instead of ʿeww, shôrêkkáh, ʿeww, shôrêkkâh = ʿeww, shôrêkkâh, “thy flesh”]): The AV translates the Heb shôrir in the description of Behemoth (Job 40 16) by “navel,” where modern translators have substituted “muscles”; similarly in the tr of shôrir (Cant 7 2) it has been
replaced by "body." There remain two passages of RV where "navel" is retained as the tr of shor. Thus we first find the word used, prep pro teto, for the whole being: "It [the four of Jeob] was the health of thy navel, and marrow to thy bones" (Prov 3 8). The uttermost neglect which a new-born babe can experience is expressed by Exekiel: "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" (Ezk 16 4).

H. L. E. LEURING

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

NAZARENE, naz-a-rēn', naz'ə-rēn (Naẓārēn, Nazarēnēs; Nazaroilos 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-filment of the old Israel prophecy (Isa 11 1 (Heb)): "That it might be "honorable Title" as 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, the term being from Isa. 11. 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 given in Isa 11, on account of the low estate in which this place was held (Jn 4 46). Nor is it perfectly clear, has been done by Tertullian and Jerome, to substitute the word "Nazaria" for "Nazarene," which in every view of the case is contrary to the patent facts of the life of Saviour.

Says Meyer, "In giving this prophetic title to the Messiah he entirely disregards the historical meaning of the same (LXX Isa 11 1, anthsos), keeps by the relationship of the name Nazareth to the word nazar, and recognizes by virtue of the same, in that prophetic Messianic name nazar, the typical reference to this—that Jesus through His settlement in Nazareth was to become a 'Nazarōis,' a 'Naza'ren.'" This name clung to Jesus throughout His entire life. It became His name among the masses: "One of the chief is Nazareth" (Lk 4 7; Jn 6 49, 24 19). Perhaps Matthew, who wrote after the event, may have been influenced in his application of the Isaian prophecy by the very fact that Jesus was popularly thus known. Even in the realm of spirits 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 disciples, in their later lives and work, also 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 attitude was compressed in that one word of Nathanael, by which he voiced his doubt, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (Jn 4 46). In the name "Nazarene," 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 haben, it signifies unadulterated 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 leaders of the Nazarenes; thus, however, is based upon the fact of the Nazarenes" (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. DYSKER

NAZARETH, naz-ar-eth (Naζαρηθ, Nazarēth, Naζάρηθ, Nazareth, and other forms): A town in Galilee, the home of Joseph and the 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; 4 16, etc.). He was therefore called Jesus of Nazareth, although His birthplace was Bethlehem; and those who became His disciples were known as Nazarenes. This is the name, with slight modification, used to this day by Molemans for Christians, Naζαρηθ—the sing. being Naζαρηθ.

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 settlement here in old times. Quaresimus learned that the ancient name was Medina Abiat, in which we may recognize the Arab. el-Mednat el-balṭah, "the white town." Built of the white stone supplied by the limestone rocks around, the description is quite accurate. There is a reference in Mish (M'nā-khah, 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.," an ancient midh rash now lost (Neubauer, Glog. du Talm., 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-Nāṣirah, 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 Edraison. 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 southwestern "lip of the hollow; that to Tiberias and Damascas on the heights to the N. The valley 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 does not have 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 the town, he town itself, bears the name of the Jn 4 46, the name of Jesus.

2. Position and Physical Features

The road to the coast, the main thoroughfare of the ancient town, runs from 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 Nebel Sa'in. From this point a most beautiful and extensive view is obtained, ranging on a clear day from the Mediterranean to 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 Esdraison is seen, that great battle-field, associated with so many heroic events in Israel's history, from Carmel and Megiddo to Tabor and Mt. Gilboa.
The Nazirite

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 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 13:55). 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?" (Ez, 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 (Epiphanius), 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 Bishars 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 1837.

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

W. Ewing

Nazaret, from the Road to the Plain of Esdraelon.

pales, nazirites, as also various words indicating "holiness" or "devotion"; AV Nazarite, nazirite:

1. Antiquity and Origin
2. Conditions of the Vow
3. Initiation
4. Restoration
5. Completion and Release
6. Semi-nazarite Character
7. Nazirites for Life
8. Samson's Case
9. Samuel's Case
10. Token of Divine Favor
11. Did Not Form Communities
12. Among Early Christians
13. Parallels among Other Peoples

The root-meaning of the word in Heb as well as the various Gr tr's indicates the Nazirite as "a consecrated one" or "a devotee." In the circumstances of an ordinary vow, men consecrated some mate-
of Israel's ancient and simpler way of living, and as a protection against luxury in settling nomads. It is worthy that the Scented vine 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 farther in refusing even in Canaan to abandon the no-wine 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, the vow is 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 Nazirismit entrailed: (1) the strictest abstinence from wine and from every product of the vine; (2) the keeping of the hair untorn 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 the Nazirite waxed the head for one year 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 head was shaved of its voluntary growth 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 restoration, in the undertaking of which the Nazirite shaved his head, presented two turtle-doves 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. This consisted of 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 6:17, the priest's vow being even designated נזר. 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 times, 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, 25b).

Samson is uniquely named a Nazirite in Jgs 13:7 and 15:17, but it has been objected that his case does not conform to the regulations in the Pent. It is said that he must have partaken of wine when he made his feast for his first feast for which 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; so that one or both of these objections, rising on the seeming 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 even so demanding as the ass's jawbone, to which the critics 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 11:1 that he was either a Nazir. ("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, and the case of the Nazirite is given.

10. Token of Divine Favor

As was also evident in the dedication of James, the tokens 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

11. Did Not some sense the Essenes may have conceived Form Com-...of the Weni...of the Nazirites, the immunities, the Lord's brother (Euseb., HE, 1, viii, 3, following Hegesippus), and also Banus, tutor of Jos (Vita, 2), who is probably the same as the Buni mentioned as a disciple of Jesus in Soph. 452, were devotees of a kind resembling Nazirites. Berecut's vow was also manifest that of the Nazirite (Jos, BJ, II, xv, 1). The case of John the Baptist is quite certain, and it was probably the means of introducing the custom among the early Christians. It was clearly a Nazir's vow which Paul Early took, "having shorn his head in Christians Cencreaus" (Acts 18:18), and which he completed at Jerusalem with other Christians similarly placed (Acts 21:23).

As the expenses of release were heavy for poor men, such were at times aided in this matter by their richer brethren. Thus Agrippa, on his return from Rome, assisted many Nazirites (Jos, Ant, XIX, vi, 1), and Paul was also at charges with others (Acts 21:23).

We come across something of the same kind in many countries, and we find special abstinence always emphasized. Thus we meet with a class of "votaries" as early as the days of Hammurabi, and his code dealt with quite a number of sections to them. Among others, it is said that they were prohibited from even entering a wineshop (Sect. 110).
Then we are familiar with the Hierodoulai of the Greeks, and the Vestal Virgins of the Romans.

The word παράξενον appears in Syr and was applied to the maidens devoted to the service of Belthias. In the text, it has always been used by individuals and societies of ascetics who were particularly Nazirites, and the modern dervish in nearly every way resembles him; while 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 pares his nails till the completion of his vow in Mecca.

W. M. Christie

NEAH, nē' (παράξενον, καραβήθ, "the nea!"; "Avvóv, Annów): 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 quite definitely localized. It may probably have lain to the N. of Rimmon (Rummaneh), about 4 miles N.E. of Sef práiräh.

NEAPOLIS, nē-ap'olís (Neapolis, Νεάπολις, WH, Νεάς Πόλις): 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 had 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 is likely to have marked there 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 Eski Kavala (Cousinry, Mackindoe, 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 Christopoli in mediaeval and Kavala in modern times. But the general view, which is generally accepted, is that Neapolis was a separate settlement, which, by the evidence, both literary and archaeological, places Neapolis at Kavala, which lies on a rocky headland with a spacious harbor on its western side, in which the fleet of Brutus and Cassius was moored at the battle of the ships of Philippi (42 BC; Appian Bell. Civ. iv.106). The town lay some 10 Roman 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 Thasos, which lay opposite to it (Dio Cassius xvi.65). It appears (under the name of Neapolis, which is also borne on its coin) 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 Thaskan revolt of 411-408 BC (Inscr. Græc., 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 III, 1838; Courajod Voyage dans la Macédoine, II, 69 ff, 109 ff; Heusey and Daumont, Mission archéol. de Macédoine, 11 ff.)

M. N. Tod

NEAR, nēr, NIGH, ní (chiefly יָרָה, יָרִיק, "to draw near," יָרָה, יָרִיק; εἴγγα, εἴγγαι): 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; Mk 13 28), or kinship (Lev 21 2; Ruth 3 12), but also employed of moral nearness. Jews are "nigh" to them that are of a broken heart (Ps 34 13). God draws nigh to His people, and they to Him (Jas 4 8). The antithesis is God's "farness" from the wicked.

NEARIAS, nē-a-r'as (παράξενον, ἄργαθ): (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."

NEBAIL, nē'bäl, nē'bāt, neb'āt (נְבָאִית, נְבָעִית): See Nebai.

NEBIOITH, nē-bi'yoth, nē-bi'yothe (נְבִי'יָהוֹת, נְבִי'יָיוֹת): LXX Nabàiôt, Nabàiôdút: Firstborn of Ishmael (Gen 25 13; 28 9; 36 3; 1 Ch 1 29). Isa 60 7 mentions the tribe Nebioith with Kedar, with an allusion to its pastoral nature: "the rams of Nebioith" are to serve the ideal Zion as sacrificial victims. Again associated with Kedar, the name occurs frequently in Assyr inscriptions. The tribe must have had a conspicuous place among the northern Arabs. Jos, followed by Jerome, regarded Nebioith as identical with the Nabataeans, the great trading community and capital of the northern desert, which was characterized by its network of cities, its great trading community and its capital and stronghold was Petra. This view is evidently accepted, but the name "Nabataean" is spelled with נ, and the interchange of נ and ת, although not unparalleled, is unusual. If the name is of Sem, it is probable a foreign name, and that could have no connection with the Nabataeans.

A. S. FULTON

NEBAILAT, nē-ba'ilat (נְבָאָלָת, nûbaháth; Na-ba'llàt, Nabàlâtass): A town occupied by the Benja-tites after the exile, named along with Lod and Ono (Neh 11 34). It is represented by the modern Beit Nebâla, 4 miles N.E. of Lydda.

NEBÁT, nêbât (נֶבָט, nûbáth): 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, nēbô (נְבּוֹ, nûbô; 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 Nebo there represent Babalon). His own special abode was "at Borsippa." His planet was Mercury. His name enters into Bib. names, as "Nebuchadnezzar," and perhaps "Abed-nego" (Dan 1 7, for "Abed-nebo, servant of Nebo"). See BABYLONIA and ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

NEBO (נְבּוֹ, nûbô; Na-bô, Nabô): (1) This town is named in Nu 32 3 between Sebam and Beon (which latter evidently represents Baal-meon of ver 35), 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 Aser and Baalmeon. In their denunciations of wrath against Moab, Isaiah names it along with Medeba (Isa 16 2) and Jeremiah with Kiriatiam (Jer 48 1), and again (ver 26) between Dibon and Beth-diblathaim. Meshha (Mi S) 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 Ashhtar-chemosh. Jerome (On Isa 15 2) tells us that at Nebo was the idol of Chemosh. The site which seems best to meet the requirements of the passages indicated is on the ridge of Jebel Nebâb to the S.W. of Hesbân, where ruins of an ancient town bearing the name of en-nebâb are found (Buhl, GIP, 266).
(2) (תֵּבֶּא, נַבֵּה; B, נָבָה, Nāḇā, A, נָבָא, Nabā, 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 to its exact position. It may be represented by either Beth Nebā, 12 miles N.W. of Jerus, or Nebā, which lies about 4 miles S.S.E of 'Id el-Mā’ (Adulium).

NEBO, MOUNT (אֶבֶּל, נָבָא, נָבָא, נָבָה): 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 23 17; 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 the 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 ‘Aṭṭārās, which is too far to the E., and is fully 15 miles S. of a line drawn eastward from Jericho. Jebel ‘Usha, again, in Mt. Gilgal, 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 Nebā is found on a ridge which, some 5 miles S.W. of Heere 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-Kady) is visible from the Nebo hilltop, and the Mediterranean is the hinder sea, it also is invisible. But, as Driver says (‘Dt. ’4,’ ICC, 419), the terms in Dt 34 1.3 are hyperbolic, and must be taken as including points in the imagination as well as the actually visible horizon (see Mr. Birch argues in favor of Tel ‘al el-Bedâ‘in, whence he believes Dan and Zoar to be visible, while he identifies ‘the hinder sea’ with the Dead Sea (PEFS, 1898, 110 ff).

NEBUCHADREZZAR, neb-ā-kad-nez’ar, NEBUCHADREZZAR, -re’zar: 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 Hebrew 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 preeminently, along with his oppression and the exodus, among the foci 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 Ν. Ναβουχοδόνος, and in the Vulg. Νεβουχόδωνος. This latter form is found also in the AV Apocalypse, Ezek, and Est and Bar, but not Jth or Tob. This change from r to s 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 Burnabury Youth and Burrunaryush, Ben-badad and Bar-hadad (see Brockelman’s Comparative Grammar, 136, 175, 220). It is possible, however, that the form Nebuchadrezzar is the Aram. tr. of the Bab Nebuchadnezzar. If we take the name to be compounded of Nabu-kudurri-usur in the sense ‘O Nabu, protect thy servant’ the name-kudurri-usur would be the best tr possible in Aramaic. Such a tr of proper names are common in the old Vetus and Scriptures and elsewhere. For example, in WAT. V. 44, we find 4 columns of proper names of persons giving the Semitic originals and the Sem tr of the tên of Bar-hadad in Aram. for Bēn-badad. In early Aram. the š had not yet become t (see Cooke, Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions, 185 f; so that for any person who thought that kudurri meant ‘servant’ N. would be a perfect tr into Aram. of Nebuchadrezzar.

The father of N. was Nabopolassar, probably a Chaldean prince. His mother is not known by name. The classical historians mention two wives: Amytis, the daughter of Astyages, and Nitoeris, the mother of Nabonaid. The monuments mention three sons: Evil-merodach who succeeded him, Nebuchadnezzar, and Marduk-nadin-ahī. A younger brother of N., called Nabu-shum-lishtir, 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, Ezek, Bar, and Jth. Further, there are the Books of Ch, Ezr, and the fragments of Berosus, Maneder, Megasthenes, Abydenus, and Alexander Polyhistor, largely as cited by Jos and Eusebius.

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

plateau of Moab, ‘sinking gradually: at first a broad brown field of arable land, then a flat crowned by a ruined cairn, then a narrower ridge ending in the summit called Siqāghah, whence the slopes fall steeply on all sides. The name Nebo or Nebā [the ‘knob’ or ‘tumulus’] applies to the flat top with the cairn, and the name ‘Tel ‘al es-Sufa’ to the ascent leading up to the ridge from the N. Thus we have three names which seem to connect the ridge with that whence Moses is related to have viewed the Promised Land, namely, first, Nebo, which is identically the same word as the modern Nebū, secondly, Siqāghah, which is radically identical with the Aram. ‘Se’āth, the word standing instead of Nebo in the Tf of Onkoles [Nu 32 3], where it is called the burial place of Moses; thirdly, ‘Tel ‘al es-Sufa’, which is radically identical with the Heb Zoph (זופֶּה), where Mizpah (מיזָפֶה) and Zophim (זופים). . . . The name Pisgah is not now
the armies of Babylon from 609 BC. At any rate, he was at the head of the army which defeated Pharaoh-necho at Carchemish on the Euphrates in 605 BC (see 2 K 23 31; History 2 Ch 35 20 ff). Having driven Pharaoh-necho 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 3d according to the Bab manner of reckoning (Dnl 1 1)), he came up first against Jerus and carried away part of the vessels of the temple and a few captives of noble lineage. Again, in Jehoiakim’s 11th year, he captured Jerus, put Jehoiakim, its king, into chains, and probably killed him. His successor, Jehoiachin, after a three months’ reign, was besieged in Jerus, captured, deposed, and carried captive to Babylon, where he remained in captivity 37 years until he was set free by Evil-mérodach. In the 9th year of Zedekiah, N. made a 4th expedition against Jerus 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 honorable 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’s great 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 Zar-pi-nat, but also to Shamash, Sin, Guila, 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 moats-walls and gates. He dug several broad, deep canals, and made dams for flooding the country to the N. and S. of Babylonia, 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 etc. 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 worthy of note that 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, but aside from the fact that we could scarcely expect a man to publish his own calamity, esp. madness, it should be noted that according to N. 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 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, or (2) of the image of gold that he set up, or (3) of the fiery furnace. 7. Madness, from which the three children were delivered (Dnl 3). 

Ascribed (Dnl 4) to N., it is 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-bal-pal and Nebuchadnezzar and Xerxes give a number of instances of the importance attached to dreams and their interpretation. It is almost certain that N. believed in them. That the dream recorded in Dnl is not mentioned on the monuments seems less remarkable than that no record of his is recorded. As to (2), we know that N. made an image of his royal person (salam sharratun, Langdon, XIX. B. col. x. 6: of the image of the royal person of Nabopolassar, id. p. 51), and it is certain that the images of Nebuchadnezzar were venerated in a bark in the New Year’s procession (id. pp. 157, 159, 163, 165) and that there were images of the former at all the temples (id. pp. 157, 159). The image was not received before these images. That N. should have made
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NECCHOD, n°-k°. —See NECHAR.
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NEEDY, nē'dē (נְדֵי, 'ebḥyōn). See Poon.

NEESEING, nē'zing (Job 41 18, AV, ERV "by his neesings a light doth shine," ARV "sneezings"): "Neeze" in Elizabethan Eng. (through two dis-
tinct derivations) could mean either "sneeze" or "snort." In the former, he cannot be caught between two words, which sense was intended by the AV editors. The Heb is נְקָנָה, 'ătāḇah, a word found only here, but connected with a Sem 'y meaning "sneeze," or, perhaps, "snort." Job 41 18 is part of the description of the "levita-
than" or crocodile. This animal has a habit of inflating himself, and after this he discharges through his nostrils, heated vapours, which sparkle in the sunlight. The act is neither a "sneeze" nor a "snort," but the latter word is sufficiently des-
criptive, There is no allusion to legendary "fire-
sputing" monsters. Cf Job 39 20; Jer 8 16.

In the older edd of AV 'neeze'd is found in 2 K 4 35; "and the child nesed seven times" (later edd and RV "sneezed"). BURTON SCOTT EASRON

NE Geb, neg'eb (נֶגֶב, ha-negeb, "the negeb," or simply, נָגֶב, negeb, from a Sem 'y meaning "to be-
dry," and therefore in the first instance among the "dry wastes," "parished regions," hence in LXX it is usually ἄνθρωπος, ἄρμος, "desert," also ἄνεβο, ἄνεβα): 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 τὴν ἔρημον, λίπης (see GEOGRAPHY).

The Eng. tr 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 22 the spies coming from the "wilderness of Zia-
tar" pitched camp "as far south as the South" although they were going north. The difficulty in these and many other passages is at once obviated if it is recog-
nized 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 Dhabayt—"the probable site of Deirib (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 E. in is bounded by the Dead Sea and the southern Ghor, and to the W. there is no definite bound-
ary before the Mediterranean. It is a land of sparse and scanty springs and small rainfall; in the char-
acter of its soil it is a transition from the fertility of Canaan to the wildness of the desert; it is essen-
tially 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 his-

tory, 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 char-
acter 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 15 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 sent the spies through this district

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 Avvun

(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 Jew-

(see SEATION). Achish allotted to David, in rep-

ons. In 1 S 20 14 we have mention of the Negeb of the Cherethites and the Negeb of Caleb. To this we may add the

4. Later History of the districts of these various clans (see separate arts. under these names). The Negeb, together with the "hilly country" and the "Shephelah" was according to the journals (17 26; 32 44; 33 13) to have renewed prosperity after the captivity of Judah was ended.

When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerus the Edomites side with the Babylonians (cf. Lam 4 211; Ezek 25 15-19) it was only recently that Herod Agrrippa withdrew himself (Jos. Ant, XVIII, vi, 2).

The palmy 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. Beersheba 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

Mohammedan the land appears to have lapsed into primitive conditions. Although lawlessness and want of any central control may account for much depres-

sion, yet it is probable that Professor Ellsworth Huntington (q.v.) is right in asserting 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

in effect with "terrasses." The Negeb and at Aweh 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

6. Its prosperity is difficult to judge; all we Ancient 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 of the Negeb, e.g., 29 (Josh 15 21; 32; 19 1-9; 1 Ch 4 28-33)—and the weight of cattle evidently was great (of 1 S 1 19; 27 9; 30 16; 2 Ch 14 14 f.). The condition of things must have been far different from that of recent times.

The extensive ruins at Bir es Seba (Beersheba) Khelasa (Elusa), Ruhebe (Rehoborit, q.v.), Aweh and other cities, together with the signs of orchards, vineyards and gardens scattered widely through these and other sites, show how comparatively well populated 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.
The whole district does not support 1,000 souls today.

LITERATURE.—Robinson, BR. (1838); Wilton, *The Mag. of South Country* of iScrip 1869; E. H. Proctor, *The Descent of Esdras, II* (1871); The *Trumbull Kashsh Barnea* (1880); G. A. Smith, *HCHL*, ch xii (1894); E. Huntington, *Pal and Its Transformation*, ch vi, etc.

E. W. G. Masterman

NEGINAH, ne-ge'nah (Ps 61 AV, title), NEGINOTH, ne-ge'noth, neg-tnoth (Ps 4 AV, title). See Music; Psalms.

NEHELMITE, ne-hel'a-mit, THE (*'1115755*, ha-nebel'don): The designation of Shemariah, a false prophet who opposed Jeremiah (Jer 29 24.31.32). The word means “dweller of Nehemiah,” but no such place-name is found in the OT. Its etymology, however, suggests a connection with the Heb halam, “to dream,” and this has given rise to the rendering of AvVm “dreamer.”

NEHEMIAH, ne-he'mi-a, ne-hem'a (*7777777*, nhem'iyâh, “comforted of Jeh”):
1. Family.
2. Youth.
4. Governor of Judaea.
5. Death.

LITERATURE.

Nehemiah, the son of Hacaliah, is the Jewish patriot whose life is recorded in the Bible, work named after him. All that we know about him from contemporary sources is found in this book; and so the readers of this article are referred to the Book of Neh for the best and fullest account of his words and deeds. See Ezra-Nehemiah.

All that is known of his family is that he was the son of Hacaliah (1 1) and that one of his brothers was Hanani (1 2; 7 2); family, the latter a man of sufficient character and importance to have been made a ruler of Jerus.

From Neh 10 1–8 some have inferred that he was a priest, since Nehemiah comes first in the list of names ending with the phrase, “those were the priests.” This view is supported by the Syr and Arab. VSS of 10 1, which read: “Nehemiah the elder, the son of Hacaliah the priest of the priests’; and by the Lat Vulg of 2 Mac 1 21, where he is called “Nehemiah the priest,” and possibly by 2 Mac 1 18, where it is said that Nehemiah offered sacrifices, after that he had builded the temple and the altar.

This argument based upon Neh 10 1–8 will fail to the ground if we change the pointing of the “serahiy of the 3d” word read “therein referring back to the princes of verse 1.” In this case, Nehemiah and Zechariah would be the princes; then would come the priests and then the Levites.

Some have thought that he was of the royal line of Judah, inasmuch as he refers to his fathers’ sepulchres at Jerus (2 9). This would be a good argument only if it could be shown that none but kings had sepulchres at Jerus. It has been argued again that he was of noble lineage because of his position as cupbearer to the king of Persia. To substantiate this argument, it would need to be shown that none but persons of noble birth could serve in this position; but this has not been shown, and cannot be shown.

From the fact that Nehemiah was so grieved at the desolation of the city and the sephures of his fathers and that he was so jealous for the laws of the God 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 to the taxexeros, king of Persia, to the responsible position of cupbearer to 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.

The mention of the sons of Sannballat, governor of Samaria, in a letter written to the priests of Jerus in 407 BC, among whom Johanan is esp. named, proves that Sannballat 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 Judaea and the letters and edicts which enabled him to restore the walls of Jerus.

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 Judaea of the 20th year of Artaxerxes. They reported that the Jews in Jerus were in great afflication 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' sepulchres, and was given letters to the governors of Syria and Pal 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 Sannballat, 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.

Having accomplished these external renovations, he instituted a number of social reforms. He appointed the priests for better service, and a new manner was introduced into the sabbath service which would have made possible the offering of sacrifices to the heathen, to keep the Sabbath, and to contribute to the upkeep 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 governorship Nehemiah returned to the king. Nothing is known as to when or where he died. It is certain, however, 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 Judaea. One of the last acts of Nehemiah's government was the chasing away of one of the sons of Joidat, the son of Eliashib, because he had become the son-in-law to Sannballat, by Artaxerxes II. This Joidat 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, XI, 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

Needy:

Nehemiah
the 3d of the Sachea pappiri, it seems that Bagoji
was already governor in 410 B.C.; and, that at the
same time, the son of Sanballat, was gov-
er in Samaria. More definite information on
these points is not to be had at present.
LITERATURE.—The only early extra-Bib. data with
regard to Nehemiah and the Judaisa of his times is to be
found: (1) In the Egy. papyri of Elephantine ("At-
mâcula Pappiri and Ostakâs aus einer jüdischen Militär-
Kaserne auf dem Euböischen Halbinsel", Sprachen-
ämter der 5. Jahrhunderts vor Chr. Bearbeitet von
Eduard Sachau. Leipzig 1911); (2) in Jos. Ant. XI.
vol. 1 chs. 14 3 15. (3) In Euseb. Ecclus 43 14, it is said:
"The renown of Nehemiah is glorious; of him who
established our waste places and restored our ruins,
and set up the gates and bars: (4) and (5) be
seen in 36 and 2 12; in the latter of these passages it speaks
of the "writings and commentaries of Nehemiah; and how
he founded, a library, gathered together the acts of
the kings and the prophets and of David and the epistles
of the kings concerning the holy gifts." 
R. DICK WILSON

NEHEMIAH, BOOK OF. See Ezra-Nehemiah.

NEHEMIAH, nê-hê-mîa's: Gr form of Heb
Nehemiah. (1) Neîmâ, Neemâ, one of the leaders of the
return under Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 8) "=Nehe-
miah" of Ezr 2 2; Neh 7 7. (2) Neîmâ, Neîmâ, Nezôr, Neh,
Neal, Naimas, B. Nezâr, Naimâs, the prophet Nehemiah (1 Esd 5 40 where AV reads "N. who also is Atharias"). Neither Nehemias nor Atharias is found in the
Ezr 2 62; Neh 7 65, but סבַּיך, ha-tîrsha'dâh = Tirshatha, "the gov-
er," by whom Zerubbabel must be intended. Thus the Heb word for "governor" has been con-
verted into a proper name, and by some blunder the
ame Nehemiah inserted, perhaps because he also
was known by the title of "governor."
S. ANGE

NEHILOTH, ne-hîl'oth, ne-hi-loth (Ps 8, title).
See Mtsc.

NEHUM, ne'hum (נְהֻם, nēhūm): One of the
twelve heads of the people who returned with
Zerubbabel (Neh 7 7). In the 1 passage (Ezr 2
2), the name appears as Râhum (q.v.), and in
1 Esd 5 8 as "Roîmus."

NEHUSHKA, neh-hush'ka (נְהֻשְׁקָה, nēhushqâ): Mother of King Jehoiachin (2 K 24 8). She
was the daughter of Elatiathan of Jerus. After the fall
of Jerusalem, she was carried with her son and his court
(2 K 24 12; Jer 29 2).

NEHUSHKAN, neh-hush'kan (נְהֻשְׁקָן, nēhushqân; cf נֵהָשֵׁק, nēhāshék, "brass," and נֵהוֹק, nēhōq, "serpent,"
"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 Nehushkan." 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, suitting the
word to the act, scornfully calls it "a [more]
piece of brass." However, this takes his place as a true
reformer, and as a champion of the purifaction of the
religion of Israel. This is the traditional inter-
pretation 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-
struction. It is emphatically a proper noun, and
is the special name given to this particular brazen
serpent. It is further said to be dedicated to all worshippers of the brazen
serpent, rather than from nēhōq, "brass," (1) because the Gr
VSS, representing a form of the Heb text earlier
than MT, suggest this in their transliteration of N.
(2, N. Neksaleti; A. Nehushta); (2) because the
Heb offers a natural derivation of N. from nēhāq,
"serpent;" and (3) because the name of the image
would more probably be based on its form than on
the material out of which it was made. In the
third place, the reading, "and it was called," which
appears in RVm, is decidedly preferable to that in
the text. It not only represents the best reading of
the Heb, but is confirmed by the similar reading,
"and they called it," which appears in the Gr VS
referred to above. These readings agree in their
indication that N. was the name by which the
serpent-image was generally known during the
years it was worshipped, rather than an expression
used for the first time by Hezekiah on the occasion
of its destruction.

Whichever derivation be adopted, however, the
word must be construed as a proper noun. If it be
derived from "brass," then the tr must be, not
"a piece of brass," but "The [great] Brass," giving
the word a special sense by which it refers unequivoco-
ally to the well-known image made of brass. If it
be derived from "serpent," then the tr must be,
"The [great] Serpent," the word in this case refer-
ing in a special sense to the well-known image in
serpent form. But the significance of the word
probably lies far back of any etymological
explanation of it that can now be given. It is not
a term that can be adequately explained by reference
to verbal roots, but is rather an epitome of the
reverence of those who, however mistakenly, looked
upon the brazen serpent as a proper object of
worship.

In view of the foregoing it may be concluded,
(1) that N. was the (sacred) name by which
the brazen serpent was known during the years the
children of Israel did burn incense to it; (2)
that the word is derived from nēhāq, "serpent;" and
(3) that it was used in the sense of "The Serpent,"
par excellence. See IMAGES, 6, (2); SERPENT,
FIERY.

LINDSAY B. LONGacre

NEIEL, ne'el (נֵיֵיל, nevél; B. 'îveh, Inad,
A. 'îbhâ, Anâd): A town on the boundary between
Zebulun and Asher mentioned between Jiftah-îl
and Cabul (Josh 19 27). It may be the same as
Neâch (ver 13), but the place is not identified.

NEIGH, nā (נָה, nāh, "to cry aloud, " neigh"):
Figuratively used to indicate lustful desire (Jer 5
8; cf 13 20).

NEIGHBOR, nôbër (נָבָר, nôḇâr, מָשָׁר, "friend,"
נָגָר, nôgâr, "near," nôgâr, ha-
מַשָּׁר, getôn, "neighbor,"
[cf 2 Macro 6 8; 8 25], "inhabitant,"
described in Lev 19 9 as a "countrman,"
the OT 10 2, RVm "townman"). In the OT,
the relationship of neighborhood involves
moral and social obligations which are
frequently emphasized. These are in the main
described in negative rather than positive
terms; e.g. there are special injunctions to kindness to
false witness against a neighbor (Ex 20 16; Dt 5 20;
Prov 25 18), or in any way to deal falsely with

NEHUM, Book of
Nephtar
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 a larger moral conduct (Hab 2 13) or to wrong 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, kinsman. 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 exactation 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 kins. This is definitively 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 the opportunity 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 commendation 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 enemies (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 48). 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 36 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 it is called the “royal law,” i.e. the supreme or governing law; Rom 13 9; Gal 5 14).

NEKEB, ne'keb: This name occurs only in combination with “Adam” (עְנֶקֶּב הָאָדָם, ha-nekeb, “Adam of the pass”); LXX reads the names of two places: καὶ Ἀπελ καὶ Ναμεφ, καὶ Ἀρνα καὶ Ναβοκ (B); καὶ Ἀραμ καὶ Ναχέ, καὶ Ἀρμα τοῦ Ναχ (Josh 19 33), so we should possibly read “Adam and Nekeb.” Neubauer says (Gogô, du Talm, 225) that later the name of Nekeb was Cydadatha. It may therefore be represented by the modern Syêdah, not far from ed-Dâmieh to the E. of Tabor, about 4 miles S.W. of Tiberias. The name of Nekeb, a town in Galilee, appears in the list of Thothamis III.

NEKODA, nê-kô'dá (נֵקֹדָּה, nê-kô'dâ): (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 descent (Ezr 2 60; Neh 7 62; cf 1 Esd 5 31 37). In the v of 1 Esd the names are given thus: Neoba and Nekodan (q.v.).

NEKODAN, nê-kô'dân (נֵקֹדַּם, nê-kô'dân; RVm “Nekodas”; AV Nekodan): (1) Head of a family which returned from exile, but “could not show their families nor their stock” (1 Esd 5 37) = “Nekodas” of Ezr 2 60; Neh 7 62. (2) See Noeba.

NEMUEL, nem’ô-el, nê-mû’el (נֵמְעֻל, nôm’âl): (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, nem’ô-el-îtes, nê-mû’el-îtes (נֵמְעֻלֵי, ha-nom’û’î). See Nemuel, (2).

NEPHEA, nê-fê’a. See Music.

NEPHEG, nê’leg (נֶפֶהָג, nepheh, “sprout”); “shooit”. (1) Son of Ishah, 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, nê’u, nê’w. See Relationships, Family.

NEPHI, nê’fî. See Nephihah.

NEPHILIM, nêf’il-im (נְפִּילים, nêphîlim): This word, tr “giants” in AV, but retained in RV, is found in two 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 Nephihile are not necessarily to be identified with the children said to be borne 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, nêfîs. See Nephis.

NEPHISH, nêfîsh, NEPHISIM, nêfît’sim, NEPHISHIM, nêfît’sim (נְפִּישׁ, nêphîš; nêfît’sim, nêphîšim; nêphît’sim): The former is the K’tâbh (Heb “written”) form of the name adopted in RV; the latter the K’tâb (Heb “read”) form, adopted in AV and RVm (Ezr 2 50). See Naphis; Nephishhaim.

NEPHTHALI, nêf’tâ-li, nêf’tâlî. See Nephtah.

NEPHTHALIM, nêf’tâ-lîm (Mt 4 13): The Gr form of Naphtali (q.v.).

NEPHTHAR, nêf’târ (נֶפֶתָרָה, Nephtâr; A and Swete, Nephtâr, AV and Vulg Naphthe). NEPHTHAI (נֶפֶתָא, Nepftah, al. Nefau, Naphthai, Naphthaih, Naphtha, Vulg Nephté, AV and Vulg, following Old Lat, Nephe; Swete, following A, gives Nepthar twice): According to 2 Mace 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’
(upon the Return), before offering the sacrifices, Nehemiah sent the descendants of the godly priests to the Temple. The priests reported that they could find no fire but only "thick water" (διόμω παχός, ἱδώρ παχῶ), which he commanded them to draw up and sprinkle upon the wood and the sacrifices. After an interval the sun shone forth from behind a cloud, and a sister of Psalms, the angelic servant of the sacrifices. Nehemiah then commanded them to pour (καταχείν, katabeíon, al. κατάχειν, katácheíon, and καταρείν, katareínei) the rest of the liquid upon great stones. Another flame sprang up which soon spent itself, "because the light from the altar shone 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 "Nepthar," which is by interpretation "cleansing." (kathaphereús, katharismós), "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 "cleansing," "purification" and the name to the spot (hunc locum), not the thing. The story 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; Diod. i. 101; Strabo, Geogr. xvi, 1, 15); the words then are probably corruptions of what the Greeks termed κάθαρα, nepthha. Ewald (Hist. V, 163) says: "This is but one of the many stories which sought in later times to enhance the very high sanctity of the Temple, with reference even to its origin." S. Angus

Nephtoah, net-t'oah, net't'o-a (תֵּיתוֹא, nephto'a), occurs only in the expression תֵּיתוֹא נַפְפָּתָה, ma'yram me 'a, "the fountain of the waters of Nephtoah"; LXX πηγὴ ὑδάτων Naphtha, pòg húdatos Naphtho) This spring was on the border line between Judah and Benjamin (Josh 15 9; 18 15). The place is usually identified with Lítfoa, a village about 2 miles N.W. of Jerus, on the east bank of the Wady biit Hanina. It is a village very conspicuous to the traveler along the high road from Jaffa as he approaches Jerusalem. There are ancientExcavations, a walk-cut tunnel and a copious spring which emps itself into a large masonry reservoir. The situation of Lítfoa seems to agree well with the most probable line of boundary between the two tribes; the spring as it 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.

Conder would identify Lítfoa with the ancient Eléph (q.v.) of Benjamin, and, on the ground that the Talm (see Talm Bah, Yom'd 310) identifies Nephtoah with Emál (q.v.), he would find the site of Nephtoah at 'Atîn 'Atîn, 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, II, 18, 43, Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

Nephushesim, nê-fush'ês-im, Nephushesim, nê-fish'ês-im (נֵפְוַשְׁשֵּׁים), nēfushes'im (נֵפְוַחֶשְׁשֵּׁים); nēfish'ês-im (נֵפְוַחֶשְׁשֵּׁים): The former is the K'thubb (Heb "written") name adopted in RV; the latter the K'rb (Heb "read") form adopted in AV and RVm (Neh 7 52). See Naphsh; Nephasim.

Ner, nēr ("2, nēr, "lamp"): Father of Abner

1 S 14 50 f; 26 5.14, etc; grandfather of Saul (1 Ch 8 38). For other references, though adding more information, are 2 S 2 8.12; 3 22.5; 28.37; 1 K 2 5.32, etc.

Nereus, nē'rús, nēr'ē-us (Νερέως, Nereús): The name of a Rom Christian to whom with his sister St. Paul sent greetings (Rom 16 15). Nereus and the others saluted with him (ver 15) formed a small community or "house church." The name of the sister is not given, but the name Nereis is found on an inscription of this date containing names of the emperor's servants (Lightfoot, Phil. 176). Among the Acta Sanctorum connected with the early church in Rome are the "Acts of Nereus and Achilleus" which call them chamberlains of Domitilla, the niece of Vespasian, and relate their story over her in persuading her to remain a virgin.

S. F. Hunter

Nergal, nēr'gāl (נֶרְגָּל, nērgāl): A Bab deity, identified with the planet Mars, and worshipped at Cutha (cf 2 K 17 36). See Babylon and Assyria, Religion of.

Nergal-Shar-ezer, nēr-gal-shar-ezer (נֶר-גָּל-שָׁר-אֶזֶר), Nergal-Shar-ezer, Heb form of Assyr Nergal-sar-asur, "O Nergal, defend the prince"); A Bab officer, the "Bab-mag," associated with Nebuzaradan in the care of Jeremiah after the fall of Jerusalem (Jer 39 3.13). According to Hommel (art. "Babylon," HDB and Sayce (HDB, s.v.), Nergal-shar-ezer is to be identifed with Nergillassar who succeeded Evil-merodach on the throne of Babylon (cf Cheyne and Johns, EB, s.v.).

Ner'î, nē'rî (נֶרִי, Nērî; for Heb נֶרִy, nēryāh): The name of an ancestor of Jesus, the grandfather of Zerubbabel (Lk 3 27). See Neriah.

Neriah, nē'rî-a (נֶרִyא, Nēryā, "whose lamp is Jeh"): The father of Seraiah and of Baruch, Jeremiah's friend and secretary (Jer 32 12.16; 46 64.32; 43 3). In Bar 1 1 the Gr form of the name, Νεψειας, Nērefias, is given, and this shortened, Neri, occurs in the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

Nerias, nē'rî-ās (Nērifēas, Nērefēias): The Gr form of Heb Neriah found only in Bar 1 1 as the father of Baruch = "Neriah" of Jer 32 12; 36 4 f; 43 3. To Baruch's brother, Seraiah, the same genealogy is ascribed in Jer 51 59.

Nero, nē'ro (Νερός, Nērō): I. Name, Parentage and Early Training II. Agripina's Ambition for Nero III. Nero's Reign IV. Downfall and Character V. "Nero Redivivus" VI. Nero and Christianity

The fifth Rom emperor, b. at Antium December 15, 37 AD, began to reign October 13, 54, d. June 9, 08.

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 Britannicus. His father was Emperor Domitianus Athenobarbus ("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 Caligula (Caligua) 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 vii: detectabile 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 maternal uncle, Domitius Lepida, now 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 (40).

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) Her betrothal to Octavia, the daughter of Claudius, having previously, by the villainy of Vitellius, broken off the engagement between Octavia and Lucius Silanus (ib. xviiiii). Later, N. married this unfortunate lady. (2) Vitellius again obliged by securing a modification of Roman 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 instilled 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 Roman imperial— the influence of the armies in the nomination of the successor. 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 restore his friends. All this 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 Locusta 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 and general 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. xiii.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 drag him, with his mother 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 Pallas. She then fell into the hands of Britannicus 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 food 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 fit 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 counsellors of moderation and justice, dictating a policy which left considerable liberty to the senate. But perceiving the depth of his evil nature, they allowed him to indulge in low pleasures and excesses with the most profligate companions, thinking, perhaps, that the young ruler would in this way prove less harmful to the public than that, after sowing his wild oats, he would return to the serious business of government. But in both ways they were sorely disappointed, for N., having surrendered himself to the basest appetites, continued to go from excess to excess. He surrounded himself with the most dissolute companions, conspicuous among whom were Salvius Otho and Claudius Senecio.

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 for such was her 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

Nero (Brit. Mus.).

1. Quinquennium Nerois

2. Poppea Sabina (58 AD)
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. The plot was frustrated and N. was informed. Agrippina, 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 Quinquageneries celebration. After the banquet she revealed the scheme to Baiae 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 died by suicide (Suet. xxxiv; Tac. Ann. cxi-cxviii).

N. no longer made any secret of taking Poppaea as his mistress, and, under her influence, bid defiance to the best Rom traditions and laws. As the result of intrigue, rumour, and jealousy, 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, Sostratus Tigellinus, a powerful ally. She succeeded in causing Seneca to retire from the court. Next she determined to remove Octavia. A charge of adulterity 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 his third 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 riches of rich nobles, against whom his creature Tigellinus could trump the slightest plausible charge. But even this did not prevent a financial crisis—the beginning of the bankruptcy of the later Rom 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 depreciated, 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 declared to have been extinguished 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 hurried 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. This act of humanity 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 live" (Suet. xviii) that had often deplored the ugliness of the city wished an opportunity to rebuild it; that he purposely set it on 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. xxxviii; Tac. Ann. xv.38 ff.). In spite of all these reports N. must be absolved of the guilt of incendiarism.

Such pathological traits 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 avert the anger of the gods against this guilty [subsidit reos], and afflicted with the most exquisite punishments those who were hated for their abominations [flagitia] and called Christians' by the populace, Christus, from whom the name was derived, was punished by the tribune of the Praetorian Pontius Pilatus in the reign of Tiberius. This noxious form of religion [exitiatia superstitionis], checked for a time, broke out again not only in Judaea its original home, but also throughout the empire as a result of which the abominations meet 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 [multitude ingens] were implicated [reading conincti, not convici], as much on the charge of incendiarism 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] commiseration was excited 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 a tyrant [Nero]" (Tac. Ann. xx.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 [subsidit 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 insansima exempla meritos). But Tacitus means by some 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 incendiarism, 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 lately been driven from the Rom empire (falsely said to have been banished in great numbers)? Or why not the members of the oriental religions, which had proved more than once obnoxious (1 Psellos wrote of the Jews to Judaism and had certain influence over N.?
to protect the Jews; she was regarded by them as a proselyte and is termed by Jos. (Ant. xx, viii, 33) theo-

phoro, theoseba, "god-fearing." When the populace and the Senate were preparing for revolt against the Jews, they had been glad of the opportunity of putting forward the pretense that Galba had been embezzled in the fund, the Papppa. 

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

sees, "in the proselytism of Papppa, guided by Jewish nurse, and led to the cognition of the first Christian 

persecution." (2) Closely connected with this was 

the bewitchment by the Roman government that 

Christianity was an independent faction from Judaism. 

This may first have been brought home to the authorities 

by the death of Panthos and later by Anthes (G. E., 

Expos, July, 1893). Judasim was a recognized and 

tolerated religion, a religio licita, and Christianity when 

denounced as Galba's crime (Galba and Christianitv 

isshable by the state, for Christianity first rose "under 

the shadow of licensed Judaism (Tert. adv. Judaicos 

Judaicerum religionis: Tert. Apol, xvi). (3) As Chris-

tianity formed a society apart from Roman society, all 

kinds of crimes were attributed to its followers. Thys-

seans, feasts, nightly orgies, hostility to temples and 

images. These fopit.must seemed summus 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 Rom spirit: of 

easum multitudo (Tac. Ann, xvi, 44: Clemens Rom. 

Cor 1, 6: saevius, saevo pilthe, of also "great multitude" of 

Rev 7: 9, 10). (5) No doubt, too, early Christian 

enthusiasm was unequivocal in its expressions, esp. 

in its belief in gravitas or "death", and the world and its 

serene faith amid the despair of others.

In the meantime Tigellinus' tyranny and con-

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

content among the nobles, which cul-

minated in the famous conspiracy at 

N.'s death (66 AD). Calpurnius 

Piso. The plot was prematurely 

betrayed by Milichius. An inquisition 

followed in which the most illustrious victims 

perished were Seneca, the philosopher, Lucan the 

poet, Lucius' mother (his illegitimate sister of Sceca and father of Lucan, T. Petro-

nious Arbiter, "the glass of fashion." Finally, "N. 

having butchered so many illustrious men, at last 

desired to exterminate virtue itself by the death of 

Thrasea, Petronius and Barea Soranus" (Tace. Ann. 

xvi.211).

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 (66-67 AD), where he 

ran the usual 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 appreciated 

by cultured people. In the meantime the revolt of 

Vindex in Gaul commenced (68 AD), but it was soon 

quelled by Verginian Rufus on account of its 

national Gaulish character. Galba of Etrurian Spain 

next declared himself pretor of the senate and the 

Rom 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.

Nymphidius Sabinus, one of the prefects, won 

over the guard for Galba, by persuading the irreso-

lute emperor to withdraw from Rome 

8. Death 

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 to escape, he had 

been revolving plans of despair in his Servilian gardens, 

whether he should surrender himself to the mercies 

of the Parthians or to those of Galba; whether 

Galba would allow him the province of Egypt; 

what he would forgive him; and how 

he showed 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 

inflict the blow for him; "Have I then no 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!" 

(Qualis artifex pereo, Suet. xlix). On learning 

that his schemes were condemned to a cruel death by the senate, 

he put the knife to his throat and was stabbed in the 

fatal blow by Epaphroditus his secretary. 

A centurion entered pretending he had come to help; 

"Too late--this is fideity," were Nero's last words. 

His remains were laid in the family vault of the 

emperor Domitius by order of Domitius 

and his concubine 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-

fall were:

1. Seven 

Causes of 

Downfall

Nero's 

character 

Nero's 

character 

Nero ranks with Galba for folly and vice, while his 

cruelettes recall the worst years of Tiberius. Very offens-

ive in his tastes, particular about the arrangement of his private 

rooms, his voice, his greatest fault was inordinate 

vanity which courted applause for per-

formances on non-Rom lines. He neglected his high 

office and deprecated Rom granae 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 gull of that nameless vice of antiquity 

love of a male favorite. His desire that N. had not 

really died, but was living somewhere in retirement 

or had fled among the Parthians, and that he was destined 

in a short time to return and bring great calamity upon 

his enemies or the world (quo viscentis et brevi magni 


vii, 27) was a force among the Parthians who were ready to 

take up arms at the report of the return of the emperor. 

In the confusion of the year of the four emperors, 

N., and Asia were disturbed by the report of the advent of 

the Parthian (Tac. Hist. i, 45). The historian promises to 

mention the fortune and attempts of other pseudo-

Neros. This was by no means the first attempt to 

gamitate with their legend of Antichrist. In Act Isra 

(1st cent. AD), the Antichrist is clearly identified with 

the Parthian; and in the Apoc. (8, 3), the same idea is 

widely distributed, "the mark of wickedness, the matricide." It occurs 

again and again in both Jewish and Christian sects, from 

the Sib Or. (3 66, 4: 117, 5): Sib. Or. (10, 136, 2, 4). 

How far N. was regarded by the Christians as the 

antichristian of the Jews. That the common belief of the revival of 

N. should influence the contemporary Christian thought, in 

the days of social and political turmoil highly probable. 

Bousset (Comm.) regards the beast of Rev 13 as Rome,
and the smitten head whose "deathstroke was hoisted" as N., and some scholars take Rev 17 10 f. as referring to N. The "scarlet, cet-color'd beast" of 17 3 may be intended either for Rome or for its "empire" N. in particular. That the number 666 (Rev 13 18) represents the sum of the ages of Neron Kesar is significant, for the Jewish Christians would be familiar with simphýiain (the numerical equivalent of "666") as in Neron Kesar's name, and also 852, as in Christ (see ch xxviii, sec. 5). In later times the idea of a twofold Antichrist was followed, and that of the Jew and Gentile being one for the Gentiles; cf. esp. Commodian, Carm. Apol. (920): "to us N. became Antichrist, to the Jews the other Antichrist, to the future coming of Christ. There was an alternate theory that N. had really been killed and thereby to rise again (8th Ob 5 216 f; Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xxix. 19; under Nero the house of dearest comes or resurrection et futurum Antichristus suscipiantur)."

VI. NERO AND CHRISTIANITY. — The name Nero does not occur in the NT; but he was the Caesar to whom Paul appealed (Ac 26 10). 1. Nero and the NT. — It is quite likely that N. heard Paul's case in person, for the emperor showed much interest in his principal predecessor, the earlier "golden quinquennium" of N.'s reign that Paul addressed his ep. to the Christians at Rome, and probably in the year N.'s reign (68 AD) Paul suffered death near the city, though Harnack (Christianity in the Oecumenical Period, 1918, 192. p. 292) represents the first Neronian persecution of 64. Although the NT gives no hint of a possible visit or sojourn of Peter in Rome, such a sojourn and subsequent martyrdom are highly probable and almost certain from the early persistent tradition in Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Papias, and later in Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and the Liber Pontificalis (catalogue of popes). His execution at Rome under Nero is practically certain.

2. The first persecution to which Christianity was subjected came from the Jews: the first heathen persecution took place under N. Up to this time the Roman government had been on friendly terms with Christianity, as Christianity was not an organized religion but any disturbance of society or was confounded by the Romans with Judaism (sub umbrae beatae Judaearum religiosarum: Pte. Apol., xxi). Paul, writing to the Christians of the capital, urged them to "be in subjection to the powers" as "ordained of God" (Rom 13 1 f), and his high estimation of the Roman government as power for good was probably strengthened by its mild captivity at Rome which permitted him to carry on his mission and to be ordained bishop on the first trial (accepting the view of a first acquittal and subsequent activity before condemnation). But soon after, because of the trial of Paul, a Roman citizen, at Rome (about 60), or of his growing holiness in the increasing numbers and the coming progress of the new religion, the distinction between Christianity and Judaism became apparent to the Roman authorities. If it had not yet been prescribed as a religio illicita ("unlicensed religion"), neither had it been admitted as a religio licita. Christianity was not in itself yet a crime: its adherents were not liable to persecution "for the name." According to one view the Neronian persecution was a sporadic act and an isolated incident in imperial policy: the Christians were on this occasion put forward merely to reassure the Neronian paranoia. They were not persecuted either as Christians or as incendiaries, but on account of flagitious practices, such as selling eggs. Oedipodan incest and nightiy orgies were attributed to them, and their withdrawal from society and exclusive manners were considered as the charge of "superstition 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, however, maintained by Church History (church History of the Roman Empire, ch xi) and E. G. Hardy (Studies in Roman Antiquities, 1897) and is that of the persecution of Christians as a permanent police regulation in a list of other seemingly permanent measures (Nero xxv. 1: "Roman christiani superstitionem nune quoque ad malfacta"), which is not inconsistent with the account of Tacitus. A change in the initial step determined the permanent result. The Christians by these trials, though not convicted of incendiarism, were subjected to considerable restraint; their social and exclusive manners, their withdrawal from the duties of the state, their active proselytism, together with the charges of immorality, thus born in them in Rome as the enemies of society. Christianity thus became a crime and was banned by the police authorities. Suetonius gives a detail which may be the historical foundation for the terrible principle into which N.'s action ultimately resolved itself. The Roman scholar Heiser says, but Hardy holds that henceforth the name itself—men superstitiosi, aunque that new word—thereafter is to be used. If the matter could be left with the prefect of the city. A trial must be held and the fugitive condemned before the prefect. Early Dogm. xxvii. 28 f. shows that Nero ordered it to suppose that the Neronian persecution of 64 extended beyond Rome to the provinces, though the present attitude of the Roman government has not had considerable influence with provincial officials. Paul seems to have gone unimpeached, or at least to have escaped obstacles, in his evangelization after his acquittal. The authorities for a general Neronian persecution and formal Roman law against Christianity are: Of course (Hist. vii. 7, "Nero was the first to put to death Christians at Rome and gave orders that they should be subjected to the same persecution throughout all the provinces")."
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 egrets 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). GENE STRATTON-PORTER

NET. See Fishing; Fowler.

NETAIM, nē'ta-im, nē'ta-im, nē-ta-im (נֵתַיָּם, nē타'aym; B, ἄντανι, Ántaní, A, Ἀντανί, Ἀτανί): 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. Gederah was in the Judaean Shephelah. Here also we should seek for Netaim, but no likely identification has yet been suggested.

NETHANIEL, nē-tha'nē-el, nētha-n'e-l, (נְתַנְיָּאל, nē'tanyā'el; nethanniel, nēthan'iel), "God has given": (1) A chief or prince of Issachar (Nu 1 8; 2 5; 7 19; 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 Shemariah (1 Ch 24 6). (5) The 5th 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 36). JOHN A. LEES

NETHANIAH, nēth-a-ni'āh (נְתַנְיָּאָה, nēthanyā'āh; "Jeh has given"): (1) An Asaphite musician (1 Ch 25 21 22). (2) A Levite who accompanied the princes sent by Jehoshaphat to teach in the cities of Judah (2 Ch 17 8). (3) The father of Jehudi (Jer 36 14). (4) The father of Iahmud, the murderer of Gedaliah (Jer 40 8 14 15; 41, 11 12; 2 K 25 23 25). Some MSS of LXX read here Mathithiæus.

NETHINIIM, nēth'i-nim (נְתַנְיָּיִם, nēthi'nīm, "given"): (1) Nethinei, Nathaneim; AV Nethinim): A group of temple-servants (1 Ch 9 2). 1. Meaning 2 and 16t in Ezr and Neh. The word has always the article, and does not occur in the sing. The LXX translators usually translatate, but in one passage (1 Ch 9 2) they render, "the given ones" (hoi dedeménon). The Syr (Pesh) also, in Ezr, Neh, translatates the word, but in 1 Ch 9 2 renders it by a word meaning "sojourner" (simeôn, dôrêmod). The meaning is that of a state of servitude, and Jos seems to confirm the suggestion by calling the N. "temple-slaves" (hierôdoulois) (Ant, XI, v, 1). It should, however, be noted that another form of this word is employed in the directions regarding the Levites: "They shall 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 fail from you of young men, both hewers 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-Israelish tribes. The Meminim, for example (Exr 2 50=Neh 7 52), are in all likelihood descended from the Moenites or Moaenites 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 Nephsim. These may be traced to the Hagrite clan of Naphish (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, it may be even humbler than, those of the N. These servant-servants 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, in 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 Zerubbabel at the first Return in 535 BC (Ezr 2 60=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 Jerusalem they enjoyed the same privileges and immunities as the other religious orders, being included by their letters of credence 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 33 1), and the situation is certainly approximate if their duties at all resembled those of the Gibeonites (see Ryle, "Ezra and Nehemiah," in Cambridge Bible, Intro, 57). They were
also organized into a kind of guild under their own leaders of the band.

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 a later time a butt for the scorn and bitterness of the Talmudic writers against everything that they regarded as un-Jewish.

John A. Lees

Netophah, nê tôf'â (נְתוֹפָה); Lev. 23 28, 31; 25 28, 31; 26 12, 17; 28 17, 19, and creation); LXX Netophāt, Netophâth, Nehôphāth, Netophotâ, and other variants): The birthplace of two of David’s heroes, Mephibosheth and Helec (2 Sam 9 17, 20; 11 17, 23), and the son of Tanhumoth the Netophathite, one of the captives who came to offer allegiance to Gedaliah (2 K 25 23, Jer 40 8). “The villages of the Netophathites” are mentioned (1 Ch 12 19) 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 5 18 (RV “Netophath”), where we have lists of the exiles returning from Babylon with Nehemiah. the place is mentioned between the Bethlem and Anathoth and in literary association with other cities in the mountains of Judah, e.g. Gibea, Kiriat-jeaum, Chephera and Beeroth. In this respect it is most plausible to identify it with the site of modern Jib, although the disappearance of a terminal gutteral in the latter creates a difficulty. Conder has suggested a site known as Kh. Umnu-Tuba, N.E. of Bethlem, an ancient site, but not apparently of great importance. Beit Netof, an important stage on a lofty ridge in the Shephelah near the “Valle of Elah,” also appears to have an echo of the name, and indeed may well be the Beth Netophath of the Mish (Sêbêrâthâ, ix 5; Neubauer, Geogr., 128), but the position does not seem to accord with all that of the OT Netophah. For Kh. Umnu-Tuba see PEF, III, 128; for Beit Netof, PEF, III, 24; RRB, II, 177; both Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

Netophas, nê tôf'âs (B, Netôphas, Netôbas, A, Nerôphá, Netôpháth): A town named in 1 Esd 5 18, identical with “Netophah” of Ezr 2 22; Neh 7 26. NETOPHATHI, nê tôf'a-thî, NETOPHATHITES, nê tôf'a-thîths. See Netophah.

Nettles, net’tlz: (1) יָרְדִּים, hârîl (Job 30 7; Prov 24 31; Zeph 2 9 m, in all, “wild vetches”); the tr “nettles” is due to the supposed derivations of hârîl from an (obs.) יָרְדֵי, hârîl, meaning “to be sharp” or “stinging,” but a tr “thorns” (as in Vulg) would in that case do as well. LXX has ἄνθριξ ἄρπα, phrikânov dria, “wild broomwood,” in Job, and certainly the association with the “saltwort” and the reed, “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) כִּימְמָשׁ, kîmmôsh (Isa 34 13; Hos 9 6), and pl. כִּימְמָשִׁים, kîmmûshônîm (Prov 24 31), tr’l (EV) “thorns” because of the tr of hârîl as “nettles” in the same ver. From Isa 34 13 kîmmôsh 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 became 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. G. Masterman

Network, net’wûr (נְטוּרִים, s’hôbhâkâh): RV in 2 K 26 17; 2 Ch 4 13 (also in pl., vs 12,13), for “wreathen 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, m “filigree work.”

NEW, nô, NEWNESS, nû’înes (יוֹנֵי, hôdâdâh; kainôs, kainôs, vûos, nôos):

The word commonly tr’l “new” in the OT is hâdâdâh, “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”; Ezek 11 19, “a new spirit”; 19 31, “new heart”; 36 26, etc; hôdâdâh is “the new moon,” “the new-moon day” (the first of the lunar month, a festival, then “month” (Gen 29 14, “a month of days”); it occurs frequently, oft tr’l “month”; we have “new moon” (I S 20 5.15.24, etc); tôrsh is “new” (sweet) wine” (Neh 10 39; in Jer 1 5; 3 18, it is Isâ, RV “sweet wine”); in Jer 22 13, “new”.

Other words in the OT for “new” are kâthâh, Aram. (Ezr 6 4): tôrsh, “fresh” (Jgs 15 15, RV “a fresh jaw-bone of an ass”); tôrsh “a creation” (Nu 16 30, if tôrsh make a new thing, and tôrsh têshû’t, “to be first-fruits” (Ezk 47 12; so RV); tû’m “setting,” is têr “newly” (Jgs 10 19); also mi’kâthâh, “recently” (Dt 32 17, RV “of late”); news is shûma’t, “report,” “tidings” (Prov 25 25, “good news from a far country”.

In the NT “new” (mostly kainôs, “new,” “fresh,” “newly made”) is an important word. We have the title of the “New Testament” 2. In the NT, the word itself, rightly given by ARV as “New Covenant,” the designation of “the new dispensation” ushered in through Christ, the writings relating to which the volume contains. We have “new covenant” (kainôs) in Lk 22 20, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood” (ERV “testament”); in Mt 26 28; Mk 14 24, “new” is omitted in RV, but in Mt m many ancient authorities insert new,” and in Mk m (ancient authorities); 1 Cor 11 25, ERV “or testament”; 2 Cor 3 6, ERV “or testament”; He 8 8, ERV “or testament”; 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 creature.” RV “If 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): “a new doctrine” (Acts 17 19); “new things” (21): “newness of life” (kainôs) (Rom 6 4): “newness of the spirit” (7 6; cf 2 Cor 5 17); “a new name” (Rev 2 17; 3 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” (Sih 9 10); artikhêpòtis, “newborn” (1 Pet 2 2); prôskhôtis, “newly slain,” “new” (He 10 20, RV “a new and living way, through the veil that is to say the flesh” in Mk “open”; Jch 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 kainos and neos, is, in the main, that kainos denotes new in respect of quality, “the new as such, as different from 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. kainôs minnèlôn, the “new tomb” in which Jesus was laid, was a work very recently 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, agánphos, “unsnoothed,”
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; Fasts 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.

NEZIAH, nə-zı’ah (נְזוֹיאָה, nəzı’āh): The head of a family of Nethinim (Exz 2:54; Neh 7:56), called in 1 Esd 5:32, “Nasi” (AV and RVm “Nasith”).

NEZIB, nə-zib (נְזוּב, nəzib): B, Naacib, Naacibh, A, Nerb, Nettib: A town in the Judaean Shephelah, mentioned along with Keilah and Marashah (Josh 15:43). Onom places it 7 miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin), on the road to Hebron. It is represented today by Beit Nasib, a village with ancient remains some 2 miles S.W. of Khirbet Kila (Keilah).

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

NIBSHAN, nib’shan (נִבְּשָן, ha-nibshōhan): B, Nadsen, Naphshazon, A, Nasan, Neban: A city in the Judaean wilderness named between Sechanah 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 nibshān to kibshān, “furnace” (Proedr, 344).

NICANOR, nı̄k-kən’or, nı̄k-kə-nor (ניקאש, Nı̄k-eš, Nı̄k-nor): 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 intrusted his chancellor Lysias with the reduction of Judaea (1 Macc 3:34 ff). Nicanor was one of the three generals commissioned by Lysias—the others being Ptolemies, 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 8:6 ff). There Nicanor, not Gorgias, is the chief in command. The battle of Emmaus is not mentioned, but “the thrice-accursed Nicanor,” having in overweening pride invited a thousand slave-dealers to accompany him to buy the Jewish captives, was humiliated, and his horse was destroyed, he himself escaping “like a fugitive slave” to Antioch (2 Macc 8:34 ff). After the death of Epiphanes, Eupator and Lysias (the last two at the hands of Demetrius 11 Macc 7:12-15), Nicanor 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 Nicanor, 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). Nicanor was appointed governor of Judaea on this occasion. Again 1 and 2 Macc differ. According to 1 Macc, Nicanor 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. Nicanor retired to Jerusalem, invited the priest 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), 161 BC, the Syrians sustained a crushing defeat, Nicanor himself being the first to fall. The Jews cut off his head and proud right hand and hanged them up beside Jesus. 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 Nicanor, 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 Nicanor to bring Judas to hame 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 Nicanor and in a more gruesome fashion (15:20 ff). It is possible that the Nicanor, the Cypriarch or governor of Cyprus of 2 Macc 12:2, is a different person from Nicanor, the son of Patroclus—a view not accepted in the above account. S. ANOV

NICANOR (ניקאש, Nı̄k-eš, Nı̄k-nor): One of the “seven” chosen to superintend “the daily ministration” of the poor of the Christian community at Jerus (Acts 6:5). The name is Gr.

NICODEMUS, nik-od’-ə-mus (ניקודמוס, Nı̄kō-dē-mōs): A Pharisee and a “ruler of the Jews,” mentioned only by St. John. He (1) interviewed Christ at Jerus and was taught by Him the doctrine of the resurrection (Jn 3:1-5); (2) desired His body before the Sanhedrin (Jn 7:50-52); (3) assisted 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 Jerus during the Passover (Jn 3:22 with 7:23). 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 the city ‘by night,’ lest he should offend his colleagues in the Sanhedrin 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 whence cometh the wind, “whether it beeth” (ver 7), 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 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 the truth 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 atonement and the salvation of man (ver 14), and of His being made “the firstborn of those who are born of God” (ver 15). If N. cannot believe in the Divinity of God (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 Sanhedrin was proclaiming of Himself as the “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 the follower of Christ. His wealth enabled him to purchase the consecrated “aloes, about a hundred pounds,” with which the body of Jesus was embalmed (Jn 19 39 ff).

The Gospel of Nicodemus and other apocryphal works narrate that N. gave evidence in favor of Christ at the trial before Pilate, though he was deprived of office and banished from Jerusalem by the hostile Jews, and that he ministered to Jesus on Golgotha. His reminiscences were said to have been found in a common grave along with those of Gamaliel and st. Stephen.

Nicodemus 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, (b).

Nicolaïtans, nik-o-la’-tans (Nicolaïtar, Nikolaita). 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 Balas, “who taught Balak to cast a stumblingblock 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 “having 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 2 14), no further direct information regarding them is given in Scripture.

Reference to them is frequent in post-apostolic literature. According to Irenæus (Adv. Haer., i. 26, 3; iii, 10, 7), followed by Hippolytus (Philos., vi, 38), they were founded by St. Irenæus, the proconsul of Antioch, who was one of the seven chosen to serve at the tables (Acts 6 5). Irenæus, 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 reaction from original principles of so too rigid asceticism. A theory, started in comparatively modern times, and based in part on the similarity of meaning of the Greek word on which they were founded, puts forward the view that the two sects referred to under these names were in reality identical. Yet though this were so, it would not have been necessary for St. John to designate them separately.

The problem underlying the Nicolaïtan 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 Nicolaïtans disobeyed the command issued to the gentile 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 coming in contact with certain practices in public festivals, 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 Nicolaïtans were themselves a glaring witness, and therefore St. John was just in condemning them. In writing to the Corinthians, St. Paul gives warning against the same evil practices, basing his arguments on consideration for the weaker brethren (cf 1 Cor 8).

NICOLAUS, nik-0-i'/us (EV), NICOLAS, nik-0-las (Νικόλαος, Νικόλαος): One of the "seven" chosen by the Lord to have the "daily ministration" 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 their opinions. It may be that the opinions of this sect were an antimonic exaggeration of the preaching of Nicolás.

S. F. HUNTER

NICOPOLIS, nik-op'o-lis (Νικόπολις, Νικόρο- λις): A city in Peloponnesus of ancient Greece, situated in the vicinity of Antioch of Nicopolis (Now Patras, in modern Greece). In the reign of Titus (A.D. 79-81), an ancient name, Nicopolis, was revived by Constantine, in memory of the victory gained over Maxentius (Jan. 1, A.D. 312) at the battle of the Milvian Bridge, near Rome, by which the Emperor Constantine was enabled to secure the succession of the empire to himself, and to impose the Christian religion upon the empire. The name is still used for the site of the modern town of Nicopolis, built by Constantine and dedicated to his mother, Constantia. The city was the seat of a bishop and of a Latin cathedral, and the site of a Latin church.
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1. The Accepted Translation.—The term "night-monster" is a hypothetical transliteration of the Hebrew term לילית, used only once, in Isa 34:14. The word is tr4 in AV "sceech-owl," m "night-monster," RV "night-monster," m "Lilith." The term "night-monster" is also an interpretation, as inasmuch as it implies that the Hebrew word is a Babylon word, 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 Lilith, Professor or ghost, was a night-demon of terrible powers and baleful influence upon men, and Statement only to be cast out with many incantations. The Lilith was attended by a serving maid, the ašrat lilit ("maid of night"), which in the Sem period development was transferred into the fem. "Lilith." It is most curious and interesting to observe that this ghost-demon lived on through the history of the Bab religion, and was carried over into the Heb religion, there to find one single mention in the words of one of the Bab prophets ("Relf. of Assyria and Babylonia," 76, 77).

Exception is to be taken to this statement, admitting the etymological assumption upon which it rests, that "Lilith" is a word in mythology, on the ground that this conception of a night-demon has no place in the religion of the Hebrews as exhibited in the Scriptures. It is certainly worthy of more than passing notice that a conception which is so prominent in the Bab 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 LUNATIC). There is no evidence of active participation in this belief, or even of interest in it as such, on the part of the prophetical writer. On the contrary, the nature of the reference implies that the word was used simply to add a picturesque detail to a vivid, imaginative description. All possible evidence of Hebrew participation in this belief belongs to a later date (see Buxtorf's "Lex., s.v. "Talmud").

II. Folklore in the OT.—Attention has been called elsewhere to the meagerness, in the matter of detail, of OT demonology (see DEMON, DEMONOLOGY; COMPARISON WITH DEMONS). 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 scant and indistinct. We have the following set of items in which such traces have been discovered: "Rahab" (דחוית), "rāḥāḥah, mentioned in Job 9:13; 26:12; Isa 51:9; "Tannin" (תָּנִינָא, תָּנִינא), Isa 27:1; "Leviathan" (תָּנִינא, לְוְיָתָן), Job 3:8; Ps 74:14; Isa 27:1; Ezek 29:3; Job 41:passim; the "serpent in the sea," in Am 9:3; "Seirin" (סְיִרֵין), 2 Chron 11:15; "Leviathan" (תָּנִינא, לְוְיָתָן), 2 Chron 11:5; Lev 17:7; 2 K 23:8; Isa 13:21; 34:14; "Alukah" (אלקות), "Alakah, Prov 30:15; "Azazel" (זָזָאצאל), Lev 16:8.10.26; "Lilith" (at sup.), Isa 34:14-15.

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; "Seirin, 5 times (with reference to idols); Alukah, once; Azazel, 3-times in one ch and in the same connection; Lilith, once.

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, 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. Poetry is the realm of truth and not of matter of fact. In passages of this tenor, mythology may explain the word itself and justify its appropriateness, it does not explain the use of the term or disclose the personal view of the writer.

All these references are in the highest degree allusive. They exhibit no exercise of the mytho- logical fancy and have received no special attention. This is most significant. So far as our specific references are concerned, we are dealing with Petrified mythology, useful as literary 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 parallels 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 behemoth and leviathan is correct, we have a simile and crocodile be allowed to stand and the mythological 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 truth apart from the reality which it stands for (see LEVIATHAN, Job, New CNT. Bible, 1955, p. 22; Meth. Rev., May, 1913, 429 f). 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 "he-goat" is in literal use for "he-goat" (Nu 15:24, et al.) and is doubtful throughout. Ewald translates it "he-goat" in Isa 34:14 and "Satyr" in 13:21. It means lit, "shaggy monster" (Vulg pilawus). We do not hesitate on the basis of the evidence to use "Alukah" (Prov 30:15, RV "high speech," by some tr4 "vampire") and "Azazel" (Lev 16:8, et al.) 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 mytho- logical-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 Comm., on Isa 51:18). The theme is expanded, 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.
Night-Monster

A river of North Africa, the great river of Egypt. The name employed in the OT to designate the Nile is in the Heb נים, y'ör, Egypt dār, earlier, dâr, usually tr'd 'river,' also occasionally 'canals' (Ps 78:44; Ezek 29:3ff). In a general way it means all the water of Egypt. The Nile is also the principal river included in the phrase שֵׁלְחָן נִיָּמִים, nahar kōsh, 'rivers of Ethiopia' (Isa 18:1). Poetically the Nile is called יָם, yām, 'sea' (Job 41:31; Nah 3:8; probably Isa 18:2), but this is not a name of the river. נַחַר, shibōr, not always written fully, has also been interpreted in a mistaken way of the Nile (see Sumer). Likewise שֵׁלֶחַנְיָם, nahar meqrayitam, '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...
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. 35° E., and flows
1. Description N.W. 550 miles to its junction with the White N. The White N., the
principal branch of the Nile, 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 Rurera 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 very 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 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.

2. Geologic Origin The mouth of the river, after the great 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 a very great volume of water in the White N. 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 near 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.

3. The Making of Egypt

4. The Inundation

5. The N. percolating through the porous Infiltration soil. This percolation is called the infiltration of the N. It always extends as far on either side of the N. as 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 (of below).

II. The Nile in History—Some of the early temples were located near the N., probably because of the delineation of the river. The rising of the surface of the land, and at the same time of the bed of the river, from the inundation, lifted both the N. 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 its 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 Kefr'Amara. 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.
The widening of the cultivable land by means of long canals which carried the water from far up the river to areas farther down the river was practised from very early times. The substitution of irrigation for modern engineering skill. Three great dams have been identified: the first a little N. of Cairo, the greatest at Assuan, and the last near Assut.

Famines in Egypt are always due to failure in the quantity of inundation of the Nile. Faminaces have not been frequent. The cause of the failure, in the water of inundation in Fertile, N. and S., but which were not so much a lack of the water of inundation from the Nile as the failure of the rains or of the change of the wind. In the great marsh land of the Sudan by the river, a kind of sedge, sometimes becoming such a tangled mass as to close the doors, tangles the channels so much that the volume of water so that the freshet in the Blue Nile causes little inundation at what is usual and during the rest of the year the Nile is so low from the same cause that good irrigation by canals and wells is impossible. A channel through the Sed is now kept open by the Egyptian government.

III. The Nile in Religion.—One of the gods of the Nile was Hapi, the Nile. In early times it divided the honors with Ra, the Sun, but that was so. If as a God the Egyptians set out to worship Nature-god's all, surely then the sun and the Nile first.

The origin of the Osirian myth is still a much discussed. Very much evidence, perhaps conclusive, can be adduced to prove that the Egyptian religion was profoundly influenced by it. The Egyptians' first notions in regard to the Nile, that in Osirian Myth Osiris was first of all the N., then the water of the N., the soul, the product of the waters of the N., and then Egypt, the same.

The Nile 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 world with a celestial Nile flowing through it. It is so represented in the mythology, but the conception of the heavens is vague.

NIMROD, nim'rod (נִירוֹד, nimrodh; Nī'rod, Nebrād): A descendant of Ham, mentioned in "the generations of the sons of Noah" (Gen 10: 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 Ur, have been identified with certainty. "The land of Shinar" is the old name for Southern Babylonia, afterword called Chaldaea (erec kadim), 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 23 29; Lev 26 22); therefore the king as benefactor and protector of his people hunted these wild beasts. The early conquest of the cities of Babylonia, or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod.


III. PALACES AT NINEVEH PROPER
1. Palace of Sennacherib
2. The Palace of Assur-bani-apli
IV. SENNACHERIB'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
V. 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 Nimron (q.v.) or Assur went out into Assyria, and built N. Biblical and Rehoboth-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 viceroys of Assur, the old capital. To all appearance N. took its name from the Bab Nina near Lagas in South Babylonia, on the Euphrates, from which early foundation it was probably colonized. The native name appears as Nínua or Ninā (Yuānu), written with the character for "water enclosure" with that for "fish."

2. EYTOMOLOGY OF THE NAME
Bab Nina was a place where fish were very abundant, and Istār or Nina, the goddess of the city, was associated with Nin-mah, 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 site by the Bab settlers, and the foundation there of the great temple of Istār or Nina. 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 Khosr falls into that stream. The outline of the wall is rectangular on the W., but of an irregular shape on the E. The western fortifications run from N.W. 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 miles, and is joined at its 1. Its Walls its western corner by the northwestern wall, which runs in a northeasterly direction for about 1½ miles. 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 3¼ miles, 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 Amuqish, and Nebī-Yunes, about 1,500 yards to the N.E. Both of these lie just within the S.W. wall.

2. Principal Mounds Extensive remains of buildings occupy and gateways 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 northwestern roads of the country, west of the E. passing through the curved outworks 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 miles, 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 in Jon 4 11, that the city contained 120,000 persons who could not discern between their right hand and their left, intended to give the number of the city's children only, then the population must have numbered about 600,000, or that 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

Walls is not only indicated by Jon 3 3, where it is described as "an exceeding 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 Mount Cau (Koyunjik), 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 Rehoboth or Resen is not mentioned by name in the Bible.

5. Calah, Resen and Calah is the modern Nimroud, and Resen Calah lay between that site and N. The name Resen-ir has not yet been found in the inscriptions, but Fried Deltzsch has suggested that it may be the rēẖēt Ninaš 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-án or Dur-Sargina), 12 miles N.E. of Koyunjik, the great palace mound of N. proper. Khorsabad is a great enclosure about 2,000 yards square, with the remains of towers and gateways. The palace mound lies on its northwest corner, and consists of a platform with the remains of Sargon's palace and its temple, with a ziggurat or temple-tower similar to those at Babylon, Borsip, Calah and elsewhere. This last still shows traces of the tints symbolical of the 7 planets of which its stonework is partly, 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 entrances 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 Tarbiṣū, now represented by the ruins at Khersan, about 3 miles N. of Koyunjik. In this lay a large palace, Sennacherib calls it—dedicated toermal. Anciently it may have been a place of some importance, as Esarhaddon seems to have built a palace there, as well as a "seat of justice" of his son Assur-bani-apli. The site of Resen, "between N. and Calah," is the southern roads through S. of N. and 3 miles N. of Nimroud (Calah). It is in the form of an irregular inclosure on a high mound overlooking 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 Nimroud, 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 Resé). 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 Nimroud, 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 been dis- appeared. 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 Sennacherib 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, 1857) 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 Palace of Nimrod, Cincinnati and New York, 1897, plate facing p. 36) does not give anli 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 cubita. The inner defensive wall which he built was called by the Sumerian name of Bad-imgalab-bi-bis, 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 tipi, 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 inner city wall—the gate of Hadad—the gate of Urg or Hadad of Tarbišu (Scherf Khan), and the gate of the moon-god Nannar, Sennacherib's own deity. The plans show five openings in the wall on this side, any of which may have been the gate used when going to Tarbišu, but that adorned with winged bulls probably furnished the shortest route.

2. The Gates—Northwest

The gates looking toward the S. and the E. were the Ašşur-gate (leading to the old capital); Sennacherib's Ḥalâḥ-gate; the gate of Samâd of Gagal, the gate of the god Enil of Kar-Ninil, and the "covered gate," which seems to have had the reputation of letting forth the fever-demon. After this are mentioned the Ślimaša-gate, and the gate of Halâh in Mesopotamia. This last must have been the extreme northeastern opening, now communicating with the road to Khorsabad, implying that Halâh lay in that direction.

The gates on the west 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-palace or armory; 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 Kouyunjik mound, and 2 on each side of that called Nêbî-Yûnu. As openings at these points would have endangered the city's safety, these 4 have probably to be eliminated, leaving 2 N. of Nêbî-Yûnu, 2 between that and Kouyunjik, and one N. of Kouyunjik. 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. This wall was made "high like a mountain."

5. The Outer Wall: the Plantations

Above and to the E. of 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 conduits. 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 Khosr 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.

7. How the Bas-Reliefs on their sledges (shaped like boats or Illustrate Assy ships), and sometimes standing the King's and supported by scaffolding. The Description bridges rest upon rollers, and are dragged by armies of captives urged to action by taskmasters with whips. Others force the sledges forward from behind by means of enormous levers whose upper ends are held in position by guy-ropes. Each side has to pull with equal 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 their 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-groves of the palace which are seen. In these the background is an avenue of trees, alternately tall and short, on the banks of a river, whereon are boats, and men riding astride inflated skins, which are much used in those 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 Aššur, about 90 miles to the S., and probably this continued to be regarded as the religious and official capital of the country. Aššur-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 Aššur-naṣir-apli, including, probably, the reigns of his successors likewise—a period of about 98 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 king, and by his son Sennacherib (recent theory that he was killed at Babylon needs confirmation), and the ceremonial triumphs of Assur-bani-apli—the great and noble Osnappar (Ezr 4 10). After the reign of Assur-bani-apli came his son Assur-ñillâni, who was succeeded by Sin-sarris-ikun (Saracoen), but the history of the country, and also of the city, is practically nonexistent during these last two reigns. The Assyrian and Bab records are silent with regard to the fall of the city, but Alexander Polykar, Abiylenus and Syncellus 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 2d year, however, the river (according to Commander Jones, not the Tigris, but the Khois), 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 2 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 Nineveh 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, Assyria and the Land of Niniveh (Cincinnati and New York 1887).

T. G. Pinches

NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF:

I. The Discovery
II. The Library
III. Writing-Materials
IV. Contents
1. Philology
2. Astronomy and Astrology
3. Religious Texts
4. Law
5. Science
6. Literature
7. History and Chronology
8. Commerce
9. Letters

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 puddled 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 Assyrians, whose civilization was derived from Babylonia, imitated the example of Babylonia in this as in other respects. The only true book-lover 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 replete 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 Egyptian literature, which was upon papyrus, has perished that of Babylon 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 analogous to the European nations in the Middle Ages. Thesudent was therefore provided with grammars and dictionaries of the two languages, as well as with reading-books and interlinear tr to Assy of the chief Sumerian texts. Besides this, long lists of the cuneiform characters were drawn up with their phonetic and ideographic values, together with lists of Assyr definitions, by which, for example, all the equivalents are given of the word “to go.” The Assyri 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 bat, “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 Assyri 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 the 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

3. Religious festivals of the gods and the payment of tithe were dependent upon it. Most of the religious texts went back to the Sumer period and were accordingly provided with Assyri tr. Some of them 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 Hammurabi, the contemporary of Abraham, was in Sem Babylonian (see HAMMURABI). Like English law, ASSYR-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 personal records of events. 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 Gilgames 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.

7. History In Assyria the royal palace took the place of the Bab or Egypt temple; Chronology and where the Babylonian or the Egyptian would begin from a religious record, the Assyrian adorned his walls 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 Babylon 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 mighty deed, which he had appointed on each New Year’s Day. In Babylon 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 Assyrian 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 of literature, as well as to other collections of tablets that the libraries was open to all “readers.”

A. H. SAYCE
NINEVITES, nîn-e-vîtes (Nînêvî, Ninewê [tû]) 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, nîfîs (Nîfîhî, Niphîthî, A, Pînîs, Phînîs; AV Niphis): Given in 1 Esd 6:21 m as = "Magbish" of Ezra 2:30, whose sons are the same in number (106) as those of Niphis, but it would seem rather to be the equivalent of Nebo in ver 29.

NISAN, nîsûn (נִשְׁנָן, nîshôn): 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, nîs'rok, nîz'rok (נִשְׁרוֹך, nîsh'rôkh): The Assyrian god in whose temple Sennacherib was worshipping when put to death by his sons (2 K 19:37; Isa 37:35). The name is not found elsewhere. Some identify him with Asshur, the national deity. See BABYLONIA and ASSYRIA, Religion of.

NITRE, nî'țrî (נִיתָר, nî'țar; vîrîôn, nîtron): 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. nâtânîn, 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 "lyce" in Jer 2:22, and "soda" in Prov 25:20. Soda or lye has been used as a cleansing agent from earliest times. It effervesces 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, nô. See No-amon.

NOADIAH, nô-ā-dî'ô (נֹעֲדִיָּה, nô'ā'dîyô), "tryst of Jeh"; Noâdî, Noâdî: (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 Mozur (q.v.), son of Sabannus (1 Esd 8:63). (2) A prophetess associated with Tobiah and Sanballat in opposition to Nehemiah (Neh 6:14).

NOAH, nô'â (נֹאָה, nô'âh, "rest"); LXX Noê, Nôe; Jos, Nôêxos, Nôchos): The 10th in descent from Adam in the line of Seth (Gen 5:25-29). Lamech here seems to derive the word from the v כַּעַת, ya'am, "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 the Pope 3:20 had been preparing for the event by building the ark (see Ark; Deluge). In the cuneiform inscriptions Noah corresponds to "Hasisadrî" (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 Pyre fell beneath the feet of Alexander, and Carthage surrendered to Rome.

GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT

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

NO-AMON, nô-ăm'ôn (נֹעֲדִיָּה, nô'ā'dîyô), Egypt nut, "a city," with the feminine ending t, and Amon, proper name of a god, City Amon, i.e. the "City, my god," of the god Amon; tôv in AV "populous No," following the Vulg in a misunderstanding of the word "amon"; RV "No-amon": Occurs in this form only in Nah 3:8, but nô'â-dîyô, "amon of No," "Amon of No," occurs in Jer 46:5. Or also Ezek 30:14-16, where nô'â, nô, is undoubtedly the same city.

The description of No-amon in Nah 3:8 seems to be that of a delta city, but ð, yâm, "sea," in that passage is used poetically for the Nile, as in Job 41:31 and in Isa 19:2. With this difficulty removed, the Egyptian 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 encyclopedia).

M. G. KYLE

NOB, nob (נֹב, nôb; B, Nô'bâ, Nômbô, A, Nôbâ, Nobâ, and other forms): An ancient priestly town to which David came on his way 8, when he fled from Saul at Gibeon (1 S 21:1). Heep has turned refuge and succour 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 Jerusalem, 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 Jerusalem. 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 No has been discovered, and so no sure identification is yet possible. 'Anâhâ (Anathoth) is 2 miles N.E. of Jerusalem. Nob therefore lay between that and the city, at a point where the city could be seen, apparently on the ancient road from Jerusalem to the Mount. Rather more than a mile N. of Jerusalem rises the ridge Râ's el-Meshâ'rif (2,655 ft.), over which the road from the N. passes; and
here the traveler approaching from that direction of gaining his place of the city. It is fittingly named "the look-out." Col. site 11a states the case for identifying this height with Mt. Scopus where Titus established his camp at the siege of Jerus (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-Joz. 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. Gid of the N. is near the N., and this lay in the most likely path to the S.

W. Ewino

NOBACH, nōḇāh (נְבְּאָה, nōḇāḇ; B, Naḇāš, Naḇōth, Naḇāš, Naḇāš, Naḇāš, Naḇāš, Naḇāš, Naḇāš). 1. Noebah the Manasseite, who 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 Kanaanet, on the western slope of Jebel Drače, the ancient name having survived of that of Nob. (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 (ED, a.v. "Gideon"). But the mention along with Dogbhabah 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-Ammon (Ammán). W. Ewino

NOBAI, nōḇāʼi (נְבָאִי; nōḇāʻāy, or nōḇāḇāy): One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Neh 10 19).

NOBLE, nōḇ’l, NOBLES, nōḇ’l-zi. NOBLEMANN, nōḇ’l-maan (נְבֶלֶם, nōḇelām, kōrdin, kōrdić), etc. (1) "nobles" (1 K 21 16; Neh 2 16; 6 17, etc); of addar, "begir'd," "mighty," "Illustrious" or "noble." Jgs 6 13; 2 Ch 20 20, etc. of addārkā, "liberal," "a noble" (Nu 21 18; Prov 1 16, etc.).

Other words are gābdāl, "great." (Jon 3 7); yakār; Aram. pāracious" (Ezr 4 10); nāghādāt, "a leader" (Job 29 10); partammām, "foremost ones" (Est 1 3; 6 9); dāvirā, "those near," "nobles" (Ex 24 11); bārī, "fugitive" (Isa 45 14); kāḇōkkāth, "weighty," "honored" (Ps 149 8). eugenēs, "well-born" (Acts 17 11; 1 Cor 2 6); krateō, "strongest," "most powerful" (Acts 24 3; 26 25). The Apoc. AV and RV, still further enlarges the list. In Is 1, we have megaptemes, "great ones" (1 Esd 1 38; 8 26, with kūrmes, "in honor") Isa 13 12). Otherwise RV's "uses of noble," and "nobility" are for words containing the κληνος and referring to birth (cf Wisd 8 3; 2 Mac 16 7; 22 12; 42 14 42 bis). AV's uses are wider (asjustify, etc.)

Nobelman is, in Lk 19 12, the tr of eugene antrôpous, "a man well-born," and in Jn 4 46.49 of basilikos, "kingly," "belonging to a king," a designation extended to the officers, courtiers, etc., of a king, RVM "king's officer." he was probably an officer, civil or military, of the Herod Antipas, who was styled "king's (basiological).

For "nobles" (Isa 43 14), AV "have brought down all their nobles," RV has "will bring down all them as fugitives." in or, and otherwise reads as their noble even." etc. for "uses" (Jer 30 21), "prince:" RV 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. "Nazarites"); "her nobles" for "his fugitives," etc. (Isa 15 5); AV has "noble" for "liberal" (Isa 32 5); for the nobles' hosts their peace," AVm. "The voice of the nobles was hushed." (Job 30 10); RV has "The voice of the nobles was hushed," m. "Heb hid"); for "most noble" (Acts 24 3; 28 23), "most excellent." W. L. Walker

NOD, nod (נֶדֶב, nāḏēḇ): The land of Eden, to which Cain migrated after the murder of his brother and his banishment by Jeth (Gen 4 16). Conjecture of the tribe is impossible. The ideas of China, India, etc., which some have entertained, are groundless. The territory was evidently at some distance, but where is now undiscoverable.

NOZABAM, nōzāḇām (נְזָבָאָם; nāzāḇām): A Hagrite clan which, along with Jetur and Naphish, suffered complete defeat at the hands of the trans-Jordanic Israelites (1 Ch 5 19). It has been suggested that Nozabam is a corruption of Nabadh or Nabadai, names which are associated with Jetur and Naphish in the lists of Ishmael'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 Nūdbē, a village in the Hauran.

NOE, nōē (Nē, Nēb): AV of Mt 24 37,38; Lk 3 36; 17 26,27; Tob 4 12. Gr form of Noah (q.v.) (thus RV).

NOEBA, nọ̄ebā (Νοάβα, Nōeβā): Head of one of the families of temple-servants (1 Esd 6 30) = "Nekoda" of Ezr 2 48.

NOGAH, nọ̄gā (נוגה, nōghā, "splendor"): A son of David born at Jerus (1 Ch 3 7; 14 6). In the | list (2 S 14 15) this name is wanting. In its Gr form (Narrāi, Naggs) it occurs in the genealogy of Jesus (Lk 3 25).

NOHABA, nọ̄hāba (נוחבה, nōḥābā): 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 (נָזָע, nōzā; kəḇāl, kāḇālān, kāḇōk, kāḇōk; דַּ֖שָּׁר, Dāšār, kāḇōḵ; דַ֖שָּׁר, Dāšār, kāḇōḵ): "Noise" is most frequently the tr of kōl, "voice," "sound," in AV (Ex 20 18, "the noise of the trumpet," RV "voice"); 32 17 bis; Jgs 5 11, "[they that are delivered] from the noise of the archers," RV "far from the noise," etc. (as otherwise the voice of"); 1 S 4 6, etc.; "because of the voice of"; 1 S 4 8, etc.; "The noise of," "voice," "sound," "noise" (Isa 24 8; 26 9); "ruaḥā, the voice," "the voice," "voice," "voice," (Job 36 29); "Dāšār, the voice," "corony," "outcry" (Job 36 33); shāmān, "desolation," "noise" (Isa 24 8; 26 3); "ruaḥā, the voice," "the voice," "voice," "voice,

etc (Josh 6 10; 1 Ch 15 28); phōnē, "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"); ṭhuqādām, "with a hissing or rushing sound" (2 Pet 3 10, with a great noise"); ginetai phōnē (Acts 2 6, AV "when this was noise abroad," m. "when this voice was made," RV "when this sound was heard"); akōs, "to hear"; dalalē, "to talk or speak" throughout, are also tr "noised" (Mk 2 1; Lk 6 55). So RV of Jth 17 16, "noised among the tents"; Acts, thrōsos, "confused noise" (Wisd 1 10); bōt, "outcry" (Jth 17 19); echōs, "sound" (Wisd 17 18; of Sir 40 13); Lat nox, "voice" (2 Esd 5 7).
For "noise" (Ps 65 7 b), 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 seas; for "a voice of noise from the city" (Isa. 66 6), "a voice of tumult from the city;" for "noise" (Jer 10 22), "voice;" for "a noise" (1 Ch 15 28), "voices" (Ps 43 9); "every battle of the warrior is with confused noise" (Ps 46 12), "the warrior of the city in the tumult," "every boot of the booted warrior;" for "make a noise," "whoan," (Ps 6 2), "roar" (Isa. 17 12); for "make a loud noise" (Ps 88 4), "break forth;" for "moketh a noise" (Jer 4 19), "is disgusted;" 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 singing" (Isa 18 7). "The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than all the mighty waves of the sea" (Ps 93 4), "above the voices of many waters, the mighty breakers of the sea, Jehovah on high is mighty." W. L. Walker

NOISOME, noisome (יוֹנָם, no' nam), ra'; ἄσθμα, kakós, kakós): "Noisome" from "annoys (annoysome)" has in Bible Eng. the meaning of "evil," "hurtful," not of "offensive" or "loathsome." It is the tr of hawwah, "mischief," "calamity" (Ps 91 3), "noisome, a common TR for "evil" (Ezek 4.15). It occurs also in Job 31 20 AVm as the tr of b'hosh, "noisome weeds." AV and RV "rockle," m as AVm; of kakós, "evil," "bad." (Rev 15 5); of a common word for "evil" (Ezek 15:21). Noisome" beasts" (RV "evil"). It occurs also in Job 31 40 AVm as the tr of bo'shah, "noisome weeds," AV and RV "rockle," m as AVm; of kakós, "evil," "bad." (Rev 13 14); of a common word for "evil" (Ezek 15:21). Noisome" also occurs in Apc (see Rev 16:3) as the tr of barâ'ân, "to make heavy," "oppress," where it seems to have the meaning of "loathsome." W. L. Walker

NON, non (יוֹנָם, no' nam): 1 Ch 7 27 AV and RVm. See Nun.

NOOMA, nō'm-ah (Noumâ, Noomâ, B,'Qumâ, Oomt; AV Ethma): 1 Esd 9 35 = "Nebo" of Ezr 10 43, of which it is a corruption.

NOON, noun (יוֹנָן, noon): noon; nānāḏ (יוֹנָן, νανάν): "a feeding former" (ἐπί στέον ἄρθρον, μεσσίνια): 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, nof (נופ, "noph; in Hos 9 6 môph): A name for the Egyp city Memphis (so LXX); hence rendered in RV (Isa 19 13; Jer 2 16; 44 1; Ezek 30 13:16). See MEMPHIS.

NOPHIAH, no'fâ (נופי, nophâh; LXX does not transliterate): A city mentioned only in Nu 21 30 (see Nophar). LXX reads kai hai gunaikeis éis prosêkouan per epi Modob, "and the women besides [yet] kindled a fire at [against] Moab." The text has evidently suffered corruption.

NORTH, nôth, NORTH COUNTRY (יוֹנָן, נוֹר, נוֹר), gâphôn, from √ נוֹר, gâphan, "to hide," i.e. "the hidden," "the dark" [Gen.]; βοσάσ, boreas; βοσᾶς, boreas; [Ith 16 4]; setepentri (2 Esd 15 45); in addition to many other 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, "Shall they 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 have they stumbed 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, "Gene, and all his hollands; his 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 northern border of the promised land, as outlined in Nu 34 7-9 and Ezek 47 15-17, cannot be determined with any certainty, being a word, the meaning of which cannot be identified, but it was approximately the latitude of Mt. Hermon, not including Lebanon or Damascus. For north (עִבְרָם) 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: "from the south-west, and down the north-west wind," which is a lit. tr. of the Gr; ἀνὰ Φαίαντα ἀπὸ τὸ βοῦλα τῆς νότου ἡ θὐθών τὴν ἀνατολὴν." The northeast wind, which does not appear to occur except here, is the corresponding Lat. wind, and was named cannot be identified, but it was approximately the latitude of Mt. Hermon, not including Lebanon or Damascus. For north (עִבְרָם) see Astronomy.

ALFRED ELY DAY

NOSE, nôs, NOSTRILS, nos'trils (יוֹנָן, ל'ק, "nose," ל'ק, ὁ πυρυγός, dual of ל'ק, ὁ πυρυγός), "nostrile"): The former expression (from "norph, like Arab. انف, 'onf) is often trs "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; "Jehovah breatheth into his nostrils the breath of life; and man breeathed a living soul into his nostrils;" "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 5; Ps 68 8; Ezek 31 14). 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 referred 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 23; Isa 37 29; cf Ezek 15 7; 34 4).

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
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 [m. ‘slit’] nose.” The Heb word is רום, barum, which is a hapax legomenon. It corresponds, however, to the Arab. ُجرام, جرم, hence, حرم. The Israhelites were said to be "notable for gold and ornament" (cf Mal 4:5); “notable” occurs also in 2 Mac 3:26 (exprex.). 14:33, RV “for all to see”; 6:28 (genitatives), “a notable example,” RV "noble; notably, only in 2 Mac 14:31 (genitatives), "notably prevented,” RV “bravely,” m. “not.”

W. L. Walker

NOTE, nôt (יוֹנָה, "hannah; *hannah, *hannah; יַעֲנֹטָה; genitatives); "Nette" (v. b.) is the tr of ḥañah, to grave; "to inscribe," etc (Isa 30:8, note it in a book, RV "inscribe"); of rḤashem, to note down, etc (Dnl 10:21, RV "inscribed"); of sōnêôtô, "to cut a sign on" (2 Thess 3:14, "note that man"). "Note" (noun) is the tr of épìsémos, "marked upon," "distinguished" (Rom 16:7, who are of note among the apostles). "Notes" (musical) occurs in Wisd 19:18, "notes of a psaltery" (philhagôs).

W. L. Walker

NOTHING, nothing (נָהַר, לַא, נַעֲרֶנָה, נַעֲרֶנָה, "nôth, "nôth, "nôth, m. "nôth, m. "nôth, n. "nôth, n. "nôth, n.); nothing is represented by various words and phrases, often with lô, which is properly a suffix, with the meaning of "nothing." Most frequently we have מָדָאָה, "not anything" (Gen 40:15; Jgs 14:6).

Other forms are לָא, "nothing" (Gen 19:14); הַמַּעְלָה, "not at all," (Gen 1:26); הָעָלָה, "not at all," (Gen 1:26); הַמַּעְלָה, "nothing"

(RV 1, 6, "as nothing"); יָבֵש, יָבִש, "nothing,

"vacancy," esp. "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶאֶדֶל, "notable"

for gold (Isa 14:11, RV "gold"); מֶאֶדֶל, מֶา...
not even one (Acts 5:30); apelegmón, "refutation" (Acts 19:27, RV "come into disrepute"); dōrēnā, "without payment" (2 Thess 3:8, RV "for nought"); erēmō, "to desolate" (Rev 18:17, RV "made desolate"); kolāthō, "to lose down" (Acts 5:38, RV "be overthrown"). In Apoc we have "set at nought" and "come to nought," etc (1 Pt 3:3; 2:2; 5:9).

For "nought" RV has "perish" (Dt 28:63); for "come to nought" (Job 8:22), "he no more"; "nought" for "notIGHT" (Ex 5:11), "for no might" (Dt 28:32); for "noughted" Isa (Isa 19:1); "brought to nought" ARV "bring to nought" (1 Cor 1:19) for "destruction" (KJV "destruction of projects"); "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" "taken for nought" (Rom 6:20) for "set at nought" for "despise" (Rom 14:3).

NOURISH, nur'ish (γαστρεύω, gibdēl, ἐχαρίζω, ἡγοῦμαι, καταλέγω, ἱππάθω, ἐκτρέφω, ἐκτρέφω, ἐκτρέφω, ἐκτρέφω): 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 most common meaning is "to feed" and the possibility of this is suggested by some other word. Gibdēl means "to bring up," "rear [children]" (Isa 1:2, m "made great"); 23:4; Dnl 1:5); "cause [a tree] to grow" (Isa 44:14). ἡγοῦμαι means "to preserve alive," (with "giving of care") (2 S 12:3; Isa 7:21, ARV "keep alive"). Kαταλέγω means "to support," "maintain," "provide for" (esp. with food) (Gen 45:11; 47:12; 50:21). ἱππάθω means "to bring up," "rear [wheats]" in a figurative use (Ezk 10:2). ἐκτρέφω means "to feed" (transitive) (Acts 12:20, RV "feed"; Rev 12:14); "to fatten" (Jas 5:5, the context indicating an unfavorable meaning). ἐκτρέφω in "to bring up," "rear," like gibdēl (Acts 7:20:21); ektrēphos is "to take care of" (Eph 5:29); ektrēphos is "to bring up," "train in" (1 Tim 4:6).

GEORGE RICKER BERRY

NOVICE, nov'is (νέοφυτος, νεόφυος, "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 2:6), 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 that 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 inflated opinion of himself. His pride is a premonition 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.
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LITERATURE

I. 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. The Heb had several words of different forms for the first few units 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 (rīḇbō or rīḇō, "multitudes"). The Egyptians, on the other hand, had separate words for 100,000, 1,000,000, 10,000,000, 100,000,000. 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 4:27; Rev 5:11); "thousands of ten thousand" (Gen 24:60); "ten thousand times 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. Lubbey System, Decimal Systems, 377) have no parallels in Heb. Fractions were not unknown. We find ½ (2 S 18:2, etc); ½ (Ex 25:10,17, etc); (1 S 9:8); ½ (Gen 47:24); ½ (Ex 18:6); ½ (Lev 23:13); ½ (Lev 14:10), and (2 S 11:1). These are less definitely expressed by ½ by "a double portion," lit. "a double mouthful" (Dt 21:17; 2 K 2:9; Zec 13:8); by "four parts" (Gen 47:24), and ½ 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 3:46 ff), 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, its Kings, Priests and People, 118; Bead, Ninive and Babylon, 90, 92); and it can now 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, H.A.1, 298).

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 Sogdian Words, Inscription, which is probably the oldest specimen 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 the 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 of kings, coins, and other items are marked. We have therefore clear evidence that numerical signs were used by members of a Jewish colony in Upper Egypt in the 5th century BC. Now, as the existence of this colony can be traced before 525 BC and there is evidence 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 44:1). 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 for the hundreds, at any rate from 100, 200, etc. 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 Talmud 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 letters and the alphabet in general, as Illustrated, it is met with in many Gr papyri, 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 Papy., 2) where 14 is three times represented by iota deriv with a line above the letters, and some codices of Rev at 13:18 where 666 is given by the three letters chi xi tau or (diapamma). It is possible that two of these methods may have been employed by scribes, as in the Punic Sacrificial Tablet of Marseilles, where (I. 6) 150 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 in many cases to refer 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 such a figure is not within the range of reasonableness, 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 4,446 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 100,000 might be 40,000; or 4,000; or 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 (yer 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 numbers like 100, 300, etc., are described. Now as the mēn 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 mistakes as on the part of copyists. The high numbers above referred to as found in Ex and Nu have been ingeniously accounted for by Professor Flinders Petrie (Researches in Sinai) in a wholly different way. By understanding 'kipper' 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 Numbers, the authors made a little of money 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, 4000, 630), as stated: It reckons the whole levy of his country at only 102,000 (Der alte Orient, XI, i, 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, ii). The safest conclusion, therefore, seems to be that, while many of the questionable numbers in the present text are genuine, 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 Kilisse, "The Thousand and One Churches," although the actual number in the valley is only 28. The modern Persians use 40 in just the same way. "Forty years" and the like is frequently meant for "a very long time," or "the period of a scribe's life" (Brugsch, cited by König, Stilistik, 55). This lax use of numbers, as we think, was probably very frequent among the Israelis and their neighbors. The inscription on the M S supplies a very instructive example. The Israelites occupied the land by Medea 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 18:29, the period extended to only 23 years at the most, the number 40 must have been used in the sense of the writer'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), 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 reign of Moses (Ex 34:28); Edith (1 K 18:9), Jos, Ant. VI, xiv, 9), of David (1 K 2:11), of Solomon (1 K 11:42) and of Jeboasha (2 K 12:1), the 40 or 80 years of rest (Jgs 3:11.30; 5:31; 8:28), the 40 years of Philipp oppression (Jgs 13:1), the 40 days' challenge of Goliath (1 S 17:16), the 40 days' fast of Moses (Ex 34:28), Edith (1 K 18:9), and Jesus (Mt 4:2 and li), 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 supposed that 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 is the course of which the old Israel died out and a new Israel took its place was generation (Nu 32:18, etc.). 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 (Sure 48) a man is said to attain his strength when he has passed the 40 years of 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; Ecel 8:12; Mt 19:29 and ||. A thousand (thousands), very often a literal number, but in not a few cases indefinite, e.g. Ex 20:6 || Dt 5:10; 7:9; 1 S 15:7; Ps 50:10; 90:4; 105:8; Isa 60:22, etc. Ten thousand (Heb rabbō, rḇbḥō, ṭḥḇḥō); Gr μυρίοι, μυρίον is also used as a round number as in Lev 26:8; Dt 32:30; Cant 5:10; Mie 6:7. The yet higher figures, thousands of thousands, etc., are, in almost all cases, divisions by 10,000, of the rounder numbers; there are remarkable occurrences in the apocalyptic 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 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 6:10). Two or three: "two or three bershebas in the [topmost] hough" (Jsa 17:6; cf Hos 6:2), "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," etc (Mt 18:20). König refers to Assyr, Syr, and Arab. parallels. Three or four: the most noteworthy example is the formula which occurs 8 t in Am (1:3,6,11,18, 2:1,4,6), for "three transgressions, . . . yea 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. 18.21,29, or more than likely denote the three, or possibly the five, of the apocryphal mechanical device, climax 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," or else: "They should not have smitten [Syria] five or six times" (2 K 13:19), an idiom met with also in Am Tab (König, ib). Six and seven: "He will deliver thee in six troubles; yea, in seven there shall he come to thee nothing," or else evil teaching (1 K 2:21), etc. "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" (Ecel 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.), "aforetime" (Josh 4:18), "herefore," "therefore" (Ex 1:6), etc., of both of these, and in other words, was widespread in the ancient East, esp. in Babylonia and regions more or less influenced by Bab culture which, to a certain extent, included Canaan. It must also be remembered that the ancestors of the Israelites have been of Babylonian stock and may therefore have transmitted to their descendants the germs at least of numerical symbolism as developed in Babylonia in the age of Hammurabi. Be that as it may, the presence of this usage of numbers is a matter that can be reasonably doubted, although some writers have gone too far in their speculations on the subject. The numbers which are unmistakably used with more or less symbolic meaning are 7 and its multiples, and 3 and 4 and 7.

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 Apoc and Its and the Pseudepigrapha, and later 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 Sbibylarians have inherited 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, Stolenzahl und Sabbath bei den Babyloniern 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, must lack ancient proof. Hehn (op. cit., 44 ff) has shown that the number acquired its symbolic meaning long before the earliest time for which the reference can be demonstrated. As this sacred or symbolic use of 7 was not peculiar to the Babylonians and their teachers and neighbors to the East, but was known in a large area of Asia 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, cf also Hehn, Stolenzahl und Sabbath bei den Babyloniern 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, must lack ancient proof. Hehn (op. cit., 44 ff) has shown that the number acquired its symbolic meaning long before the earliest time for which the reference can be demonstrated. As this sacred or symbolic use of 7 was not peculiar to the Babylonians and their teachers and neighbors to the East, but was known in a large area of Asia 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, cf also Hehn, Stolenzahl und Sabbath bei den Babyloniern und im AT, 4 ff.
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 reciting ritual actions. The number 7 is particularly marked in the OT in the tabernacle, and especially the seven lamps or seven altars (Ex 25:31; 36:3). The seven years of leavened bread (Ex 12:18, etc.) and 7 days of unleavened bread (Lev 23:6, 8) allude to the seven days of the week. The 7th year was the sabbatical year (Ex 23:21, etc.). The Moabite Balak built Balaam on three occasions 7 altars and offered seven rams and seven heifers (Num 22:4). This 7 is repeated in the structure of sacred objects, for instance the candlestick or lamp-stand in the tabernacle and the shewbread table (Ex 25:31, Lev 24:9). The number 7 is also repeatedly mentioned in the rules for the purification of the leper and the leprous house (Lev 14:49). The leper was ordered to bathe 7 times in the Jordan (2 K 5:10). In the case of suspected uncleanness through leprosy, or the presence of a corpse, or for other reasons, 7 days' seclusion was necessary (Lev 12, etc.). Circumcision took place after 7 days (Gen 17:12). 7 days old before it could be offered in sacrifice (Ex 22:30). Three periods of 7 days each are mentioned in the rules for the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Lev 1:3, 9). This 7 was repeated in the first instance by 7 holy things (Gen 21:29 ff and Num 11:25). The 7 sons of Jesse were entered into the structure of sacred objects, for instance the candlestick or lamp-stand in the tabernacle and the shewbread table (1 Sam 16:11). Many other instances of the ritual use of 7 in the OT and many instructive parallels from Bab texts could be given.

(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) The birth and growth of King David: his 7th son was Bathsheba's son (2 S 5:14; cf. vs 27, 30), and his bowing down 7 times to Esa ù (Gen 35:3). David was born in the 7th year of Saul (1 Sm 16:1), and the 7th day of the week was dedicated to him. He was anointed king of Judah (2 S 16:1), the 7th son of Jesse (1 S 16:10), the 7th son of Saul (2 S 21:6), and the 7th son of Job (1 S 21:6; cf. 42:13), the 7th month of the 7 years of famine (Gen 41:33), and the 7th month of the 7 years of plenty (2 K 25:31). The 7th hour of the day was the hour of prayer (Acts 3:1). The 7th day of the week is the day of rest (Ex 20:11). The 7th hour of the night is the hour of prayer (Acts 3:1). The 7th day of the week is the day of rest (Ex 20:11). The 7th hour of the night is the hour of prayer (Acts 3:1). The 7th day of the week is the day of rest (Ex 20:11). The 7th hour of the night is the hour of prayer (Acts 3:1). The 7th day of the week is the day of rest (Ex 20:11). The 7th hour of the night is the hour of prayer (Acts 3:1).

(b) The number 7 is also used to denote the number of the months of the year (Gen 4:13; 5:3). In the case of the number 7 in the Bible, it is evident that it is used for a number of purposes which are not necessarily symbolic.

(c) The number 7 is also used to denote the number of the months of the year (Gen 4:13; 5:3). In the case of the number 7 in the Bible, it is evident that it is used for a number of purposes which are not necessarily symbolic.

(d) The number 7 is also used to denote the number of the months of the year (Gen 4:13; 5:3). In the case of the number 7 in the Bible, it is evident that it is used for a number of purposes which are not necessarily symbolic.

The significance of 7 extends to its multiples. Fourteen, or 14, is often thought of as symbolic in such cases. The stress laid in the OT on the 14th of the month as the day of the Passover (Ex 12:6 and 16 other places), and the regulation that 14 lamb were to be offered on each of the 7 days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread is an example of the intentional selection of the number, esp. in view of the fact that 7 and 14 occur repeatedly in cuneiform literature—in magical and liturgical texts, and in the formula so often used in the Am Tab: "7 and times at the foot of the king my lord, that I may prostrate myself." The arrangement of the generations from Abraham to Christ in three groups of 14 each (Mt 1:17) is probably intentional, so far as the number in each group is concerned. It is doubtful whether the number has any symbolic import in Acts 27:27, 2 Cor 12:2. 12 is a term of course, but it should be remembered that both the Heb and Gr words for 14 ('arkob 'ahrab, dekate'ssar) suggest that it is made up of 10 and 4, but constant use of 7 in the sense "to multiply by 7" has influenced the application of its double, at least in some cases.

Forty-nine, or 7 x 7, 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 49 days, which was called the "fiftieth day" or "seven times separated by 7 x 7 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 72 elders of Israel (Jgs 1 9; Neh 10 24 f); the 70 kings ill treated by Adonizek (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 Ahab (2 K 10 1 6); 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 f; Dn 9 2). Zec 1 12; 7 5); the 70 weeks of Daniel (Dn 9 24); and the 70 years of human life (Ps 90 10). Other noticeable use of 70 and its powers of Elime (Ex 15 27 [Nu 33 9]); the offering of 70 bullcows in the time of Hezekiah (2 Ch 29 32), and the offering by the heads of the tribes of 12 silver bowls each of 70 shekels (Nu 7 13 ff). 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 languages in the world, including the dead languages, under the care of 70 angels, based perhaps on the list in Gen 10; the Sanhedrin of about 70 members; the 70 chapters of the Pentateuch (LXX), and the 70 members of a family in one of the 70 sons of Jacob. 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 names of Lamech (Gen 4 24); the number of the Moabites and elders of Sodom (Gen 14 24 f); and the number of lambs in a memorable sacrificial (Esr 8 35), would appeal in the same way to the oriental fancy.

The product of seven and seventy (Gr habdomikontidaks kephtis) is met with once in the NT (Mt 18 22), and in the LXX of the above-quoted Gen 4 24. Moulton, however (Gram. of Gr NT Protopogema, 98), renders in both passages 70 7; contra, Allen, "Mt," ICC, 199. The number is clearly a forceful equivalent of "always."

Seven thousand in K 1 K 19 18 [Rom 11 4 may be a round number chosen on account of its embodiment of the number 7. In the M 8 the number of Israelites slain at the capture of the city of Neb by Cambyses (2 K 21 21; Neh 3 1); and the number of lambs in a memorable sacrifice (Esr 8 35), would appeal in the same way to the oriental fancy.

The half of seven seems sometimes to have been regarded as significant. In Dn 7 25; 9 27; 12 7; Lk 4 25; Jgs 5 17; Rev 11 2; 13 5 a period of distress is calculated at 31 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 includes many where its 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—the arithmetical fact more, 70 national groups of Bab Irans such as heaven, 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 palm trees, etc. as 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 guests (Gen 18 19); Gen 18 21; 3 measures of meal (ver 6; cf Mt 13 33)); 3 in military tactics (Jgs 7 16 20; 9 43; 1 s 11 13; 17 Job 1 17); 3 great freshmen (Ex 33 14); the 3 daily prayers (Ps 55 17; Dn 6 10 13); the 3 might watches (Jgs 7 19); God's 3-fold call of Samuel (1 S 3 8); the 3 keepers of the temple threshold (Jer 52 24); the 3 presidents appointed by Darius (Dn 6 2); the 3 temptations (Mt 4 3, 4 4); the 3 prayers in Gethsemane (Mt 26 39 42 44); Peter's 3 denials (Mt 26 70 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; 20 21 2 24 13; Isa 20 3; Jon 1 17; Mt 16 32; 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 3 of the number 7, just as it is natural to the Jews and the Zoroastrians that a corpse was not recognizable after 3 days (for Jewish testimony of Jn 11 39; Yehudamah, xvi 3; Midr. Gen, ch c; Simakhot, viii; for Pers ideas of Ezov 7, 18; XVIII, 580). The abundance of such references to the 3-fold is a literary way, sometimes appearing only in the structure. Note as examples the 3-fold benediction of Israel (Nu 6 24 ff); the Three Holy of the seraphim (Isa 6 5); the 3-fold overturn (Ezk 21 27; Heb 3 11); the 3-fold covenant (Gen 18 2); and the 3-fold prayer as regarded one psalm (Ps 42 5 11; 43 5); the 3 names of God (the Mighty One, God, Jehovah, Jos 22 22; cf Ps 60 1); the 3 graces of Cor 13; the 3 witnesses (1 Jn 5 8); the frequent use of 3 and 3rd in Rev; the description of God as "who is and who was and who is to come" (Rev 1 4); and "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28 19). In some of these cases 3-fold repetition is a mode of expressing the superlative, and others remind us of the remarkable association of 3 with deity alluded to by Plato and Philo, and illustrated by the triads of Egypt and Babylonia and the Far East. It cannot, however, be proved, or even made probable, that there is any direct connection between any of these triads and the Trinity. All that can be said is, that the same numerical symbolism may have been operative in both cases.

The 4 points of the compass and the 4 phases of the moon will have been early noticed, and the former at any rate will have suggested 4. The symbol of completeness of range, of Four comprehensive extent. As early as the 3rd millennium B.C. 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 36; Ezk 37 9), and the 4 quarters or corners of the world (Gen 11 12; Ezk 7 2). 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 (1 S LXX, 15 ff; 6 1 ff), the chariots being directly connected with the 4 winds; 4 punishments (Jer 16 8; Ezk 14 21), the latter with the parallel, the 4 kingdoms in Nebuchadnezzar's
dream as interpreted (Dnl 2:37 ff) and Daniel's vision (7:3ff); the 4 living creatures in Ezek (1:5ff; 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 symbolical, as in a number of passages in Apoc and Pseudepigrapha. Whether the frequent use of 1 in the structure 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 proverbial and prophetic speech (Prov 30:15,18,21-22; 5:12; 12:27). The 4 latter represent full-scaled iniquity, and the 4-folding group in the former suggested the wide sweep of the classification. Perhaps it is fanciful to find the idea in the 4 sets of hearers of the gospel in the parable of the Sower (Mat 13:19-23). The rabbis almost certainly had it in mind in their 4-fold grouping of characters in six successive paragraphs (Ab, v:16-21) which, however, is of considerably later date.

As the basis of the decimal system, which probably originated in the counting with the fingers, 10 has been a significant number in all historical ages. The 10 antediluvian patriarchs (Gen 5; cf. the 10 Bab kings of Berosus, and 10 in early Iranian material, etc.) and the 10 righteous men who had saved Sodom (Gen 18:32); the 10 plagues of Egypt; the 10 commandments (Ex 20:2-17); Dt 5:21; 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 instructed with 10 pounds (Lk 19:13 ff), the most capable of whom was to be given 10 cities (Lk 19:17); 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 31:7; Neh 4:12; Dnl 1:29, etc., an idiom met with repeatedly in Am Tsb); 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 10 kings was a proverb referring to the 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 Amos (Am 7:11); the number was in company at the paschal meal, and of a row of courtiers 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 examples are found in the context).

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 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, Israelistic 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 (Ex 28:22); the 12 cakes of shewbread (Lev 24:5); 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 Elijah's altar (1 K 19:31); the 12 disciples or apostles (26 t); and several details of apocalyptic imagery (Rev 7:5ff; 12:1; 21:12,14,16,21; 22:2; cf. also Mt 14:20; 19:27; 25:53; Acts 26:7). The number point in the first 616 the 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 brandishing 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 a typically parabolic sense, e.g., in the story of the two sons, etc., the part of the Hagiographa known as Ecclesiasticus, the Ethical Egyptian
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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 Acts 2:32; and by Sir J. Hawkins, Eusebius Synagogae, 163 ff.

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 Acts 2:32; and by Sir J. Hawkins, Eusebius Synagogae, 163 ff.

VI. Gematria (גמטראיה) — A pedagogical application of numbers which was in great vogue 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 geometria, that is, "geometry," but Dalm (Wörterbuch, s.v.) connects it in this application of it with grammatica. There is only one clear example in Scripture of the application of this term, 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 name, rech = 200, vaq= 200, vav= 6, nun= 50, koph= 100, samekh= 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, in the number of the so-called 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 16:2. As the
numerical value of the consonants which compose Eliezer 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.: Rehn, Siebenzahl und Sabbath bei den Propheten und von v.a. König, Sidonius, Redhead, Patrick, sect. 51-57, and the same writer's art. "Number" in HDB; Sir J. Hawkins, Horse Synonyms, 163-67; "Number" in Pentateuchal Criticism, 155-69; "Number" in HDB (1-vol); EB; Jew Enc; Smith, DB; "Numbers" in DCG; "Zahlen" in the Dict. of Wien., Richm., Guthe; "Zahlen" und "Sieben" in RB.
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A. Alleged Groups of Distribution
   1. Objections to Same
      a. Hypothesis Unproved
      b. Written Record Not Impossible
      c. No Book Ever Thus Constructed
      d. Inherent Difficulties of Analysis
      e. The Story of the Spies
      f. Rebellion of Korah
      g. Story of Balaam
   2. Size of the Congregation
      a. Multiplication of People
      b. Exodus in One Day
      c. Support in Wilderness
      d. Room at Mol. Sinai
      e. Slow Conquest of Canaan
      f. Number of the Firstborn
   3. 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. Interpolations of the Fighting Men
   b. Size of the Congregation
      a. Multiplication of People
      b. Exodus in One Day
      c. Support in Wilderness
      d. Room at Mol. Sinai
      e. Slow Conquest of Canaan
      f. Number of the Firstborn
   2. Traces of Late Authorship
   a. Certain Passages Have the Appearance of Having Been Written by Moses
   b. Account of Battle with Egyptian Manners and Customs

LITERATURE.

I. Title and Contents.—Stylized in the Heb Bible וּבְנָדָר, "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 'Aqbash, Arithmai, in LXX and 1 e to the 50th of the 2d month after the exodus, describing:

(1) Before leaving Sinai, 1-10 10 (a period of 10 days, from 1st to the 10th of the 2d month after the exodus), describing:
   a. The numbering and ordering of the people, chs 1-4.
   b. The cleaning and blessing of the congregation, ch 5.
   c. The princes' offerings and the dedication of the 63rd altar, ch 6.
   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 11-35.
   b. The events at Taberah and Kibroth-hattaavah, ch 11.
   c. The rebellion of Miriam and Aaron, ch 12.
   d. The return of the spies, chs 13.
   e. The wanderings in the desert, chs 14-19 (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, chs 18.
      e. The water of separation for the unclean, ch 19.

(3) 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.
   c. The second census, 26 1-51.
   d. Directions for dividing the land, 26 52-27 11.
   e. Appointment of Moses' successor, 27 12-20.
   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 refuse 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 name has 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 830), 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 distinction 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 (2) perhaps earlier or a pre-Mosaic theory of 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, monotheists 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, Baentsch [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 sup-
ported by not a few considerations of
weight, one may fairly urge against it
the following objections.

2. Object-
ions to
Same
Hypotheses

(1) Hypothesis 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 docu-
ments supposed (which is inevitable) that E and
J cannot with confidence be separated from each other—Kuenen himself saying that "the at-
tem to make out a Jehovistic and an Elohist
writer or school of writers by means of the Divine
names has not been achieved" (those of P substituted); and some
even denying that P ever existed as a separate
document at all, Eerdmans (St, 33, 82), in parti-
cular, maintaining, as the result of elaborate
exegesis, that P could not have been constructed
in the post-exilic times "as an intro-
duction to a legal work."

(2) Written record not impossible.—It is impos-
sible to demonstrate that the story of Israel's "wan-
derings" 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
supervision, were not under any circumstances
besides had been commanded by God to write the journeyings
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
Israel, is quite natural; and the fact that written
characters was only the tradition that
had floated down for 5 cents. from mouth to mouth,
is simply to say that little or no dependence can
be placed upon the narrative, that there while there
be at the bottom of it some grains of fact, the main
body of it is fiction. This conclusion will not be
readily admitted.

(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 contri-
butions have never been intermixed as those of
J, E, D, and P are declared to have been; nor, when
joint authorship has been acknowledged on the
title-page, has it been possible for readers confi-
dently to assign to each author his own contri-
bution. And yet, modern criticism, dealing with
documents more than 2,000 years old and in a lan-
guage and a script foreign to our own,
moreover, exist only 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 para-
graphs, sentences, clauses or words, were supplied
by J, E, P and D respectively. Credal 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
unthinkable in any document with ordinary preten-
sion to historical veracity, is burdened with inherent
difficulties which make it hard to credit, as the
following examples, taken from Nu, will show.

(a) The story of the spies: Nu 13 and 14 are thus
distributed by Cornill, Driver, Strack and E:
JF, 13 170–20.22–24.266–31.326; 33; 14 3.4.8.9.11–
25.39–45.

P, 13 1–17a; 21.25.36a (to Paran); 32a; 14 1.2 (in
the main), 5; 7.10.26–38 (in the main).

Knaastz generally agrees; and Hartford-Bats-
erry 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 17b, in which case it wanted both the in-
troduction 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 docu-
ment, which is doubtful); or if JE contained both
the instruction and the names, these were sup-
plied by 1–17a from P. As the former of these alter-
atives is hardly likely, one naturally asks
why the opening verses of JE were removed and
then, if they were removed, what has become of them? Does not the oc-
urrence of Jeh in 1–17a, on the critical principles of
some, suggest that this section is the missing para-
graph of JE?

(ii) If the 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
32e, 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 N. as Hamath, after
which ver 22 mentions that they entered the country
from the S. and went up to Hebron and Eshcol,
without at that time finding anything beyond what
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 to the less generous crops of 26b, fresh
after 40 days and reported what they had found to
Moses and Aaron as well as to all the congre-
gation. Without these verses the narrative would
have stated neither how long the land had been
searched nor whether Moses and Aaron had re-
ceived 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 ex-
ceedingly improbable. Ver 11 is in no way in-
consistent with vs 26b–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
traversed by intermecne wars and the incursions of
robbers and marauders. The starvation theory, how-
over, is not supported by the texts (Lev 26:35;
Ezk 36:13) usually quoted in its behalf.

(iii) To argue (Driver) for two documents be-
cause Joshua is not always mentioned along with
Caleb is not strikingly convincing; while if Joshua is not included among the spies in J, that is obviously because the passages containing his name have been assigned beforehand to P. But if Joshua's name did not occur in J, why would it have been inserted in the story by a post-exilic writer, when even in Dt 1 30 Joshua is not mentioned among the spies of the previous generation? Again, the language in Dt 1 38 tacitly suggests that both Caleb and Joshua were among the searchers of the land, and that any partition of the text which conveys the impression that Joshua was not among the spies is wrong.

(iv) If the text-analysis is as the critics argue, how comes it that in J the name Jeh does not once occur, while all the verses containing it are allotted to P? 23

(5) 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 (unnally or consciously to the experience.) (v) It does, as are not unanimous, with the exception of 16 15. 26. 12—15. 25. 26. 27—34, which are given to J, though variations are unavoidable.

It is admitted that the J verses, if read continuously, make out a story of Dathan and Abiram as distinguished from this 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 these three or even two narratives to have been intermixed is traveling beyond the premises.

(vi) If J contained more about the conspiracy of the Reubenites, Dathan and Abiram, than has been preserved in the verses assigned to I, what has become of the excited 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 J? And how does it happen that the name used throughout, with one exception, ver. 22, is Jeh, while in J it occurs only 6 ? 24 (vi) J contains only the parts assigned to it and nothing more happened than the Reubenites' escape, why should the Korahite rebellion have been added to it 4 cents. later. If that rebellion never happened? J (vii) If the Korahite conspiracy did happen, why should it have been omitted in J. and nothing whispered about it till after the exile? (viii) If the two conspiracies, ecclesiastical (among the princes and civil (among the laymen), are so intermingled, and the conspirators made common cause with one another, in that there was nothing groundless of which the one apprised the other. But, as has been observed of the same type of chance, in expressing the sum of all the secular writers, it would be manifestly false. If 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 J. Except 22. 20. which is generally handed down 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, 25, 26, which are property of J, because of the use of Jeh (Driver, Kautzsch); or whether some additional verses should not be assigned to J (Cornell, HDB), critics are not agreed. As to chs 23 and 24, authorities hesitate whether to give both to J or to E, or ch 24 to E and ch 24. 25 to J, 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, 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 ch 6 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 author 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, and that the author's name and interpolations 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 either 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 authority, unless it could be shown either from the narrative itself or from extraneous sources that the events chronicled were internally improbable, incredible or false. 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 a posterior version (P), founded upon a posterior one (im) 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 impossibilities.

1. The Little Passover (9 1—6)—The critical argument is that a contemporary historian would naturally have placed this paragraph before 1 1. The answer is that the chronological order, which it manifestly was not (see chs 7 and 9), and that which the compiler of this book deemed necessary to state that the Israelites had celebrated a second Passover on the legally appointed day, the 14th day 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 supplementary Passover, realized that in after years readers might erroneously conclude that this was the Passover that had been kept in the 2d year. So to obviate any such mistaken inference, he prefixed to his account of the Little Passover, as it is sometimes called, a statement to the effect that the statutes of Passover, as given in the Law, 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 or 40
be considered the beginning of the 3rd or of the 40th year,
the fitting reflection of 37 years is by no means a
one case in almost unbroken silence: in the other with
scarcely anything of moment recorded save Korah's
rebellion. The repudiation of a family of levitical
offerings to be made when the people reached the land
of their habitation. To pronounce the whole book un
historical, because of an absolute or comparative silence
(see) is unreasonable. Most biblical books would be
formed into the whole book. Besides, a historian might have
reason to pass over as for recording the incidents of any
period. And this might have been the case
the author of Nu. From the moment sentence
of death had been pronounced at Kadesh till the hour when
the new generation started out for Canaan, he may have counted that Israel had prac
ticed idolatry, and that perhaps that family of Levites
formed no part of the history of Jehovah's kingdom;
and it is noticeable that scarcely had the tribes
resumed 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 of the 40 years in a decade, and left the interval a
blind spot, a solution which has not even the merit of being clever
and explains nothing. It does not explain why, if the
narrative was being written at the time, there would have been
an interval at all. A romance would not have missed so
splendid an opportunity for a coincident interval. It would
have left at least a period of 30 years unlinked; but like the writers
of the apocryphal Gospels would have crowded it with
manufactured events.

On the better theory, not only is the silence explained,
but the items inserted are accounted for as well. Though
the unbelief of the generation had ceased to be the people
of Jehovah, Aaron had not yet been sentenced to exclusion from
the promised land (Num. 20:1-13), and was still one of the representa
tives of the kingdom of Jehovah, and Korah's rebellion prac
tically struck a blow at that kingdom. As such it was punished,
and why, in view of its breaking of rank and super
sion was recorded, as a matter of vitally concerned the
state of the church of God. In the apocalyptic
narrative sections were included in the narrative. They
were Jehovah'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
Aaron's 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
certain that all the events in this section were
fittingly recorded after Moses began his oration; neither (b) is
it necessary to hold that they all occurred in succession;
while (c) it is certain that events following each other
as another is ascertained, it will not be possible to
decide whether or not they could all have been begun and
finished within a space of 6 months.

(1) Number of the fighting men.—This, which may be
drawn down roughly at 600,000, has been chal
lenged on two grounds: (a) that the
2. So-called 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 incompatible with an unusual or
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 written from the point of two such also
would have been made either exactly equal or more widely divergent; and (d) that so many variations occurring in the strength of
the tribes as numbered at Sinai and again in Moab,
while probably not in reality constituting 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 41
times that number, or about 25 millions,
several difficulties emerge which have led to the suggestion
(Eerdmans, Conder, Wiener) that the 600,
000 should be reduced (to, say, 50,000), and the entire
population to less than 30,000. The following
alleged impossibilities are believed to justify the
reduction: (a) that the 2.5 millions of
Egyptian captives between the descent into, and the departure
from Egypt; (b) that of 2.5 millions being led out of
Egypt in one day; (c) that of obtaining support
for so large a multitude with their flocks in the Sinai desert
from either the Mount Sinai, or in the limited
extent 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 possi
bility 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 2.5
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
for each of Jacob's sons who were married
(say 51 out of 53), 4 male descendants (Colenos
allows 41), these would in 7 generations—not in
4 (Colenos)—amount to 835,584, and with surviv
fathers and grandfathers added might well
reach 600,000. But even this was well over 425
years of age. But in point of fact, without definite
knowledge of 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 narr
ative 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 met.

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 (Eerdmans, Vorge
schichte Israels, 78) on the ground that the
births were so numerous as these presupposes, two
midwives (Ex 1 20-21). The events following this,
one another is ascertained, it will not be possible to
decide whether or not they could all have been begun and
finished within a space of 6 months.

(1) The number of the fighting men.—This, which may be
drawn down roughly at 600,000, has been chal
lenged on two grounds: (a) that the
2. So-called 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 incompatible with an unusual or
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 written from the point of two such also
would have been made either exactly equal or more widely divergent; and (d) that so many variations occurring in the strength of
the tribes as numbered at Sinai and again in Moab,
while probably not in reality constituting 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 41
times that number, or about 25 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 force estimated Israelites, more than likely to delay or linger in their movements. But how could there have been 2½ millions of fugitives, it is asked (Erdmans, 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 horses and his horsemen. (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 Sinaic 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 subsequently settled there were rich. 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. (Deut 7:24). 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 the flocks and herds were not taken over 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 accepted in 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 argued that that which was supplied was not sufficient 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 was a means, but not the only one, for providing in abundance, continuously 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 Ex-Rahal (Robinson, Staunton)—though the plain of Schabach, admittedly not so rocky, 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 further increased by lateral valleys receding from the plain itself" (Forty Days in the Desert, 73; cf Keil on Ex 19,12). Kalsche, though putting the size of the plain at a smaller figure, adds that "it thus forms a large space, sufficient for the host of Israel"—a conclusion accepted by Ebers, Richet 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; but it is possible that 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 movement of Canaan: The long time it took to conquer Pal (Erdmans, Vorgeschichte Israels, 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 the great movement, viz. the Israelites, does 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 commandment given to them in the trusted, 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 20:14, 21). If instead of 600,000 Israelite soldiers they had only possessed 6,000, it is not difficult to see how they could not drive out the Canaanites. The difficulty is to perceive how they could have achieved as much as they did.

(f) The number of the firstborn.—That the 22,273 firstborn males (Nu 3:43) is out of all proportion to the 605,550 men of 20 years old and upward, being much too few, has frequently (Bleek, Bohlen, Colenso and others) been felt as a difficulty, since it practically involves the conclusion that for every firstborn there must have been roughly big, in each family. Various solutions of this difficulty have been offered, the prevalence of polygamy has been suggested (Michaels, Haenriek). The exclusion of firstborn sons who were married, the inclusion only of the mother's son, the great variability, the babies which have been called in to surmount the difficulty (Kurz). 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 12:29; Nu 3:13; 8:17) (Keil, Delitzsch, Gerlich). It may be urged, of course, that this would require an exceptionally large number of births in the 15 months; but in the exceptionally joyous circumstances of the emancipation this might not have been impossible. In any case, it does not seem that there is any explanation which might vanish were all the facts known, to impeach the historical accuracy of the narrative, even in this particular.

Note.—In Scotland, with a population of nearly double that of the Israelites, viz. 3,232,743, marriages in 1909 were 30,092, the lowest on record for 55 years. At the same time births in Scotland in the 12 months after the exodus might have been 15,046, assuming each marriage to have had issue. As this marriage rate, however, is excessively low for Scotland in normal years, the number of marriages and therefore of births in Israel in the first year after the exodus may well have been twice, if not 3 times, 15,046, i.e. 30,092, or 45,185. Reckoning the half of these as males, viz. 15,046 or 22,569, it does not appear as if the number of the firstborn in the text were quite impossible, on the supposition made.)

3. Alleged Levitical laws, Physical Impossibilities—fully minute observation, were they not only in Canaan. (b) In point of fact, as Moses afterward testified (Dt. 12:8), the Levitical laws were not scrupulously kept in the wilderness.

(c) There is no reason to suppose that the Passover of the 2d year was celebrated before it had been in Egypt before the exodus, the slaughtering of the lambs being performed by the heads of families. And (d) as the Levites were set apart to minister to the tabernacle (Nu 1:50), they would be in able many ways to assist the priests.
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, was to be present. To the contrary, 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 spake 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 231 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 fall without the presence of Israel (Nu 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 in 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.

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 completed (i.e. if no division began to fall into line till its predecessor completed the task of its predecessor in the camp, or is completed in the process it required 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 sight of one another even if the would require 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 numbers 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. (d) If the march was not divided into 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 mimetic, no doubt营, rather than quasi-prophetic, rout formations. It is, however, possible that these were used by the enemy. But 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, arithmetical calculations are of little value and are not entitled to discredit the truthfulness of the narrative.

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 in the whole of Canaan without the presence of Israel (Nu 31:30-41). But what is the 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 pursuing army: that of Gideon's 300 over the Midianites at a later date (Jgs 7:22), that of Samson single-handed over 1,000 Philis (Jgs 15:15); and that of Jehoshaphat at the battle of Tekoa (2 Ch 20:24), which was won without a blow—all more or less miraculous, no doubt. For in profane history, Tacitus (Ann. xiii.39) relates an instance in which the Romans slaughtered all their 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, 330). Hence Israel's victory over Midian does not afford sufficient ground for challenging its historic credibility.

Restricting attention to evidence from Nu itself, it may be remarked 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 the materials which went to make up the book were substantially the work of one pen (whoever may have been the first 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 contemporary 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 Mosan 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, is 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 regarded as written only by one hand, the 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 before the prophecy of Balaam comes.” And if Moses could thus have skillfully concealed times he 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 the author of the Divine Teaching, and represented this as it were by a double emphasis, which showed (a) that the Jeh 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 are believed to exist 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 there when the portico was erected. But the description of 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 24 14.15, 17.18.27–30, certain archaic songs are cited as if the people were familiar with them. But according to the Authorized Version, as it 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 it was composed before the song of Balaam (Num 23.12). It is therefore a song that was begun to be composed soon after the defeat of Amalek is not an unreasonable hypothesis (Ex 17 14). As for the statement that “Aaron 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 within the scope of an old prophetic song, as showing that their present position had been long before anticipated by God. (d) 24 16, according to the Authorized Version, is not unreasonable, that which 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 in Canaan, it was in so unexpected a manner that 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 contention of the Exonites only then began (25 5 14; 1 Ki 11 1; 1 Ch 18 12 13).

Examples such as these show that many, if not most, of the like objections against the Mosaic 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 by 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 could thus skillfully conceal times he did so, the presumption at least is created that the whole book has proceeded from his pen. (b) The apocryphal songs taken from the Book of the Wars of the Lord (ch 21), which some critics (Cornill, Kautzsch and others) hold true, are by no means equally competent scholars (Bleek, De Wette, J. Meyer, König and others) recognized as parts of Israel’s heritage from the Mosaic age, whenever they were incorporated in the book (c) The list of camping stations (ch 33) is expressly assigned to Moses. Whether “by the commandment of the Lord” should be connected with the “journeys” (Köning) 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 prepared by Moses, that does not amount to conclusive evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the whole book. Yet it creates a presumption in its favor (Dreehals, Keil, Zahn). For why should Moses have been interested in a passage collected and arranged by the compiler of Deuteronomy, if it presupposes the amanuensis, and whether by express command or without it (not an unreasonable supposition), there was no particular need to record that this was so. If, however, Moses was not thinking of preserving an incident, but of the historical record of the covenant, that he desired that he should do so, then there was need for a special commandment to be given; and need it should be recorded to explain why Moses incorporated in his book a list of names that in most people’s judgment might have been omitted without impairing the value of the book. Looked at in this way, the order to prepare this itinerary rather strengthens the idea of the Mosaic authorship of the whole book.

(2) Acquisition of the part of the author with Egyptian manners and customs.—This points in the direction of Moses. (a) The trial by jealousy (5 11–31) may be compared with the tale of Setna, belonging probably to the 3d cent. B.C., but relating to the new knowledge of the Egyptian sun-god, Thoth, having found the book which the god Thoth wrote with his own hand, copied it on a piece of papyrus, dissolved the copy in water and drank the solution, with the result that he knew all the secrets contained in the book (RP, IV, 138). (b) The consecration of the Levites (8 7) resembled the abolutions of the Egyptian priests who shaved their heads and bodies every 5d day, bathed twice during the day and twice during the night, and performed a grand ceremony of purification, preparatory to their seasons of fasting, which sometimes lasted from 7 to 40 days and even more (WAE, I, 181). (c) Uncleanness with contact from the dead (19 11) was not unknown to the Egyptians, who required their priests to avoid graves, funerals and funeral feasts (Porphyry, De Abst. ii.50, quoted in Speaker’s Comm.). (d) The fish, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions and garlic referred to in 11 5 were articles of diet in Egypt (Herod. ii.83). (e) The antiquarian statement about the leek of Helbon (13 17), as if it were a new food, is more than a writer in Mosaic times. "A later writer could have had no authority for making the statement and no possible reason for inventing it" (Pulpit Comm. on Nu). On a candid review of all the arguments pro
NUMENIUS, nō-men-ī-ūs (Νομένιος, Nu-
mēnios): 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 Hazor (Galilee) over the
princes of Demetrius (1 Macc. 12:18) about 144
BC. Their mission was to confirm and renew the
friendship and treaty which had existed from the
days of Judas (8 17 ff). They were well received and
successful, both at Rome (12:3) and at
Sparta (12:19 ff, 14:22). After the death of
Jonathan, the victories of Simon and the establish-
ment 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
minae—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 integ-
ritv of Jewish territory, and forbidding these kings
to disturb the Jews, and requiring them also to sur-
render any deserters (14:15 ff). See also LUCIUS;
Schürer, Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes (3d and 4th
edd), i, 236, 250 f. S. ANGUS

NŪN, nōn (נ, נ): 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 (᾿Ν, νῦν, "fish," derivative meaning
"fecundity")—Father of Joshua (referred to
thus 29 times) (Ex 33:11; Nu 11:28, etc; 1 Ch 7:27,
מ "Non"); Sir 45:1, m "Nave").

NURSE, nūrs, NURSING, nūrs'ing: "Nurse" in
AV represents two different Heb words: In 8 pas-
sages (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 νηοη renders some form of the vb. νηοη, γανη, "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. Josiah, the son of
Ahitub, 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.
Rebek-
kah was accompanied by her nurse when she left
home to be married (Gen 24:59; 35:8). In 5 pas-
sages (Nu 11:12; Ruth 4:16; 2 S 4:4; Isa 49:23;
60:4 AV) "nurse" represents the Heb word νηοη,
ἀμαμ, "to support," "be faithful," "nourish."
The part. of this vb. denoted a person who had
eaten of the children—a guardian or woman of
child. 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 care the sucking child. The
same word is found in 2 K 10:15 (AV "they
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 τητῆρας, τροφής.
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

NURE, nūrē: The word occurs in AV in Eph
6:4 as the tr of παιδεία, παιδεία, but AV changes to "chastening," and NASB "nurture" (vb.) for AV "bring up" (τητῆρας, τροφής) in the first
part of the verse. "Paideia has the idea of training
and correction; in RV 2 Esd 8:12 for Lat. crutio;
and of AV Wind 3:11; Sir 18:13 (paideíα), etc.

NUTS, nuts:
(1) (γυοζ, ἐχθραί; καράς, καρύα; Arab. jouz, "the
walnut" [Cant 6:11]: 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-

Pistachio Nut (Pistacia vera).

tains. In such situations it attains the height of
from 60 to 90 ft. A grove of such trees affords the
most delightful shade.

(2) (κοπρί), bokrot; τοπάθραβος, τερβίνθοι [Gen
43:11, m "pistachio nuts!"] The Heb is perhaps
allied to the Arab. butiam, the "terebinth," which
is closely allied to the Pistacia vera, N.O. Anacar-
dioce, which produces pistachio nuts. These nuts,
known in Arab. as fistal, are prime favorites
with the people of Pal. They are oblong, ½ in. long,
with green, oily coxyleons. They are eaten raw
and are also made into various sweets and confection-
ery. They are a product of Pal, very likely to be
sent as a present to Egypt (Gen. 43:11).

NYMPHAS, nim'fas (Νυμφᾶς, Nymphas; Lach-
mann, Tregelles [m], WH read Νυμφᾶ, Νυμφα, the
name of a woman [Col 4:15]: A Christian resident
in Laodicea, to whom Paul sends salutations in the ep.
which he wrote from Rome to the
church in Colosse, 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 be read, then it is a Christian lady who is meant—was 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, ὦξ: Several Heb words are so tr., but there has always been great doubt as to which words should be tr. "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 may originally have 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. ἀλήθ (in LXX usually τερεβίνθος, terebinthos, in Vulg. terebinthus, or, more commonly, quercus)

2. Hebrew
   - 1. Hebrew 1 K 13:14; 1 Ch 10:12; Isa 1:30; Ezk 1:13; in Isa 13 (AV "tell tree") and Hos 4:13 (AV "els") the tr is "terebinth" because of the juxtaposition of ἀλήθ, tr, "oak.

3. "Yah of Eleah" (in "the Terebinth") is found in 1 S 17:21.9. The expression in Isa 1:30, "whose face fadeth," is more appropriate to the terebinth than the oak (see below).

2. ἀλήθ (terebinthos, quercus [Vulgate]), apparently a slightly variant for ἀλήθ only in Jos 24:26; Gen 30:4 (ἄληθ) and in Jgs 9:6 (ἄληθ).

3. דָּלָּם or דָּלָם, "elim, perhaps pl. of ἀλήθ, occurs in Isa 1:29 (m "terebinth"); 57:5, m "with idols"). "AV "allem"; m "oaks"; 61:3, "trees"; Ezk 31:14 (text very doubtful), "hight," AV "upon themselves"; הָלָּם, "N, in El-phan (LXX terebinthos) (Gen 14:6), probably means the "tree" or "terebinth" of Paran. Colossi (Hier. l,34 if) argues at length that the above words apply well to the Τατανίνα (q.v.) in all the passages in which they occur.

4. דָּלָּם (usually δέλας, δέλα, "oak"), in Gen 12:6; 15:13; 14:13; 18:1;Dt 11:30; Josh 19:33; Jgs 4:11; 9:6.37; 1:10 3 (AV "plain"); in all these references, δέλας has "oaks" or "terebinth," or "terebinths.

5. "Oak of Mezonemin" (in "the augurs' oak (or terebinth)" in Jgs 9:37.

6. "Yah of Eleah" (in "the Terebinth") is found in 1 S 17:21.9. The expression in Isa 1:30, "whose face fadeth," is more appropriate to the terebinth than the oak (see below).

If (1) (2) (3) refer cap. to the terebinth, then (4) and (5) are probably correctly tr."oak." If we may judge at all by present conditions, "oaks" of Bashan is far more correct than "terebinths" of Bashan.

This fact, that the church met there, also shows that Nymphas was a person of some means, for a very small house could not have been a suitable place for Christian men and women who gathered together on the first day of every week for the purposes of Christian worship, and which indicates that the church in Laodicea had a numerous membership, 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

There are, according to Post (Flora of Palestine, 737-41), no less than 9 species of oak (N.O. Cupuliferae) in Syria, and he adds to these

2. Varieties 12 sub-varieties. Many of these have of Oak no interest except to the botanist. The following species are widespread and distinctive: (1) The "Turkey oak," Quercus cerris, known in Arab. as Balsam, as its name implies, occurs in other countries, too, and is common in Pal. Under favorable conditions 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 bristle, scales, giving them a mossy aspect. The wood is hard and of fine grain. Galls are common upon its branches.

(2) Quercus lusitanica (or Ballota), also known in Arab. as Balsam, as the last is frequently found dispersed to a bush, but, when protected, attains a height of 30 ft. or more. The leaves are dentate or crenate or late 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. Galls are common, and a variety of this species is often known as Q. inferna, on account of its liability to infection with galls.

(3) The Valonic oak (Q. acerolopha), known in Arab. as Balsam, has large oblong or ovate deciduous leaves, with deep serrations terminating in a point, and very large acorns, globular, thick cups covered with long reflexed scales. The
cupules, known commercially as valoncia, furnish one of the richest of tanning materials.

The Evergreen oak is often classed under the general name “lex oak” or Holm (i.e. holly-like) oak. Several varieties are described as occurring in Pal. Q. \textit{tux} 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 \textit{Q. cocccifera} (with var. \textit{Q. pseudococccifera}) is known in Arab. as \textit{Sindn}. 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 \textit{Q. cocccifera} are found the insects which make the well-known Kermes dye. 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 hilltops; 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 frequent landmarks (Josh 19:33) or places of meeting (cf “Oak of Tabor,” 1 S 10:3). The custom of heathen worship beneath oaks or teebitha (Hos 4:13; Ezek 6:13, etc.) finds its modern counterpart in the cult of the Wely in Pal. The oak is sometimes connected with some historical event, e.g. Abraham’s oak of Guern now shown at Hebron, and “the oak of weeping,” \textit{Aliun bacak}, of Gen 35:8.

E. W. G. \textsc{Masterman}

\textbf{OAK OF TABOR (עֵין תַּבְרֶה, el'ôn taborh):} Thus RV in 1 S 10:3 for AV “plain of Tabor” (RVm “teebinth”). 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.

\textbf{OAR, 6.} See Ships and Boats, II, 2, (3).

\textbf{OATH, 6th (עֵשֶׁב הַעֲבֵד, shebha'ah, probably from shebbah,' seven,” the sacred number, which occurs frequently in the ritual of ancestor worship, and the stronger word כָּלָּה, kaláh, by which a curse is actually invoked upon the oath-breaker (LXX \textit{aôd}, \textit{ard}): In Mt 26:70-74 Peter first denies his Lord simply, then with an oath (shebha'ah), then invokes a curse (kaláh), 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).}

1. Law Re-; 6:20: 19:21; 23:19. It guarded Oaths playing a very important part, not only in the laws, (Ex 28:27) and state affairs, (Am 7:11) 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 sacredness of an oath, forbidding on the one hand swearing falsely (Ex 20:7; Lev 19:22; 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 \textit{kerekos}; 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; cf Prov 29:24). Both required a sin offering (Lev 5:1f). 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 (\textit{Makkot} 2:3; \textit{Shebha'ah} 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 Jeh in ordinary cases (so Dalman).

Swearing in the name of the Lord (Gen 11:22; 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 the Old Testament that swearing by false gods was frequent, and we learn also from the newly discovered Elephantine papyri 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 Hecubbeth, and by Isun. In ordinary intercourse it was customary to swear by the life of the person addressed (1 S 1:25; 20:5; 2 K 2:2); by the life of the king (1 S 17:55; 26:20; 2 S 11:11); by one’s own head (Mt 3:6); by the earth (Mt 7:33); by the heaven (Mt 5:34; 22:21); by the angels (Bf, II, xv, 4); by the temple (Mt 23:16), and by different parts of it (Mt 23:16); by Jesur (Mt 5:35); by \textit{sh'bhu'ah}. The oath “by heaven” (Mt 5:34; 22:21) is confirmed 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 palter 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 rendered, and any false oath was treated as a crime against Jehovah (Gen. 43:33). The usual form was to hold up the hands to heaven (Gen. 41:22; Ex. 6:8; Deut. 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 (Num. 5:22). The usual form of an oath was either: “He that is witness betwixt me and thee” (Gen. 31:50), or more commonly: “As Jehovah [or God] liveth” (Jgs 8:19; Ruth 3:13; 2 Sam. 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 Sam. 3:35; 1 Kings 2:23; 2 Kings 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 that by mentioning it the thing might be drawn upon himself some of the punishment by merely mentioning it.

Philosophy expresses the desire (ii.194) that the practice of swearing should be discontinued, and the Egyptians used no oaths (B.j. 11, 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 Peter (Acts 26:27–28) (II. 18–19).

Permissibility. 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 absolutely true as his oath. In the kingdom of God, where that principle holds sway, oaths become unnecessary.

PAUL LEVYTOFF

OBAIDIAN, bê-hâ-dî’a (אֶבַדִּיה; עְבַדִּיה, “servant of Jehovah”):

1. The steward or prime minister of Ahab, who did best to protect the prophets of Jehovah against Jezebel. He must have held his office on his return from Zarephath, and bore to Ahab the news of Elijah’s reappearance (1 Kings 18:3–16).

2. The prophet (Ob.1). See OBADIAH, Book of.

3. (a) A descendant of David (1 Chron 3:21).

4. (a) A chief of the tribe of Issachar (1 Chron 7:3).

5. (a) A descendant of Saul (1 Chron 8:38; 9:44).

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


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

10. A Merarite, enclosed by Jehovah to oversee the workmen in repairing the temple (2 Chron 34:12).

11. The head of a family who went up with Ezra from Babylon (Ezra 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 SANPEY

Obadiah, Book of: Obadiah is the shortest book in the OT. The theme of the book is the destruction of Edom. Consequent 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

1.1 Their hidden treasures will be rifled;

1.2 Their confederates will turn against them; nor will the wise and the mighty men 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 forget the selfish and heartless deeds of which he had been guilty when Jehu was sacked by foreign foes (vs. 10–14).

3. The day of the display of Jehu’s retributive righteousness upon the nations is near. Jehu shall complete completely his task, whom he has tried to uproot, while Israel’s captives shall return to possession of their own land and also to seize and rule the mount of Esau. Thus the kingship of Jehu shall be established (vs. 15–21).

The unity of Ob was first challenged by Eichhorn in 1824, vs. 17–18 being regarded by him as an appendix attached to the original exilic prophecy (of Jeremiah) of the time of Alexander the Great (323–30 BC). Ewald thought that an exilic prophet, to whom he ascribed vs. 11–14, 16–21, had made use of the exilic prophecy by Obadiah in vs. 1–10, and in vs. 15–18 of material from another older prophet who was contemporaneous, like Obadiah, with Isaiah. As the years went on, the material assigned to the older oracle was limited: 5.7.10.11.13.14.15.16, while all else was regarded as a later appendix of the composition of Ob. Ob is thus summed up by Bewer: “Vs. 1–6 are a prologue, of Ob that was assigned to Jeremiah, and redacted with additions (vs. 7–15) by another Obadiah in the early post-exilic days; vs. 16–21 in an appendix, probably from a Marcanite time” (ICC, 5). Bewer’s own view is closely akin to Barton’s. He thinks that Obadiah, writing in the 6th cent. B.C., “quoted vs. 1–4, almost, though not quite, 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 quoted once more vs. 4 of the older oracle without any show of literalness.” He ascribes to Obadiah vs. 10–14 and 15b. The appendix consists of two sections, vs. 15a and 15b, the latter being a fragment of a different author, 15b being a quotation from some older prophet. To the average student of the prophecy a five minute analysis of a brief prophecy must seem hypercritical. It will prefer to read the book as a unity: and in doing so 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 Obadiah, Book of

(a) Did Obadiah quote from Jer? 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; six are closely related; a fifth embarks on a verse of Obadiah which, while it contains the same themes, is an expansion of the preceding verse, and with which verse, the theme 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 verses of Obadiah with his own, so that the entire verse or verses so interwoven there is not one 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 of expression, however, between the two versions, but it has not been disproved by the arguments from meter advanced by Bewer and others. (d) Did both Obadiah and Jeremiah quote from an older oracle? This is the favorite solution among modern scholars, most of whom think that Obadiah preserves the vigor of the original, while Jeremiah quotes with more freedom; but Bewer in TIC, after a detailed comparison, thus sums up: "Our conclusion is that Obadiah quoted in vs 1-9 an older oracle, but in vs 10-14 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 5.6 cf Jer 49 9.10s; with Ob ver 8 of Jer 49 7; with Ob vs 92 of Jer 49 22b. 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 ver 17. If Joel prophesied during the minority of the boy 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 ver 12). Hence most scholars identify the calamity described by Ob with the later destruction and destruction of Jerusalem 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 Jerusalem to Babylon. We know, however, from Ezek 36 1-15 and Ps 137 7 that Edom rejoiced over the final destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldaeans in 587 BC, and that they encamped 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 prophet had warned and despatched the Chaldaeans by his efforts. But Obadiah wrote before 587, and may have prophesied in 597, and some others identify it with a Shaparda 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 Bithynia or Galatia (Sayce). Some think that the mention of "the captives of this host of the children of Israel" and "the captives of Jerusalem" (ver 20) proves that both the Assyrian captivity and the Bab exile were already past. This argument has considerable force; but it is well to remember that in the first half of the 6th century BC Edom carried on extensive wars of aggression and that the prophecies of Obadiah, like those of the prophets of the northern kingdom of Israel, were written to defend the rights of the kingdom against its enemies, and were written to warn the inhabitants of Edom of their future destruction if they persisted in their hostility to Judah. Obadiah is a prophecy of the future, and not an interpretation of past events.

(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 Babel 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 long-windedness. The criticism of the minor prophets and 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 any 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 Shaparda 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 Bithynia or Galatia (Sayce). Some think that the mention of "the captives of this host of the children of Israel" and "the captives of Jerusalem" (ver 20) proves that both the Assyrian captivity and the Bab exile were already past. This argument has considerable force; but it is well to remember that in the first half of the 6th century BC Edom carried on extensive wars of aggression and that the prophecies of Obadiah, like those of the prophets of the northern kingdom of Israel, were written to defend the rights of the kingdom against its enemies, and were written to warn the inhabitants of Edom of their future destruction if they persisted in their hostility to Judah. Obadiah is a prophecy of the future, and not an interpretation of past events.

2174 4. Interpretation of the Book.—Ob is to be interpreted as prediction. In vers 1-14 there are elements of historic description, as vs 1-10 and 15-21 are predictive.

LITERATURE.—Comm's: Caspari, Der Prophet Obadiah ausgelogt, 1842; Pusey, The Minor Prophets, 1860; Ewald, Comm. on the Prophets of the OT (ET), II, 277 ff, 1875; Keil (ET), 1886; Juan (Cambridge Bible), 1889; von Orelli (ET), The Minor Prophets, 1893; Duhme, The prophet of the latter part of the 7th century BC, 1903; Eisslen, Der Prophet Obadiah, 1911; Miscellaneous: Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the prophets, 33 f, 1906; Boring, A History of Driving, 37 f, 1889, in DBB, III, 577-80; Barton in JE, IX, 369-70; Cheyne in EB, III, 345-52; Peekham, An Intro to the Study of Ob, 1910; Kent, Students' OT, III 116-21.

JOHN RICHARD SAMPEY

OBAL, o-bal. See Ebaal, 1.

OBdia, ob-dia (A, 'Obsdia, Obedia, B, 'Obsdai, Hobbi). One of the families of usurping priests (1 Esd 5 38) = "Hobaia" of Ezr 2 61; "Hobaiah" of Neh 7 63.
Obadiah, Book of Obedience of Christ

Obed, 6bed (עָבֶד, הָבֶּד, "worshipper"); in the NT 1ωβῆδα, 1ωβεδ:  
1. Son of Boaz and Ruth and grandfather of David (Ruth 4 17.21.22; 1 Ch 2 12; Mt 1 5; Lk 3 24).  
2. Son of Ephal and descendant of Sheshan, the Jerahmeelite, through his daughter who was married to Jarha, an Egyp servant of her father's (1 Ch 2 37.38).  
3. Son of David's mighty men (1 Ch 11 47).  
4. A Korhite doortkeeper, son of Semeah, and grandson of Obed-edom (1 Ch 26 7).  
5. Father of Azariah, one of the centurions that took part with Jehoiada in depositing Queen Athaliah and crowning Josiah (2 Ch 23 1; cf 2 K 11 1-16).  

David Francis Roberts

Obed-edom, 6bed-ed'm (עַבְד-אֵדֶם, הֵבָדֶד-אֵדֶם) [2 Ch 25 24]; [2 S 6 10; 1 Ch 13 13.14; 15 25], but elsewhere without hyphen, "Abiathar's" servant.  
6. The Ark of Jehovah into his house when David brought it into Jerus-ehir-jearim. Because of the sudden death of Uzzah, David was unwilling to bring the ark to Jerusalem and it remained three months in the house of Obed-edom, "and Jeh blessed Obied-edom, and all his house" (2 S 6 11). According to 1 Ch 13 14 the Ark had a special "house" of its own within. There is probably the same as the Levite of 1 Ch 15 25. In 1 Ch 15 16-21 Obed-edom is a "singer," and in 1 Ch 15 24 a "doortkeeper," while according to 1 Ch 26 4-8 he is a Korhite doortkeeper, to whose house fell the overseership of the storeroom (ver 15). Obed-edom is sometimes mentioned as a "minister before the ark," a member of the house or perhaps a guild of Jeduthun (see 2 Ch 25 24).  

Obed-edom is an illustration of the service rendered to Heb religion by foreigners, remining one of the Simeon 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 Obed-edom performed, and hence the references to him as a Levite.

David Francis Roberts

Obedience, 6-bē' di-en, OBEY, 6-bā' (עָבֹד, shā'ma; ἀκοῦω, ἡκοπάω): In its simpler OT meaning the word signifies "to hear," "to listen." It carries with it, however, of Terms the ethical significance of hearing with reverence and obedience. In the OT 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, πείλομαι, πείλομα.  

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 not abdul him; he shall obey 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 relation is expressed as by Samuel when he asks the question, "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 S 15 22). It was the condition without which no right relation might be sustained to Jehovah. This is most clearly stated in the relation between Abraham and Jehovah when he is assured "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice" (Gen 22 18).  

In prophetic utterances, future blessing and prosperity were conditioned upon obedience: "If ye will be obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land" (Isa 1 9). After surveying the glories of the Messianic kingdom, the prophet assures the people that "this shall come to pass if ye will diligently obey the voice of Jehovah your God" (Zec 6 15). On the other hand misfortune, calamity, distress and famine are due to their disobedience and distrust of Jehovah. See Disobedience.  

This obedience or disobedience was usually related to the specific commands of Jehovah as contained in the law, yet they conceived of God as giving commands by other means. Note esp. the rebuke of Samuel to Saul: "The voice of Jehovah is not heard, neither the voice of his servant Jehovah; but a voice of an ass is heard, and they obeyed not the voice of Jehovah." . . . therefore hath Jehovah 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, 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 7). Peter designates believers in Christ as "children of obedience" (1 Pet 1 14). Thus it is seen that the test of fellowship with Jehovah in the OT is obedience. The bond of union with Christ in the NT is obedience through faith, by which they become identified and the believer becomes a disciple.

Walter G. Clippinger

Obedience of Christ: The "obedience" (ἀκοῦω, ἡκοπάω) of Christ is directly mentioned but 3 in the NT, although many other passages describe or allude to it: "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 learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (He 5 8). In 2 Co 10 5, the phrase signifies an attitude toward Christ: "every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."  

His submission 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 the Commandments and in the NT writers: "without sin" (He 4 15); Character "who knew no sin" (2 Co 5 21); noble, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners" (He 7 26), etc; and is affirmed by Himself: "Which of you convinceth me of sin? (In 8 46); and implicitly conceded by His ene-
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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 redemp- 
tive work; it might conceivably, though improbably, be said that "the slave to his master, but in time denoted the act of bowing as a token of respect." T. Lewis

OBELEISK, ob'ēlisk, ob'd-ēlisk: A sacred stone or maqēḇbōḥāh. For maqēḇbōḥāh RV has used "pillar" in the text, with "obelisk" in the margin in many instances (Ex 23 34; Lev 26 1; De 12 3; 1 K 14 23; Hos 3 4; 10 1,2, etc.), but not consistently (e.g. Gen 28 18). See pillar.

OBEΘ, ob'ēth (Oḇēṯ, Obēth, Oḇḕb, Oḇōbē): One of those who went up with Ezra (1 Esd 8 32) = "Ebed" of Ezr 8 6.

OBL, o'bil (ḇōḇ, 'obhīl, 'camel driver'): An Ishmaelite who was "over the camels" in David's palace (1 Ch 27 30).

OBJECT, ob'jēkt: 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" (1 K 22 20) in Wisd 2 3.4, RV "the objectors to" or "the objectors" (as our translators use "transgressing of our education" (RV "layeth to our charge sins against our discipline")) or "to make charges against" in Acts 24 19, AV "who ought to have been here before thee, and object, if they had ought against me" (RV "and to make accusation").

OBLATION, ob-lā'shun: In Lev and Nu, AV occasionally uses "oblation," but generally "offering," as a rendering of ḥōḇēṯ, ḥōḇōb, a general term for all kinds of offering, but used only in Ezek, Lev and Nu. RV renders consistently "oblation." In Ezek (also Isa 40 20), "oblation" renders ḥwēḇōb, trūmōb, generally tō 34 "heave offering." In some cases (e.g. Isa 1 13; Dn 9 21) "oblation" in AV corresponds to ḥōḇēṣ, Markup, the ordinary word for "gift," in P "grain offering." See Sacrifice.

OBOTH, o'both, o'bōth (ḇōḇ, "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-skū'ri-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 (ḇōḇ, "ophel, "darkness"); 58 10; 69 9 (ḇōḇēḵ, "darkness"); Ad Est 11 8 (ḇōḇōph, ḥōḇōp, "darkness"). Cf Prov 20 20, AV "in obscure darkness," ERV "in the blackest darkness," ARV "in blackness of darkness."

OBSERVE, ob-zôr' (representing various words, but chiefly ḇōḇ, ẖāmār, "to keep," "to watch," etc.): Properly means "to take heed to," as in Isa 42 20, "Thou seest many things, but thou observest not," and from this sense all the usages of the word in Eng 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." Observers 1720, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" (malà waparòýòwos, metà paratérësēs). 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" is a matter of extraordinary dispute at the present time. See Kingdom of God. BURTON SCOTT EASTON

OBSERVATION, ob-sër'

OBSERVANT, ob-sër-vant. See DIvinATION.

OBSINITY, ob-stîn-ût-ë. See HARDENING.

OCCASION, o-kâ'shûn: The uses in RV are all modern, but in Jer 2 4 "occasion" is employed (both in Heb and Eng.) as a euphemism for "time of conception of offspring." OCCUPY, ok'â-pë: Is in AV the tr of 7 different words: (1) ἔκατον, neðthan; (2) ἔκατον, sēbhar; (3) ἔκατον, ērakhk; (4) ἔκατον, ēsah, either with or without the added word, ἔκατον ἐκ ἐκ; (5) ἐκατάληθος, ἐκατάληθος; (6) παρατηρεῖν, παρατηρεῖν; (7) πραγματεύειν, pragmateuein. In almost every case the meanings of "to occupy" as used in AV in harmony with the common usage of the time have become obsolete. (1) In Ezk 27 16.22, nāthan meant "to trade," and RV reads "traded." (2) From sēbar, "to go about," was derived a designation of "merchants" (RV) (Ezk 27 21). (3) ērakh (Ezk 27 9) signifies "to exchange" (ERV and AV)B, but AV "deal in"). (4) ēsah (Ex 28 24) means simply "to use" (RV), and the same word in Jgs 16 11, with ἐκ ἐκ ἐκ ("work") added, signifies that work had been done (RV). (5) In 1 Cor 14 16, "occupy," the AV rendering of ἐκαταλέθησαν, would still be as intelligible to most as RV "fill"; (6) "Occupy" in Ho 13 9, in the sense of "being taken up with a thing," is the tr (both AV and RV) of periπατεῖν, lit. "to walk." Finally (7) pragmateuein (Lk 19 13) is rendered in AV "occupy" in its obsolete sense of "traded" (RV). OCCURRENCE, o-kur'ënt (AV, ERV, 1 K 5 4): An obsolete form of occurrence "(so ARV). OCCIDENT, ok'i-dënts (Oxîpulos, Ochêlos, B, 'Opîhlos, Oxivâ; AV Ochiel): One of the "captains over thousands" who furnished the Levites with much cattle for Josiah's Passover (1 Esd 1 9) = "Jeiel" of 2 Ch 35 9.

OCHEILUS, ok'i-lûs (Oxîpulos, Ochêlos, B, 'Oxivâ, Oxivâ; AV Ochiel): One of the "captains over thousands" who furnished the Levites with much cattle for Josiah's Passover (1 Esd 1 9) = "Jeiel" of 2 Ch 35 9.

OCHEL, ok'ral (Tiy, "ochêrla), from o'khôr, "trouble"; AV Ocran): The father of Pagiel, the prince of the tribe of Asher (Nu 1 13; 2 27; 7 72; 10 26).

OCHEL, ok'ral, RED (Isa 44 13, "He marketh it out with a pencil," m "red ochre," AV "lime"; Tiy, serôk, a word found only here, and of unknown etymology): Designates the implement used by the carpenter to mark the wood after measuring. "Red ochre" signifies this to have been a crayon (as does "pencil"), but a scratch-awl is quite as likely. Ochre is a clay colored by an iron compound.

OCIDELUS, os-i-del'us, os-i-del'us (A, 'Okeidélos, Okeidêlos, B and Swete, 'Okeilados, Oktalêdos, Fritzsche, 'Okeidélos, Oktalêdos; AV and Fritzsche Ocdelus): One of the priests who married a "strange wife" (1 Esd 3 29); it stands in the place of "Josabad" in Ezr 10 22 of which it is probably a corruption.

OCINA, os-'î-na, os-'î-na (Ocina, Ocin̄): A town on the Phoen coast of Syria, mentioned only in Jth 2 28, in the account of the campaign of Holofernes in Syria. The site is unknown, but from the mention of Sidon and Tyre immediately preceding and Jemmaan, Azotus and Ascalon following, it must have been S. of Tyre. One might conjecture that it was Sandallium (Is- kandera) or Umm al-'Awanid, but there is nothing in the name to suggest such an identification.

OCRAN, ok'ran. See Ochran.

ODED, o'ded ( DriverManager [2 Ch 15], DriverManager [elsewhere], o'dothêk, "restorer"): (1) According to 2 Ch 15 1, he was the father of Azariah who prophesied in the reign of Asa of Judah (c. 918-877), but ver 8 makes Oded himself the prophet. The two verses should agree, so we should probably read in ver 8, "the prophecy of Azariah, the son of Oded, the prophet," or else "the prophecy of Azariah the prophet." See AZARIAH. (2) A prophet of Samaria (2 Ch 28 9) who lived in the reigns of Pekah, king of the Northern Kingdom, and Ahaz, king of Judah. According to 2 Ch 28, Oded protested against the enslavement of the captives which Pekah had brought from Judah and Jerusalem; or on his return from the Syro-Ephraimite attack on the Northern Kingdom (735 BC). In this protest he was joined by some of the chiefs of Ephraim, and the captives were well treated. After those who were naked (i.e. those who had scanty clothing) and the meaning of the word "naked" (in Mk 14 51) had been supplied with clothing from the spoil, and the bruised anointed with oil, the prisoners were escorted to Jericho.

The narrative of ch 28 as a whole does not agree with that of 2 Chr 16 57; 17 14, where the allied armies of Rezin of Damascus and Pekah besieged Jerusalem, but failed to capture it (cf Isa 7 1-17; 8 5-82). As Curtis points out (Chron, 459, where he compares Ex 21 28; Lev 25 29-43; Dt 15 19-23), whereas enslavement of their fellow-countrymen was not allowed to them by the pivotals, and this fact the passage illustrates. It seems to be a fulfillment in spirit of Isa 61 1-2, a portion which Our Lord reads in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk 4 16-20).

ODES, o'dëz, OF SOLOMON. See APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE.

ODELLAM, o'd-ôl'am (Odelam, Odelam): The Gr form of ADELLAM (q.v.), found only in 2 Mace 12 38.

ODEM, o'd-em (Odomê, Odomê, B, Odamôpôs, Odamôpa, Iuda Odonâ; AV Odonarkes, m Odamarkos): 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 Mace 9 60) in 156 BC.

ODOR, o'dôr: In the OT the rendering of ἔμφυτος, besom, "fragrance" (2 Ch 16 14; Est 2 12; in Jsr 34 5, RV "burnings"), and of one or two other
words; in the NT of ἀπέκτω, ἐσκαλάνω (Jn 12 3; Phil 4 18; Eph 5 2 RV); in Rev 6 8; 18 13, of ἄτυπακα, θηλαμάσα, where RV (with AV in former passage) 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 genitive or possessive relations 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 Crammer (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 no longer familiar—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 hear about" or "to hear of" (cf 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 28 22, "We 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 28 22) 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" elsewhere in AV (and even in the immediate context, Mt 23 27 28) refers to the contents, but here the "of" represents the Gr ἐκ, εκ, "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, RV substituted has related an obscurity for where the el of 1611 read "cut down branches of the trees," the modern edd 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 Mac 4 7, they went forth of 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 second sense of this 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, "rejoiceth 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 information about 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.
frequent in the Gospels (Mt 5 29, "if thy right eye offend thee"; 5 30; 16 6; 18 9, "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 whereof ... offended," 1 Cor 8 13 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 connects strongly "to stumble" or "to cause any one to stumble". Thus, it strikes against injuriously (it is LXX for μολέχτην, αὸς τοῦ γαίναι, "a noose" or "a snare", Josh 23 13; 1 S 18 21); "a stumbling-block" (LXX for μικαθήλα, see above). Lev 19 14). For skandalize, skandalon, tr in AV, "offend," "offence," RV gives "cause to stumble," "stumbling-block," etc; thus, Mt 5 29, "if thy right eye cause 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 fail to make a good showing in the faith; 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 stumbleth," 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 offence [did proskómmänatos], 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 8 13; Rom 16 17. "Mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine, [whether they] are supposed to be learned. (Is not it necessary to "teach" of Christ Himself implied here?). Everything that would embolden another to do that which would be wrong for him, or that would turn anyone away from the faith, must be carefully avoided, so as not to put stumbling-blocks in the way of my brother, "for whom Christ died," "giving no occasion of stumbling [proskópeō] in anything" (2 Cor 6 3).

A πρόκλησις, "not causing to stumble," is τρι τι "void of offence" (Acts 5 10, "a conscience void of offence"; 1 Cor 10 32, RV "occasion of stumbling"; Phil 1 10, "void of offence"); ἑμαυτός, "to miss the mark," "to sin," "to err," is "offended" (Acts 2 22); ἐκαμάρτα, "sin," "error" (2 Cor 11 17, RV "Did I commit sin in being a sinner"); ἐντὸς, "to stumble," "fall" (Gen 2 25; 3 2 bis, 3 bis "offend," "offend"); ἐπέτυλος, "a falling aside or away," is "offence" (Rom 4 25; 5 13). In 16 17; in 20, in each case RV "trespass"; ἀδίκητος, "to be unrighteous" (Acts 31 11, RV "wrong-doer," AV "offender"). In Apoc we have "offence" (skandalon, Jth 12 2). RV "I will not cast thereof, lest there be occasion of stumbling," "offend" (Rom 1 1, RV "sinned") (2 Cor 11 15, RV "offended") (skandalize, 32 25, RV, "stumble").

W. L. WALKER

OFFER, of'er, OFFERING, of'er-ing. See SACRIFICE.

OFFICE, of': 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 1, 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. גָּדוֹל, "pedestal," "place" (Gen 40 13, AV "place"); 41 13); חֲבֹד, "abhaddith, "labor," "work" (1 Ch 6 32); חֹשֵׁב, "think," "oversight," "charge" (Ps 109 8); תֹּמֶם, ma'ūmād, lit. "standing," e.g. waiting at table (1 Ch 23 28); דְּבַל, mish-mär, "charge," observance or service of the temple (Neh 13 14 AV).

Similarly in the NT the word the is used in periphrastic renderings, e.g. priest's office (Lk 1 8 9); office of a deacon (διακονία, διακονία, 1 Tim 3 10); office of a bishop (ἐπίσκοπος, εἰπισκόπος, 1 Tim 3 1); RV uses other renderings, e.g. "ministry" (Rom 11 13); "serve as deacons" (1 Tim 2 9). In Acts 20 12, RV has "office" (m "overseership") for AV "bishoprick." T. LEWIS

OFFICER, of'i-ser: In AV the term is employed to render different words denoting various officials, domestic, civil and military, such as, כְּנֶסֶת, "eunuch," "minister of state" (Gen 37 36); יֶעָן, "minister in charge," "overseer" (Gen 41 34); דָּבָא, דְבָא, "eunuch," "stationed," "garrison," "prefect" (1 K 4 19); נַשְׁרֵה, נַשְׂרֵה, "scribe" or "secretary" (perhaps arrange or organizer), then any official or overseers. In Est 9 3 for AV "officers" of the king, RV has "more literally" "they that did the king's business." 

In the NT "officer" generally corresponds to the Gr word ἱπποτής, ὑπόπτης, "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 πρόκρισις, πρόκτηρ, 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 erstwhile fair and holy city, despoiled, defiled, derided by the profane, the enemies of God and of His people (Lam 3 45, ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος). The favored people, whose city lies in heaps and is patrolled by the heathen, are hailed and held up as the scrappings, the offscouring, the offal of the earth. They who were once exalted were cut down to 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 (πρόκλησις, πεπρόκλητος) should remind us what it cost in former times to be a true servant of Christ. G. H. GERBERING

OFFSPRING, of'spring. See CHILDREN.

OFTEN, of ten (πάντοπα, παύνον, "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 wounds... a broken limb—an often chance" (Tennyson, Gareth and Lynette).

OG (אָג, ὄγ): 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
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Oil, Oil

Oil, oil (έκρ, σκυμην; ἀλαος, ἀλαον): 1. Terms

2. Production and Storage

3. Uses

4. Figurative Uses

Shemen, lit. “fat,” corresponds to the common Arabic szemun of similar meaning, although now applied to boiled butter fat. Another

1. Terms

Heb word, sayith (זית), “olive,” occurs with shemen in several passages (Ex 27 20; 30 24; Lev 24 2). The corresponding Arab. zaat, a contraction of zayith, which is the name for the olive tree as well as the fruit, 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 13). Compare this with the Gr. ἀλαος (alaos), “oil,” a neuter noun from ἀλας, elas, “olive,” the origin of the Eng. word “oil.” ἀλαος, yishar, 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. ἰσμα, ms'kah, a Chald word, occurs twice: Ezr 6 9; 7 22. ἀλαος, ἀλαον, 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 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 of this type are found in old Rom presses in Mt. Lebanon and other districts.

The second step in the preparation of the oil is
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.

This method gives a delicious oil, but is wasteful. This is no doubt the beaten oil referred to in connection with religious ceremonies (Ex 27:22). 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 ECONOMIES OF GEN.) Macalister shows how this was done. 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 17:13; 2 K 4:2). In 1 S 16:13; 1 K 1:39, horns of oil are mentioned.

(1) As a commodity of exchange.—Olive 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. The oil now used to protect the body against the cold. Many Bib. references indicate the use of oil as a cosmetic (Ex 25:6; Dt 28:40; 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, sorb 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 5:5). At times of fasting the Oriental Christians use only vegetable oil, especially olive oil, for cooking. For Bib. references to the use of oil as food see Nu 11:8; Dtt 7:13; 14:23; 32:13; 1 K 17:12-14; 2 K 4:267; 1 Ch 12:40; 2 Ch 2:10-15; Ez 3:7; Prov 21:17; Ezek 16:13-18; Hos 2:22; Hag 2:22: Rev 21:26.

(5) As an illuminant.—Olive oil until recent years was universally used for lighting purposes (see LAMP). In Pal are many houses where a most primitive form of lamp similar to those employed by the Israelites is still in use. The prejudice 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; 35:8-14:25; 39:37; Mt 26:3-4:8).

(6) In religious rites.—(a) Consecration of officials or sacred things (Gen 28:15; 35:14; Ex 29:21; Lev 21:1; Nu 4:9; 1 S 10:1; 16:13; 2 S 1:21; 1 K 1:39; 2 K 9:13; Ps 89:20). This was adopted by the early Christians in their ceremonies (Jas 5:11), and is still used 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 or oil jugs with the supply of oil and oil pious adherents. In Israelitish times oil was used in the meal offering, in the consecration offerings, offerings of purification from leprosy, etc. (Ex 29:2; 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; 12:8; Ezek 18:12; 46:46; Mic 6:7). (c) In connection with the burial of the dead: Egyptians pray to 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 12:3-8; 18:40).

Abundant oil was a figure of general prosperity (Dt 32:13; 33:21; 2 K 18:22; Job 29:6; Joel 2:19-21). LANQUISHING of the oil indicated general famine (Jn 2:10; 11:38). Oil is still used as a symbol of 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 55:21; 34:12). Cursing becomes a habit with the wicked as readily as oil seaks 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 (αἵματα ἄρα, shemen hamishkah): 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 subsequently entrusted 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 OHR

OLIVE (Ex 27 20; Lev 24 2; Nu 28 5). See OIL; GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

OLI, HOLY. See OIL; ANOINTING.

OLI, OLIVE. See OIL; OLIVE TREE.

OIL PRESS. See OIL; WINE PRESS.

OIL-MAKING. See CRAFTS, II, 11.

OIL TREE, oil tre (αἵματα τοῦ φώκα, 'ēc shemen [Isa 41 19], m "oileaster," in Neh 8 15, tr"wild olive," AV "pine"; τοῦ φώκατοῦ, 'ēc shemen, in 1 K 6 33 31 32, tr"olive wood"): The name "oileaster" used to be applied to the wild olive, but now belongs to another plant, the silver-berry, Elaeagnus hortensis (N.O. Elaeagnaceae), known in Arabic as Zeraizan. It is a pretty shrub with sweet-smelling white flowers and silver-grey-green leaves. It is difficult to see how all 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"oil 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 φώκα as horlenesis 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 mishkah (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. Mishkah 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 23-25. 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 1, 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"ointments" in the NT is ἀρθρον, muron, "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 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 OHR

OLAMUS, ol'a-mus (Ὀλάμουs, Ὀλάμω) or Oldamus; One of the Israelites who had taken a "strange wife" (I Esd 9 30) = "Meshullam" of Est 10 29.

OLD, old. See Age, OLD.

OLD GATE. See JERUSALEM.

OLD MAN (عالج, palatios, "old," "ancient"): A term thrice used by Paul (Ro 6 5; Eph 4 22; Col 3 9) to signify the unrenewed man, the natural man in the corruption of sin, i.e. sinful human nature before conversion and regeneration. It is theoretically synonymous with "flesh" (Rom 8 5-9), which means, not for bodily organism, but for the whole nature of man (body and soul) turned away from God and devoted to self and earthly 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 (α'ευθύς ώς, nábáb' 'ēdah z̄êkâ, "an old prophet" [1 K 13 11], Nâbâb' ha-nâbâb' ha-z̄êkâ, "the old

1. The prophet" [ver 29]): The narrative of Narrative I K 13 11-32, in which the old prophet is mentioned, is part of a larger account telling of a visit paid by Bethel by "a man of God" from Judah. The Judaecon prophet uttered a curse upon the altar erected there by Jeroboam 1. When the king attempted to use force against him, the prophet was saved from the king's power by Elisha, and 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 Judaecon 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 Judaecon returned with him. While at 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 in tr ver 12o: "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 24 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 from him (following LXX, B with W. B. Stevenson, H.D.B. III, 594a, n.).
Benzinger ("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 form or an exalting religious story." 2 Ch 24:27 refers to a "midrash 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." Jo 1:1 names the Judean prophet Jadon (Ant., VIII, viii, 5), and so 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. Kittel and Benzinger 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 heads 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 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 Judean (ver 31)? The answer is implied in ver 32, and is more fully given below (2 K 23:15-20), where King Josiah defiles the graves of the prophets at Bethel. On seeing a "monumental stone by the face of the grave," he inquires what it is, and is told that it marks the grave of the prophet from Judah. Thereupon he orders that his be buried 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-lb-aś'tér (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 trē (G735, zāyith, a word occurring also in Aram., Ethiopic and Arab.; in the last it means "olive oil," and zādan, "the olive tree"). Aa'α, ol'ain): 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 is the king of the trees (Job 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 reference in the Bible to evidence (see 4 below) from archaeology and the important place the product of this tree has held in the economy 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 are the product of bare and rocky ground (cf Dt 33:13) situated preferably at no 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 who for revenge may carry out revenge by cutting away a ring of bark 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 Beirût is 6 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 8 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 Arab. as khawdūrāh. 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 ungathered 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 humble homes 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 tread them by foot (Mic 6 15). Oil is obtained

3. Olive Oil

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 an upright pivot. A plentiful harvest of oil was looked upon as one of God's blessings (Joc 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, morsels of bread being dipped into it in eating; also medicinally (Lk 10 3; 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 oil. 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" ("Gezer Mem," PEF, II, 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 ancient olive 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 without 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 1724). On the mention of "branches of wild olive" in Neh 8 15, see Oil Trees.

5. Wild Olives

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

OLIVE YARD, ol'iv yār'd. See Olive Tree.

OLIVES, ol'ivz, MOUNT OF (AMLH'N-TH'), har ha'-zēbîn [Zec 14 4], בַּרְכֶל הָזֶּבִים, ma'atolah ha'-zēbîm, "the ascent of the mount of Olives" [2 S 15 30, AV "the ascent of (mount) Olivet"]; בִּדְרוֹס תְּוָנָאָלָא, בִּדְרוֹס תָּוָנָאָלָא, "the Mount of Olives" [Mt 21 1; 24 3; 26 30; Mk 11 1; 13 3; 14 26; Lk 19 37; 21 37; Jn 8 1]; בִּדְרוֹס תְּוָנָאָלָא, בִּדְרוֹס תְּוָנוֹמֶנִי אֲלָאָלָא, "the mount that is called Olivet" [Lk 19 29; 21 37; in both references in AV "the mount called (the mount of) Olives"]; בְּלָאָלָא, בְּלָאָלָא, לְאָלָאָלָא [Acts 1 12, EV "Olivet" lit. "olive garden"]; 1. Names

2. Situation and Extent

3. OT Associations

(1) David's Escape from Absalom (2) The Vision of Ezekiel (3) The Vision of Zechariah
Olives, Mount

4. High Places
5. Olives and Jesus
6. View of the City from Olivet
7. Churches and Ecclesiastical Traditions

Literature

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, viii, 6; BJ, V, ii, 3; xii, 2), but later Jewish

1. Names writings give the name בער, har ha-mischibbith, “Mount of Oil”; this occurs in some MSS in 2 K 23.13, and the common rendering בער, har ha-mischibbith, “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 throughout Jewry the appearance of the new moon.

To the natives of Pal today it is usually known as *Jebel at Tur* (“mount of the elevation,” or “tower”), or, less commonly, as *Jebel Tur ez zoit* (“mount of the elevation of oil”). The name *Jebel ez-zoïtan* (“Mount of Olives”) is also well known. Early Arab writers use the term תור Zeit, “Mount of Oil.”

The mountain ridge which lies E. of Jerus leaves the central range near the valley of *Shā'phat* and runs for about 2 miles due S. After 2. Situation culminating in the mountain mass on

and Extent

which lies the “Church of the Ascension,” it may be considered as giving off two branches: one lower one, which runs S.W., forming the southern side of the Kidron valley, terminating at the Rd of S. S. and another, higher one, which slopes eastward and terminates a little beyond el-Ma'zīleh (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 נארי and *Karāl*, which has been entirely denuded over the Jerus site (see Jerusalem, II, 1). The flints were the cause of a large settlement of paleolithic man which occurred in prehistoric times on the northern end of the ridge, while the soft chalky stone breaks and forms a soil favorable 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 strong olive less, since the quiver less, and the ripening 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 (Kanád) 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 next, 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 S.W. of the ridge, and this main 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 es Salyûd*, 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 imartistic, tower erected by the Russians. The two subsidiary spurs referred to are: (1) a somewhat indistinct ridge running S.E., upon which lies the squall village of el-'Azareyeh—Bethany; (2) a small spur running S., covered with grass, which is known as “the Prophets,” on account of a remarkable 4th-cent. 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 Batn el Hawa, “the belly of the wind,” or traditionally as “the Mount of Offence” (cf J 11 7; 2 K 23 13), is usually included in the Mount, 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 Silwan (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 16 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, where he was wont to worship God, (m), behold, Hushai the Archite came to meet him with his coat rent, and earth upon his head (ver 32).

And when David was a little past 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 this Mount, 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 Rândh. See BARURIM.

(2) Ezekiel in a vision (11 22) saw the glory of Jeh 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 *eḥkīnāh* I 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 Jeh in that day stand upon the Mount of Olives, and the Mount of Olives shall be lifted up from 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—e.g., 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 Sem 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 11:32). 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; 2 Sam 11:19, 20; Neh 11:32; but esp. Isa 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 el Raseebi. 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] Jerusalem, and for Moloch the abomination of the children of Ammon," and the further account that the "high places that were before [E. of] Jerusalem, which were on the right hand [S.] of the mount of corruption [in "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 [Josiah] defile" (2 K 23:13).

That these high places were somewhere upon what is generally regarded as Mount Olives, seems clear, and the most probable site is the main mass where today the Christian sanctuaries, though Graets and Dean Stanley favor the summit known as Viri Galilaei. 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 Offensionis, given to the southeastern extension, S. of the city, is merely an ecclesiastical tradition going back to Aqureminius in the 17th cent., which is regarded by Burchard (q.v.) (17 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 Jerusalem destroyed all the timber and thorns there as 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 Galilean, must gladly have taken Himself from the noise and closeness of the overcrowded city. It is to the Passion Week, with the exception of Jn 8:1, that all the incidents belong which are not mentioned as 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 Judea 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 the Passover, that is, on the house of Simon (Mt 26:6-12; Mk 14:3-9; Jn 12:1-9). The Mount of Olives is expressly mentioned in many of the events of the Passion Week. He approached Jerusalem, "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 wept over Jerusalem (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 withered fig tree (Lk 19:11-12; Mt 21:19; Mk 11:12-14); 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 22:40-52)—He took leave of His disciples (Acts 1:12).

The view of Jesus 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 a view from Olivet and departed glory compared with that over which Jesus wept. 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 the Kidron valley by a high and massive wall, from 60 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 hawkers 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 walled area, magnificent with their 9 gates rising from a narrow terrace at a slight elevation above the platform and the terrace encoun-
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passed by a fence within which none but Israelites may pass, which rises a house like a lion broad in front and narrow behind; . . . From the open porch of this house stone steps descend to a great perpetually smoking and sacrificial altar. . . . Off the N.W. of the Outer Sanctuary a crest (the Augsburg) dominates the valley with lofty towers. Beyond . . . the Upper City rises in curved tiers like a theater, while all the lower slopes to the S. At a distance a few houses, girt by the central wall of the city. Against that crowded background the sanctuary with its high gable gleams white and fresh. But the front of the house, glittering with gold plates, is obscured by a column of smoke rising from the altar and the Feast of Pentecost. This altar is commemorated by the slatters and sacrifices—a splash of red, as our imagination takes it, in the center of the prevailing white. There are bursts of music; singing of psalms, the clash of cymbals and a great blare of trumpets, at which the people in their court in the Inner Sanctuary fall down and worship" (extracts from G. A. Smith's Jerusalem, 11, 518-20).

To the Bible student the NT is the best guide to Olivet; tradition and "sites" only bewilders him. Once the main hilltop was a mass of 7. Churches churches. There was the "Church of and Ecclesiastical the Ascension" to mark the spot whereby tradition (contrary to the Traditions direct statement of Luke) states that the Ascension occurred. Now the site is marked by a small octagonal chapel, built in 1834, which is in the hands of the Moslems. There a "footprint of Christ" is shown in the rock. A large basilica of Helena was built over the place where it was said that Christ taught His disciples. In 1869 the Princess de Latour d'Auvergne, learning that there was a Moslem tradition that this site was at a spot called el Battiiniah south of the summit, here erected a beautiful church known as the Church of the Dormition. And around the courtyard she had the Lord's Prayer inscribed in 32 languages. When the church was in course of erection certain fragments of old walls and mosaics were found, but, in 1911, as a result of a careful excavation of the site, the foundations of a more extensive mass of old buildings, with some beautiful mosaic in the baptism, were revealed in the neighborhood; there is little doubt but that these foundations belonged to the actual Basilica of Helena. It is proposed to rebuild the church.

Mention has been made of the name Viri Galilaei or Galilei as given to the northern summit of the main mass of Olivet. The name "Mount Galilei" appears to have been first given to this hill early in the Christian era. But a third century AD Epiphanius in his work explains the name by the statement that here was a khan where the Galileans lodged who came up to Jerus. In 1620 Quaresmius applies the names "Galilei" and Viri Galilaei to this site and the latter name may be due to its having been the spot where the two angels appeared and addressed the disciples as "Ye men of Galilea" (Acts 1 11). Attempts have been made, without much success, to maintain that this "Galilea" was the original form of the Lord's name of Jacob, for instance to indicate to His disciples as the place of meeting.

The Russian enclosure includes a chapel, a lofty tower—from which a magnificent view is obtainable—a hospice and a pleasant pine grove. Between the Russian buildings to the N. and the Church of the Ascension lies the sqal' village of et Tūr, inhabited by a peculiarly turbulent and rapacious crowd of Moslems, who prey upon the passing pilgrims and do much to spoil the sentiment of a visit to this sacred spot. It is possible it may have had its origin under the name of BETHPHAHAGA.


E. W. G. MASTERMAN

OLIVET, o'levet. See Olives, Mount of.

OLYMPAS, o'lim-pas ('Olympás, Olimpás): The name of a Rom Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16 15). Olympas is an abbreviated form of Olympadouros. 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.

OLYPIUS, o-lipi-us ('Oλυπίου, Olimpios): An epithet of Jupiter or Zeus (q.v.) from Mt. Olympus in Thessaly, where the gods held court presided over by Zeus. Antiochus Epiphanes, "who on God's altars danced," insulted the Jewish religion by dedicating the temple of Jerus to Jupiter Olympius, 108 BC (2 Macc 6 2; 1 Macc 1 54 ff).

OMARUS, o'ma-er-us: AV = RV "Ismaurus" (1 Esd 9 34).

OMAR, o'mar (أَمَارُ, o'mar, connected perhaps with 'umar, "speak"); LXX Ἰσμα'ουλ, Omen, or ὸμῆρος, Omito): Grandson of Esau and son of Eliphaz in Gen 36 11; Jer 1 56; given the title "duke" or "chief" in Gen 36 15.

OMEGA, o'me-ga, o-me'ga, o-me'ga. See ALPHA and OMEGA.

OMENS, o'menz. See AUGURY; DIVINATION.

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

OMNIPOTENCE, om-nip'6-tens: The noun "omnipotence" is not found in the Eng. Bible, nor any noun exactly corresponding to it 1. Terms and Usage The adj. "omnipotent" occurs in Rev 19 6 AV; the Gr for this, παντοτέπτης, παντοκράτωρ, occurs also in 2 Cor 13 18; Rev 1 8; 4 8; 11 17; 15 3; 16 14; 19 13; 21 22 (in all of which AV and RV render "omnipotence"). It is also found frequently in LXX, esp. in the rendering of the Divine names θεόπαθείας and θεόπαθεία, "power", the element of "authority," "sovereignty," "side by side with that of power," makes itself more distinctly felt than it does to the modern meaning of "omnipotence" though it is means to be included in the latter also. Cf further ὁ δύναμεν, ho dunameon, in Lk 1 49.

The formal concept of omnipotence as worked out in theology does not occur in the OT. The substance of the idea is conveyed in 2. Inherent various indirect ways. The notion of strength is inherent in the OT conception 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 pliform, by bringing out the fulness of God's power, 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 Shadday, of Gen 7 1; 28 14; 31 11; 46 4; 48 24; Gen 3 24. Ex 3 3. This name, however, designates the Divine power as standing in the service of His covenant-related to the patriarchs, as transcending Nature and overpowering it in the interests of redemption.

Another Divine name which signifies this attribute is Jehovah, Jehovah. This name, characteristic
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 and intimately to be world

Both in Nature and history, in creation and in redemption, it produces and controls 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 insignificant cause and effect it extends and masters all details of reality (Mt 10:30; Lk 12:7). There is no accident (1 S 6:9; cf with ver 12; Prov 16:33). It need not operate through second causes; it itself unifies all second causes and makes them what they are.

It is creative power producing its effect through a mere word (Gen 1:3 ff; 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 9:6; 17:13; 18:20; 26:14–20). The power of the Messiah is the outgrowth of the triumph of the cause of Jeh (Job 9:5 ff; 9:5 ff; cts 38 and 39; Isa 10:12 ff; 49:6, 7, 8). The power of Messiah is the outgrowth of the triumph of the cause of Jeh (Job 9:5 ff; 9:5 ff; cts 38 and 39; Isa 10:12 ff; 49:6, 7, 8). The power of Messiah is the outgrowth of the triumph of the cause of Jeh (Job 9:5 ff; 9:5 ff; cts 38 and 39; Isa 10:12 ff; 49:6, 7, 8).

The same is true of the processes of history. God sovereignly disposposes, 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 1–3 3; 9:7; Isa 10:5, 15; 28:2; 45:1; Jer 26:9; 27:6; 43:10). The prophet ascribes 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 ignored in the estimate put upon His might (Isa 31:3).

Even more 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 Jeh in the wonders of the exodus. It is God's exclusive prerogative to do wonders (Job 5:9; 9:7; Ps 72:18). All things can be "a new thing" (Nu 16:30; Isa 43:19; Jer 31:22). In the NT the great embodiment of this redemptive omnipotence is the resurrection of believers (Mt 28:29; Mk 16:16) and specifically the resurrection of Christ (Rom 4:14, 25:21:24; 15:20, 3; Is 1:19 ff); but it is evident in the whole process of redemption (Mt 19:26; Mk 10:27; Rom 8:31; Eph 3:7, 20; 1 Pet 5:1; Rev 11:17).

The significance of the idea may be traced along 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 state of consciousness which Scripture calls "the fear of Jeh." Omnipotence in God is that to which human faith addresses itself. In it lies the ground for assurance that He is able to save, as in His love that He is willing to save (Ps 65:5, 6; 73:18; 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 prominence 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
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 keeps nothing from us, that His loving condescension toward the creature in perfect equilibrium and makes them mutually fructified 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, 115, 159 ff.; Richter, Theologie des NT, Dietrich, Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie, 244; Davidson, OT Theology, 24; Kees, Die Aste der alttestamentlichen Religion, 127, 135 ff., 391, 475.

GUERRARDUS V OS

OMNIPRESENCE, om-ni-pres’ens: 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. On the other hand, the necessary attribute is but the correlate of the monotheistic conception of God as the Infinite Creator, Preserver and Governor of the universe, immanent in His works as well as transcendent above them.

The philosophical idea of omnipresence is that of exemption from the limitations of space, subjectively as well as objectively; subjectively, in so far as space, which is a necessary form of all created consciousness, is not externally related to His omnipotence and omniscience: that He is everywhere present. Hence the actuality of space-relations in the created world imposes no limit upon the presence and operation of God. This metaphysical conception of transcendence above all space is, of course, foreign to the Bible, which in regard to this, as in regard to the other transcendent attributes, clothes the truth of revelation in the popular language of omnipotence: hence the exemption from the limitations of space in terms and figures derived from space itself. Thus the very term “omnipresence” in its two component parts “everywhere” and “present” contains a double inadequacy of expression, both the notion of “everywhere” and that of “presence” being special concepts. Another point, in regard to which the popular nature of the Scriptural teaching on this subject must be kept in mind, concerns the mode of the Divine omnipresence. In creating the concept philosophically, it is of importance to distinguish between its application to the essence, to the activity, and to the knowledge of God. The Bible does not draw these distinctions in the abstract. Although sometimes it speaks of God’s omnipresence with reference to the pervasive immannece of His being, it frequently contents itself with affirming the universal extent of God’s power and knowledge (Dt 4:39; 10:14; Ps 139:6–16; Prov 15:3; Jer 23:24, 27, Am 9:2).

This observation has given rise to the theories of a mere omnipresence of power or omnipresence by an act of will, as distinct from an omnipresence of presence, on the ground that in this antithetical form such a distinction is foreign to the intent of the biblical statement in question. The writers in these passages content themselves with describing the practical effects of the divine omnipresence, without reflecting upon the difference between this and its ontological aspect: the latter is neither affirmed nor denied. That no denial of the omnipresence of being is intended may be seen from Jer 23:24, where in the latter half of the verse 23 is expressed in terms of omnipresence, while in the latter half the idea finds ontological expression. Similarly, in Ps 139:7 the sense of the verse is the same. As here, so in other passages the presence of God with His being in the space is explained and confirmed (1 K 2:27; 2 Ch 6:6; Isa 66:1; Acts 17:28).

Omnipresence being the correlate of monothelism, the presence of this God in the earlier OT is denied by all those who assign the development of monothelism in the OT religion to a later stage than that of eidos monotheism. It is undoubtedly true that the last of the scribes and religious leaders excluded God’s relation to space: they describe Him as coming and going in this world as a human person. But it does not follow from this that the OT does not receive of God’s being as circumscribed by space. Where such forms of statement occur, not the presence of God in general, but His visible presence in theophany is referred to. If from the local element enters into the description of God, to the limitations of space referred, then one might with equal warrant, on the basis of the physical, sensual elements entering into the representation, impute to the writers the view that the Divine nature is corporeal.

The theophanic form of appearance does not disclose what God is ontologically in Himself, but merely how He chooses to appear as a way of bringing the redemption of His people. It establishes a redemptive and revelatory presence in definite localities, while concomitantly the mind of the writer, detract from the divine omnipresence, which is now confined to one place; the altars built in recognition of it are in patriarchal history erected in several places and considered as each and all offering access to the special presence of God. This is not the case. During the period already during the patriarchal time these theophanies and the altars connected with them are confined to the holy land. This shows that the idea embodied in them has nothing to do with a crude conception of the Deity as a deity remotely circumscribed, but marks the gradual restoration of the gracious presence of God to fallen humanity, the completion of which forms the goal of the whole prophetic and redemptive history. It must be observed that the tabernacle, on Mt. Zion (Nu 10:35; 2:8; 6:4; 2 K 2:15; Ps 3:4; 99:1); in the temple (1 K 8:4). Ps 26:8; 46:5; 46:2; Isa 8:18; Joel 3:16; Am 1:21; in the Holy Land (1 S 26:19; Hos 9:3); in Christ (Jn 1:14; 17:24); in the church (Eph 1:22). Rev 6:11. 1 Cor 3:16; 3:16. Eph 2:21. 21, 11:1. 2 Tim 3:15; He 10:21. 1 Pet 5:2); 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 not a manifestation of an ontological presence, but as a presence of specific redemptive manifestation (1 K 8:16–21; 2 Ch 6:22–46; 6:12). Ps 106:37. There is little to show that such a 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 earthly sanctuary, are merely parallel accounts of 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. Thes. der AT, I, 103, 114). There are, however, a number of passages in the Pentateuch, bearing witness to the early existence of this belief (Gen 11:1–9; 19:24; 21:17; 28:11; 28:12). Jeh comes, according to the account of the period of the law, before the Tabernacle of the earlier period, with the clouds (Ex 14:19; 20:18–19; 23:14–15; Nu 11:23; 12:5). That even in the opinion of the people Jehu’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. It was nothing more than a circumscribed presence as between sanctuary and sanctuary, it necessary to be thought of as between earth and heaven (of Gunkel, Ges. 157).

Both from a generally religious and from a specifically soteriological point of view the omnipresence of God is of great practical importance.

4. Denial of the Idea in the Earlier

5. The Special

6. Religious

Significance

SIGNIFICANCE

This concept of a God incomprehensible and unapproachable bears the guaranty that the actual nearness of God in 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'ens: 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 הָבוֹלָה (hôbôlôâh), את־הדוֹאָמ (ât-hôâôm), צֶבָּה (tsôbah, Job 9:39; also "seeing" and "hearing," "the eye" and "the ear" occur as figures of knowledge of God, as "arm," "hand," "finger," serve to express His power. In the NT are found γνῶσις, γνῶστο, γνῶσις, εἰδώλον, εἰδοκέν, with the same connections.

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 cognizance 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 hâbûlôh literature, and in the NT. This is due to the increased internalizing of religion, 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 3 11; Isa 40 26; Acts 1 24; He 4 13; Rev 2 23).

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 spheres 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 the world in its totality. All the 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; 34 21; Ps 14 2; 17 26; 33 13-14; Isa 40 26; Acts 1 24; He 4 13; Rev 2 23). It extends to all the divisions of time, the past, present and future alike (Job 14 17; Ps 86 8; 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

MODE OF OMNIPRESENCe (Acts 23 25 f). It is also closely related to Knowledge God's eternity, for the latter makes Him in His knowledge independent of the limitations of time (Isa 40 8-12). God's creative relation to all that exists is represented as underlying His omniscience (Ps 33 15; 97 9; 139 13; Isa 29 15). His all-comprehensive purpose forms the basis of His knowledge of all events and developments (Acts 1 22-27; Am 3 7).

The omniscience of God, however, does not mean that God's knowledge of things is identical with His creation of them, as has been suggested by Augustine and others. The act of creation, while necessarily connected with 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 this 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. 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's knowledge of all things as being 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 and the purpose of the human heart 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 God's foreknowledge. Isa 40 14-15; Jer 17 10; Am 4 13; Lk 16 15; Acts 1 24; 1 Thess 2 4; Rev 2 23. It extends to all the divisions of time, the past, present and future alike (Job 14 17; Ps 86 8; 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).

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 independence of the acts of man must, therefore, explain 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, independent of God's absolute omniscience. 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. Certainly, however, during a knowledge can be possible in God, when the outcome is psychologically undetermined and undeniable. The knowledge could originate no sooner than the determination originates through the free decision of man. It would, therefore, necessarily become 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 predeterminedness, 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 life 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; Ezek 18 12; 9 9). Esp. along three lines this fundamental religious importance reveals itself: (a) it lends support and comfort when the pious suffer from the misconception 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, theologische theologie der AP; 876; Riehm, alttestamentliche theologie, 293; Dillmann, Handbuch der alttestamentlichen theologie, 349; Davidson, OT theologie, 180 ff.

GEERHARDUS VOS

OMRI, omri ("ômër," omri; LXX 'AĂµpî; Amri; Assyр "Hûmîr" and "Humriya"):

(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 13-15; 2 Sm 8-9; 12, 13-15; 2 Sm 12; and 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 mentioned as an officer in the army of Elah, which was engaged in the siege of the Philistine city 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 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 7 years. It is only with vs 23 and 29, vs 23 and 29 before O. gained full control.

O.'s military ability is seen from his choice of Samaria as the royal residence and capital of the Northern Kingdom. This step may have been suggested to O. by his own easy conquest of Tirzah, the former capital. Accordingly, he purchased the hill Shomeron of Shemera for two talents of silver, about $4,352.00 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 Syrians and Assyrians.

2. The siege was finally taken by Sargon in 722.

Founding: After the siege had lasted for 3 years, 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.

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 90 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 Abah. During the year 1910 the excavations revealed a building covering 11 acres of ground. Four periods of construction were recognized, which, on archaeological grounds, were tentatively assigned to the reigns of O. and Abah. See SAMARIA and articles by David G. Lyon in Harvard Theological Review, IV, 1911; JBL, V, XXX, Part I, 1911; PEFS, 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 I 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 province. Many 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. . . . . O. obtained possession of the land of Medeba 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 Assurnasirpal 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*a*a*b*a*l Hw*m*r, “Jehu son of Omri.” O. entered into an alliance with the Phoenicians by the marriage of his son Ahab 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 1 K 18:25-26, that he “dealt wickedly” 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 Jeh, and therefore the unfavorable light in which he is regarded is justified. 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 Phoen influence along with Baalism of prime importance 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 ( TREM, 'on; EGYPT ʿan, ʿanā, probably pronounced Aa 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; 50:20. It occurs in one other place in Ex XXI (Ex 11:1), 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 ʿayyin in Isa 19:18 (see RV, R.V., or “k ake-keaaas”). On may also be mentioned by Jeremiah (43:13) under the name Beth-shemesh. Ezekiel speaks of an Aven ( ת espresso, ʿaavan) (Exk 30:17), where it is mentioned with Babel (Babastis). Aven in 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-nes (Heracleopolis); the other in Lower Egypt, An-Meheet (Bruges, Geogr. On or Isischr., 254, 255, nos. 1217, a, b, 1218, and De- scription referred to in the Bible. It lay about 20 miles N. of the site of Old Memphis, about 10 miles E. 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 retrograded to the eastward, the result of the raising of the level 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 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 pre-historic time. From the IIIId to the Vth Dynasty the seat of government was shifted from On to Memphis, and in the XIlth Dynasty to Diospolis. 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 antedated them by considerable time (Budge, Hist. of Egypt, II, 53, 54, 105; 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 contains 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 XIlth Dynasty removed the capital to Diospolis, Useretao I (Scenwret) 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 XIlth 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-Yahudiyyeh, 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 subserviency 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 Amn," 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 Asurbanipal. The city has been claimed 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 Helopolis.

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 (TN, 'bn; As, Atn): A Reubenite, son of Peleth, who took part with Dathan and Abiram in their revolt against Moses (Nu 16 1).

ONAM, 0'nam (CN, 'dnm, "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 (CN, 'dnm, "vigorous"); cf ONAM: A "son" of Judah (Gen 36 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 452, 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, wum. See NUMBER.

ONESIMUS, 6-nes-im-ob (O'nis'mos, Onisimos, lit. "profitable," "helpful" [Col 4 9; Philem ver 10]): Onesimus was a slave (Philem 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 curia, and died.

What brought him into contact with Paul we do not know. It may have been hunger; it may have been the pang of conscience. He could not forget that his master had been the house 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. "Come and take place in the bond, Philem 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 his charge to the Ephesians on other matters, and he intrusted the Ep. to the Col to the joint care of Philemon.

2. Paul's letter to Philemon is addressed to "Theare to the brethren in Colossae, as a "faithful and beloved brother, and to who is one of you," and he goes on to say that Tychicus and O. will make known to them all things that have happened to Paul in Rome. Such a commutation 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 him. 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" (Philem 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" (Lichtfuss, Commentary on Col, 335).

(1) Onesimus profitable.—The apostle accordingly begets 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 belie 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 him he says that if he has defrauded Philemon in anything, he becomes 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 at 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, ôn-i-sif'ór-us (Ὅνησιφόρος, Onēsiphōros, lit. “profit bringer” [2 Tim 1:16; 4:19]). 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 Paul in Rome gratefully remembered these facts. But Paul himself, when arriving at Rome, and learned that Paul was in prison, “very diligently” sought the apostle. To do this, though it was only his duty, involved much personal danger at that particular time. For the persecution, instigated 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 ministry. If 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 oftimes.

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. The Lord in that day, “To me,” 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 of O.” (RV “house”[s]) 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

ONIAES, ôn-i-as (Onias, Onias): 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, 3). Only two names of the Onias 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 Macc 12:7-20, a contemporary of Areus (Arius), king of Sparta, who reigned 300-265 BC (Diod. xx.29). This Onias was the recipient of a friendly letter from Areus of Sparta (1 Macc 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 Macc 12:20 ff) (see Schürer, Hist 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 Macc 1:1; 4:7). O. was the father of Onias IV. Onias III was prominent 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 (Gr ἀειδέα). 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 “unvoluntary 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 appallition,” a horse with a terrible rider accompanied by two strong men, and 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 Macc 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 Daphne and there cruelly slew him—an act which caused indignation among both the Jews and the Greeks (2 Macc 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 Macc given
ONIONS, υπάκοα (πράκα, βγάλλειν, κρόμφονον, κρόμμιον), 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 in Arabic as būqāl and is cultivated all over Syria and Egypt; it appears to be as much a favorite in the Orient today as ever.

ONLY BEGOTTEN, בַּלִּי בָּגַּטְתָ‏ּ (μονογενὴς, μονογενός). Although the Eng. words are found only 6 t in the NT, the Gr word appears 9 t, 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); "mine 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; 1 Js 4 9). In these passages, too, it might be tā 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; whereas the term begotten describes the relation of the Risen Christ in His glorified humanity to man" (Westcott on He 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, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (Jn 1 18). Men therefore behold His glory, "glory as 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 unbroken communion 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 can be defined only in terms of His nature. The term begotten, or begotten 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.

ONYX, oun's. See ONSO.

ONYCHA, on'-ka (πράκα, σκηνθῆ; cf Arab. ًل، subhāt, "filings," "husks"). "Onycha" is a transliteration of the LXX ὄνυχα, ὄνυχα, acc. of ὄνυξ, o'niks, 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 sh'keleth occurs only in Ex 30 34 as an ingredient of the sacred incense. It is supposed to denote the horny operculum found in certain species of marine gastropods, the operculum. 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 blocks the exit of the shell. A substance of which may be horny or stony, is absent in some species. The horny 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 Tribes of Abyssinia, cited by E.B., s.v. "Onycha.")

ONYX, oun'sks, oun'sks. See STONES, Precious.

OPEN, oun'p'n: In the OT represents chiefly פֶּה, pē, "mouth," but also other words, as פַּתָּח, pātāh, "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 it is used with the usual meaning, e.g., (opening of mouth, eyes, heavens, doors, etc). A peculiar word, παραφίνω, παραθυρωται (lit. to have the neck bent, to be laid bare), is used for "laid open" before God in H 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 בַּפַּתָּח, bāphath, 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 threshold-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," the latter "in all colored garments." Consequently various attempts have been made to emend the text, of which the simplest is the omission of בַּפַּתָּח, "in an open place." If, however, the text is right—as is not improbable—the opening-door floor close to the gate. See the commentaries.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

OPERATION, op-ér-a'shun (ποίημα, ma'āshē, "work"); ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργεια, "energy"). Twice used in the OT of God's creative work (Ps 28 4 5; Isa 5 12). The Holy Spirit's "working" and power are manifest in the bestowal 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).

OPEHLE, oun'fel (ποίημα, ha'-ophel [2 Ch 27 3; 33 14; Neh 3 26; 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 the Heb word, with the references given above with the art. 1. Meaning of Name. Opehle has simply "Ophel"; but Ophel is in m "the tower"; in Isa 32 14, "the hill" with m "Ophel," but AV "the fortress" in Mic 4 8; also in the "towers"; Mic 4 8; also in the "Heb" Opel, "but AV "the stronghold"; 2 K 5 24, "the hill,"
Three places are known to have received this name: (1) A certain place on the east hill of Jerus, S. of the temple; to this all the passages quoted above except one—ref. (2) The "Ophel," tr. "hill," situated apparently in Samaria (cf. 2 K 5 3), where Gehazi took his ill-gotten presents from the hands of the servants of Naaman the Syrian. The tr. "tower" would suit the sense at least as well. It was some point probably in the wall of Samaria, perhaps the citadel itself. (3) The third reference is not Bib., but on the M. S., an inscription ofMesh, king of Moab, contemporary with Omri. He says: "I built KIRIH [Karalah], the wall of y'arim, and the wall of 'Ophel and I built its gates and I built its towers." In comparing the references to (1) and (3), it is evident that if Ophel means a "hill," it certainly was a fortified hill, and it seems highly probable that it may have some official, in addition to its fortifications, e.g. a bulging or rounded keep or encine." (Burney, loc. cit.). Isa 32 14 reads, "The palace shall be forsaken; the populous city shall be desolated; the hill [Ophel] and the watch-tower shall be for duns for ever." Here we have palace, city, and watch-tower, all the handiwork of the builder. Does it not seem probable that the Ophel belongs to the same category?

The situation of the Ophel of Jerusalem is very definitely described. It was clearly, the reference shows that it was 3 26 7 3; 33 14), on the east hill S. of the temple. The Ophel of Jos states (BJ, V, iv, 2) that the Jerusalem eastern wall of the city ran from Siloam "and reaches as far as a certain place which they called Ophlas when it was joined to the eastern cloister of the temple." In BJ, V, vi, 1, it states that "John held the temple and the parts thereto adjoining, for a great way, as also Ophla," and the Valley called the "Valley of the Ophel," which are here identically with the "A dua" and "Lower City," which was called by Simon. There is not the slightest ground for applying the name Ophel, as has been so commonly done, to the whole southeastern hill. In the days of Josiah it was cut from the hill the temple walls, but the OT references suit a locality nearer the middle of the southeastern hill. In the art. Zion (q.v.) it is pointed out that that name does not occur (except in reference to the Jebusite city in the works of the Chronicler, but that the Ophel," which occurs almost alone in these works, is apparently used for it. Mic 4 8 m seems to confirm this view: "O tower of the flock, the Ophel of the daughter of Zion." Here the "tower of the flock" may well refer to the shepherd David's stronghold, and the second name appears to be a synonym for the same place.

Ophel then was probably the fortified site which in earlier days had been known as "Zion" or "the City of David." King Joatham "built much" "on the wall of Ophel" (2 Ch 27 3). King Manasseh fortified the city of David, on the west side of Gihon, in the valley, even to the entrance at the fish gate; and he compassed Ophel about with it, and raised it up to a very great height!" (2 Ch 33 14). It was clearly a fortified place of great importance, and its situation must have been so near that of the ancient "Zion," that scarcely any other theory is possible except that it occupied the site of that ancient fortress.

E. W. G. Masterman

Ophir, OPHIR, OPHIR (Gen 10 10, 11, 22; [Gen 10 10, 11] [Gen 10 29], 22). The name in order of the sons of Joktan (Gen 10 29 = Ch 1. Scrip. 1 23). There is a clear reference also to the tribe Ophir (Gen 10 30). Ophir is the name of a land or city somewhere to the S. or S.E. of Pal for which Solomon's ships were charged to get out from Ezion-geber at the head of the Gulf of Aka-bah, 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 2 K 10 28 we are told that 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 advanced, namely (1) India and the Indus, (2) Africa, (3) Arabia.


(1) India and the Far East.—All the wares mentioned are more or less appropriate to India, even including the fuller list of 1 K 10 22. "Almug"-wood is conjectured to be the Indian sandal-wood. Another argument is based on the resemblance between the LXX form of the word (Sopherd) and the Coptic name for India (Sophir). A closer identification is sought with Abhir, a people dwelling at the mouths of the Indus. Supara, an ancient city on the west coast of India near the modern Goa, is also suggested. Again, according to Wildman, the name denotes a vague extension eastward, perhaps as far as China. (2) Africa, day the greatest gold-producing region of the three. Sofala, a seaport near Mozambique on the east coast of Africa, has been advanced as the site of Ophir, both on linguistic grounds and from the nature of its products, for there are signs that the sea is divided. If 10 22 could be procured. But Gesenius shows that Sofala is merely the Arab. form of the Heb saphkâlath. Interest in this region as the land of Ophir was renewed, however, by Mauch's discovery at Zimbabve of great ruins and signs of old Phoen civilization and worked-out gold mines. According to Bruce (I, 440), a voyage from Sofala to Ezion-geber would have occupied quite three years owing to the monsoons.

(3) Arabia.—The claim of Southeastern Arabia as the land of Ophir has on the whole more to support it than that of India or of Africa. The Ophir of Gen 10 29 beyond doubt belonged to this region, and the search for Ophir in more distant lands can be made only on the precarious assumption that the Ophir of K is not the same as the Ophir of Gen 10. Of the Arabian products mentioned, the only one which from the OT notices can be regarded as clearly native to Ophir is the gold, and according to Pbny and Strabo the region of Southeastern Arabia bordering on the Persian Gulf was a famous gold-producing country. The other wares were not necessarily produced in Ophir, but were prob-
ably brought them 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 asssumable view that Ophir was on the Persian Gulf in South eastern Arabia and served in old time as an emporium of trade between the East and West.

A. S. FULTON

OPHNI, of n (יִפּוֹן, hā-ophni; 'Aphni, Aphon): A place in the territory of Benjamin (Josh 18 23). It is mentioned again in 1 S 13 17. The Philistines came thence to ambush Saul without murdering bands, another eastward, down “the valley of Zeboim toward the wilderness”; the third “turned upon the way that leadeth to Ophrah, unto the land of Shual.” The three must have advanced northward, as Saul commanded the passage to the S. Onam places it 5 Rom miles E. of Bethel. A site which comes near to fulfilling these conditions is et-Taybeh, which stands on a conical hill some 5 miles N. E. of Betha. This is possibly identical with “Ephron” (2 Ch 13 19), and “Ephraim” (Jn 11 54).

(2) 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 Abiezerite, the father of Gideon. It was apparently not far from the plain of Esdraelon (vs 33 f), so that Gideon and his kinsmen snared under the near presence of the opposing 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 Jeth, and made thorough cleansing of the instruments of idolatry. After his great victory, he set up here the golden moon 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 escapeing 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 not it.

To cite 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 Ophrah, “and the one that suggests itself as most probably identical is Ophrah of the Abiezerite.” But this seems too far to the S.

(3) A man of the tribe of Judah, son of Me onothai (1 Ch 4 14).

W. EWING

OPINION, of pîn’em (יִפּוֹן, dēs, יִפּוֹן, g’ippim): “Opinion” occurs only 5 x, thrice in Job (32 6 10, 17 as the tr of dēs), “knowledge,” “opinion” (in the address of Elihu), and once of g’ippim, from g’daph, “to divide or branch out,” hence division or party, unsettled opinion (in the memorable appeal of Elijah, “How long halt ye between two opinions?”)

1 K 18 21, ARV “How long go ye leaping between the two sides?”). In Ecclus 3 24, we have, “For many are deceived by their own vain opinion” (παραγωγή, “a taking up,” “a hasty judgment”), RV “The conceit of many hath led them astray.”

W. L. WALKER

OPWAYSMUM, op-o-bal’sam-mum: RV in Ex 30 34. See STAGE.

OPPRESSION, o-presh’ən: Used in RV to translate a variety of Heb words, all of which, however, agree in the general sense of wrong done by violence or by law and custom. In some cases it is tantamount to the oppression of Israel by foreigners, as by their Egyptian 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 מְקוֹם, lāḥaq. 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 lāḥaq, various forms of the מְקוֹם, ʾashak, and other words are used by the writers of the LXX to express their 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; 42 2; 43 2; 124 21; 83 3; 119 34); the preacher observes and reflects upon its prevalence (Eccl 4 1; 5 8; 7 7 AV); the prophets Amos (3 9), Isaiah (6 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 6, “oppress” is the rendering of καταδυνάμεω, καταδύναμον, “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 brooketh in his southe” (Piers Plowman [B], VII, 93; cf Merchant of Venice, III ii, 65). It is also used with “or” before (Ps 99; 118 19 AV, etc) and ARV substitutes in Eccl 16 2 (cf vs 12); Cant 6 12; Dan 6 24.

ORACLE, or’ak’l: (1) A Divine utterance delivered to man, usually in answer to a request for guidance. So in 2 S 16 23 for יְבִאֳר, dāḥar (“word,” as in RVm). The use in this passage seems to indicate that at a period early oracular utterances were sought from Jeh 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 13 18 19 36 42, etc, belong rather to divination [q.v.]). In RVm of such passages as Isa 13 1, “oracle” is used in the titles of certain special prophetic sources as a substitute for BUKEN (q.v.) (יִפּוֹן, moad), with considerable advantage (esp. in Lam 2 17 18); in later Jewish 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 יִפּוֹן, dāḥar, “hinder part,” with יִפּוֹן, “speech”), 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).
(3) In the NT EV employs “oracle” as the tr of ἀπόστισις, ἀπώσις, “saying,” in four places. In all, Divine utterances more properly defined in Acts 7 38 as the Mosaic Law (“living oracles” as “commandments enforced by the living God”), in Rom 3 2 as the OT in general, and in He 5 12 as the revelations of Christianity (6 2 3). In 1 Pet 4 11 the meaning is debated, but probably the command is addressed to those favored by a supernatural “gift of speech.” Such men must keep their own personality in the background, adding nothing of their own to the inspired message as it comes to them.

Burton Scott Easton

ORACLES, SIBYLINE, sib’i-lin, -lin. See Apoc-alyptic Literature, V.

ORATOR, or’a-tér, ORATION, or’a-shun: The word “orator” occurs twice: (1) An AV rendering of הַלָּחָשׁ, lahash; only Isa 3 3, “the eloquent orator,” AVs “skilful of speech,” where RV rightly substitutes “the skilful enchanter.” The word lahash is probably a mimetic word meaning “a hiss,” “a whisper,” and is used in the sense of “incantation,” “charm.” (2) Heb לְדַנֵּגֹרֶה (לְדַנֵּגֹרֶה), “to speak in an assembly” (from dām, “people,” agoreuō, “to harangue”), is often found in classical Gr, generally in a bad sense (Lat concinari); here only in the NT.

D. Miall Edwards

ORTHED, or’ch-ərd: (1) ὀρθήδοξος, orĒ-thë-dôks, from Old Pers, “a walled-in enclosure”; ἀπαθέας, parasiteis, a word in classical Gr applied to the garden of Babylon (Diodorus Siculus xi.10) and to a game, “park”; Cant 4 13. (2) as an AV. (3) See Neh 3 5, “forbes,” “park”, Cant 4 13, “orchard,” and in “paradise” (of pomegranates); Ecc 2 5, “parks,” AV “orchards;” see Paradise. (2) κιθέρος, κιθέα, “garden” or “orchard”: AV “a white thorn in an orchard” (Bar 6 71).

ORDAIN, or’dàn, ORDINATION, or’di-na’shun (Lat ordinarium, “to set in order,” “to arrange); in post-Augustan Lat “to appoint to office;” from ordī, gen. ordinēs, “order,” “arrangement.” In Av the VT “to ordain” renders as many as 35 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 tense 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 “set apart for holiness” (RV “appoint?”); Ps 7 13 (RV “makest?”); 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 of M K 12 22, “should have been ordained in the month” (ver 33); Nu 28 6; Ps 8 3 23; Isa 26 12; 2 Esd 6 49 AV (RV “preserve”)); Sir 77 15; Gal 3 19. (3) To decree, give orders, prescribe: “And doth the power that man adores Ora(h)in their don’t?”—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; Tob 1 6; 8 7 (RV “compassions”); 1 Mac 4 50; 7 49; Acts 16 4; Rom 7 10 AV; 1 Cor 2 7; 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). Frequent 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; Dnt 2 24; 1 Esd 8 49; 1 Mac 3 55; 10 20; 15 16; 14 25; 1 Tim 2 7; Tit 1 8; Heb 1 1 3 83; RV substitutes “bestow” (Web 9 2, “recorded” in Sir 48 10, “become” in Acts 1 22, “written of” (in “set forth”) in Jude ver 4, but retains “ordain” in the sense of “appoint,” “set apart,” “ordain” (e.g. K 3 25 5; 1 Ch 27 22; 2 Esd 6 23; Ad Est 13 6; Sir 10 42; 3 13 87 17 31; Rom 13 1. (5) To appoint ceremonially to the ministerial 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 sacerdotal rank (ordō), 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, but the brethren were already “ordained,” “Their act is described as one and not repeated. The gift was once for all, not to individuals but to the abiding body” (Westcott, ad loc.). In the Apostolic age there is no trace of the doctrine of an outward rite conferring inward grace, though the instances 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 6 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 1 1). (3) Barnabas and Paul are said to have “ordained,” RV “appointed” (χωροθαινεῖν, cheirotoniaste, “elect,” “appoint,” without indicating the particular act of ordination), elders, “priests in every city with prayers and fasting (Acts 14 23). So Titus was instructed by Paul to “appoint elders in every
city" in Crete (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 the hands of the presbytery (1 Tim 4:14), (b) by the laying on of hands of Paul (2 Cor 13:12). 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 Heb 6:2 is not exclusively to ordination, but to all occasions of laying on of hands (see Hand, Imposition 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 the historical and theological doctrine of such see E. Dean, Hatch's valuable art. on "Ordination" in The Dict. Christian Antig.).

D. Miall Edwards

**ORDER, or **7777, "arakh, "to arrange"; τάξις, τάξιν (>diatassōn, táxis, táymal): "Order," in LXX, 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 text which sense is next alone in 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 1:7; 1 K 5:17) in 18:33; cf Heb Gen 22:9; Isa 30:33): Rows of laying out flax-stalks for drying (Josh 2:6); of preparing offerings (Lev 1:8:12; cf. 6:5); Jgs 6:26) of arranging lamps (Ex 27:21; 39:37; Lev 24:3:4); of Ps 19:17); of placing the shewbread on the table (Ex 24:43); Lev 6:12; 24:8; 2 Ch 13:11); of drawing up the battle array (1 Ch 12:38 [Heb 39, 'adhar]); and of arranging weapons in order for battle (Jer 46:3; ARV "prepare"). As "ord," "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 24:3, ARV "set in order"); Jth 2:16; Wisd 8:1; 15:1; Ecclus 2:6). The Heb pa'am (lit. "hoof-beat, occurrence," repetition") in the plural conveys the idea of an architectural plan (Ezek 41:6). Another word, shālahh, lit. "to join," in connection with the tabernacle, has in some VSS been trasper 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; Wisd 7:29; 1 Macc 6:40; Col 2:5). Akin to the idea of arranging things in a row is that of arranging words (Jb 33:5; 37:19; Ps 5:3), of recounting things in order (Isa 44:7; Lk 1:1 AV [diatassōn]; Lk 1:21; cf. Lev 26:1; Ps 50:21). From the idea of ranging in order for the purpose of comparison the Heb "arakh acquires the meaning "to compare" (Isa 40:18; Ps 89:7). This is clearly the meaning of " tipos Akhrakh (Ps 5:5[Heb 6:1)], where "they cannot be set in order unto the"

must be interpreted to mean "There is nothing that can be compared unto thee."

As the fundamental meaning of "arakh is arrangement in space, that of "sohar is order or sequence in time. (The LXX σύντονος, phýlogos) suggests, in the place of "sōhārām, a word for "light," possibly σωκραγισμόν. In the NT we find "order" used of time in connection with the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:23 [tōgnws]; and of a succession of places visited (Acts 18:23 [katēkēs]. The phrase "in order unto" (Ps 119:35) expresses causal sequence and hence purpose.

The idea of classification is present in the Heb takahn, tr super "set in order," with reference to a collection of proverbs (Ecc 12:9). The same stem is used with reference to the fixation and arranging of singers before the altar Organize (Heb Eccles 47:9). The classification of priests according to their service and an idea of their order (1 Ch 24:3:19, Heb pāshād). Next to the high priests ranked priests of the second order (mishneh, 2 K 23:4; cf. 25:18 [v Jer 52:24). The related concept of organization is present where the Heb kîn (lit. "to establish") is used (Ps 119:17; cf. LXX, "a British" ARV; Ps 119:133; 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 [diatassēn]; Tit 1:5 [epiōdivthē; 1 Cor 13:11 [ord]). In the sense of likeness or manner, is used in the phrase "after the order of Melchisedek" to translate the Heb al dibbārōth, or rather 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 1:7; 1 K 5:17; 1 Macc 6:40; Col 2:5). This well-known phrase is rendered in LXX kathō tōn tāξīn, a tr adopted in Heb 5:6:10; 6:20; 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" (Heb 7:16).

In the sense of regulation, we find "order" as a tr of mishpār (which is lit. "the ruling of a shōphēh," whether as a judicial decree or legislative active act) in connection with the consecration of the Levites. As a vb. in Ex 23:17; 2 Ch 30:16; cf. Lk 1:8; Hand Ed 1:6), and with reference to the Nazarite 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 8:14, ARV "ordinance"). The phrase "al yadh, lit. "according to the hand of," tr" in 2Ch 10:10; 1 Ch 25:25:3:6 bis 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 Esd 8:10; 1 Macc 9:55). He "that ordereth his conversation aright" (sōn dērēkh, Ps 60:22) 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 2 Ch 13:3, Heb ṣagār, lit. "to bind," hence "to join" or "begin"; cf. paradigm containing fort) in many legal cases (Jgs 23:4; 13:18; cf. Ps 50:21). From the idea of ranging in order for the purpose of comparison the Heb "arakh acquires the meaning "to compare" (Isa 40:18; Ps 89:7). This is clearly the meaning of "tipos Akhrakh (Ps 5:5[Heb 6:1]), where "they cannot be set in order unto the..."
6. Declaring of Last Will

ORDINANCE, or'di-nans: This word generally represents שׁוֹכֶב, suchokhot, something prescribed, or required, usually with reference to matters of ritual. In AV the same word is frequently transliterated as "statute" or "statutes," which is rendering of a similar Heb word, viz. פֶּתַח, hōk. RV generally retains "ordinance," but sometimes substitutes "statute" (e.g. Ezk 18:20; Ps 99:7). In one instance RV renders "set portion" (Ex 45:14). The word generally has a religious or ceremonial significance. It is used for instance in connection with the Passover (Ex 12:43; Nu 9:14). According to Ex 12:14, the Passover was "an ordinance to ever," i.e. a permanent institution. In the pl. the word is often employed, along with such terms as commandments, laws, etc, with reference to the different prescriptions of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly codes (Dt 6:1; Lev 18:1). In 11 passages (Ex 15:25; Jos 24:25; 1 S 8:25; 2 K 17:34-37; 2 Ch 33:8-13; Ps 119:91; Isa 68:2; Eze 11:20) "ordinance" is the rendering of סְתַנּוֹת, mishketh, judgment, decision or sentence by a judge or ruler. In the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:22-31; 31:33) the term "judgment" denotes civil, as contrasted with ritual, enactments. In 2 K 17:34 AV employs "manners" and "ordinances" as renderings of this word. In 3 passages (Lev 18:20; 22:9; Mal 3:14) "ordinance" is the tr. of סָתַן, mishmereth, "charge," which RV restores. In one instance (Neh 10:32) "ordinance" renders סֶתַן, mishpeth, "commandment," while in Ezk 3:10 AV the phrase "after the ordinance of David" represents a Heb phrase which lit. means "upon the hands of David," i.e. under the guidance or direction of David.

In the NT "ordinance" renders different Gr words, viz. (1) ἁρμαρία, diáthrōma, in Lk 1:6 and He 9:1-16. The word means lit. "anything declared right"; but in these passages ceremonial and religious regulation; (2) διάθησις, diáthesis, in Eph 2:15; Col 2:14. In the NT this word always means a decree or edict (Acts 17:7); (3) ταγνάθος, paradosis, in 1 Cor 11:2 AV, RV substitutes "traditions"; (4) κληρονομία, klinōnymia, "setting up," "institution," in 1 Pet 2:3. The term is used exclusively of the action of God. Peter implies that institutions, apparently human, such as the family and the state, are of Divine origin. The same doctrine is found in Rom 13:1. T. LEWIS

ORDINANCES OF HEAVEN. See ASTRONOMY, 1, 1. 1. ORDI NATION, or-di-ná-shun. See ORDAIN, ORDI NATION.

OREB, or'eb (אֹרֶב, אֵרוֹב; "raven," esp. "crow"), and ZEEB, ze'eb, zeb (ゼブ, ゼブ, "wolf") (Jgs 7:25; 8:3; Ps 83:11, and Isa 10:26 [Oreb only]). Mitzri inhabitants captured and besieged by the Ephraimites, who brought their heads to Gideon. As to the meaning of the two names, both words are found in Arabic. Robertson Smith, Kinship, etc (100 ff, 218 ff), says that the use of the names of animals as names of persons is a relic of totemism. But Nöldeke (ZDMG, XL, 160 ff) and

1. Meaning others hold that such use shows a desire that those so named should be detested or execrable to their enemies as the plant or animal which the name denoted. Some again (e.g. Stade, Geschichte, 189 ff) maintain that the two names here are borrowed from localities and not vice versa, as Jgs 7:25 implies. If so, we must take the names to be originally two places, apparently in Ephraim, for the words "beyond Jordan" in 7:25 contradict 8:4, where it is said that Gideon came to the Jordan and passed over. Moore (Jgs 214) suggests that the two localities were near the junction with the Jordan of the stream that comes from Wady Far'ah. The construction of the Heb allows of a tr "the rock [called] Oreb," and "the winepress [called] Zeeb."

The account of a battle here is corroborated by Isa 10:26, a verse which mentions the "rock of Oreb," and suggests that the great defeat of the Midianites took place there of Isa 9:4). The passage in Oreb Isa 10:24-26 is proverb, however, and is said to be late editing (see G. H. Box, Isa, 65). In Ps 83:11 (Heb 12) there is a prayer that God would make the "noble" among the Psalmist's enemies as Oreb and Zeeb.

OREB: In 2 Esd 2:33 AV for Mt. Horeb (q.v.; so RV).

OREN, or'en (אֹרֶן, אֵרֶן; 'Aḇĕrāh, Arāh, Alex. Ἀραν): "a son of Jerahmeel, the firstborn of Hezron (1 Ch 2:25)."

ORGAN, or'gân: See Music.

ORION, or'i-on: A brilliant constellation dedicated to Nimrod or Merodach. See Astronomy, 11, 11.

ORNAMENT, or'na-ment (Τέμ., ῥαθή, "ornament"): In common with all the Orientals, the Hebrews were very fond of wearing ornaments, and their tendency to extravagance of this kind was often met with stern prophetic rebuke (Isa 3:16-24; Ezk 13:18-20). On this subject, little is said in the NT apart from Jesus' (Lk 7:25; 12:23) and James' (2:2) invectives against meretricious estimates of man's character. Yet the employment of attractive attire receives sanction in the Divine example of Ezk 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 name, may be summarized here as finger-rings, particularly prized as seal-rings (Gen 38:12-25; Jer 22:24); arm-rings or bracelets (Gen 24:22, 25:10); earrings (Gen 35:4; Ex 35:22); nose-rings (Gen 24:47; Ezk 16:12); anklets or anklet-chains (Isa 3:16,18); head-bands or fillets or crowns (referred to in Isa 318 only), and necklaces or neck-chains (Gen 41:42; Ezk 16:11).

Figurative: The universal devotion to ornament among the Orientals is the occasion for frequent Bib. allusions to the beauty and adornment of noble 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 attractions 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).
Ostracal with Lk 22 70f.

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 Cleanthes 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 Bouriant 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 among 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; 16 18-22; 16 21; Lk 12 13-16; 22 40-71; Jn 1 1-9; 1 14-17; 18 10-25; 19 15-17. The texts are in 3 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 on the woman taken in adultery (Jn 7 53–8 11), which is otherwise unattested in the Sa'idic NT. A Christian hymn to Mary, akin to the canticles 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, ostrich (עַרְיֵךְ עַרְיָךְ), anak; στρουθός, strouthos; Lat Struthio camelus: The largest bird now living. The Heb words yā'ānāh, which means "greediness," and both ha-yā'ānāh, "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 more 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 τρε is 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 roaring 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 flabby. 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 uric acid, the rarest organ ever developed in a feathered creature.

These birds hied on the deserts of Arabia and at the lower waters of the great Sina. Here the ostrich left her eggs on the earth and warmed them in the sand. That young was not hard harked was due 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. If the custom continues, one may reason 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 polymonous, 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 communal nest 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 in Lev 21:16 RV "owl"; Dt 14:16, RV "little owl"; AV "owl." This must have referred to the toughness of grown specimens, since there was nothing 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 disconsolate to him of the ostrich in the following manner:

"The wings of the ostrich wave proudly: But are they the pinions and plumage of love?" (39:13-15).

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, when 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 the time tramp of the 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 for help; and the falcon shall dwell there, 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, to my chosen" (41:20). Homer 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 dwell there, and the ostriches [AV "owls"] shall dwell there also; and it shall be no more inhabited forever; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation" (Jer 50:39).

"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.

TRANSLATION

OSTHNI, oth'n, oth'n, oth'n, meaning unknown: A son of Shemariah, a Korahite Levite (1 Ch 26:7).

OTHENIEL, oth'n-el (ביתן), ʻothnēl: A hero in Israel, son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother. He conquered Kiriath-sephon, 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 Mesopotamia, 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 2, V, iv, 3), and reestablishing government in the same quarter 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 Meonothai (cf. reference Lucians of 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).

OTHONIAS, oth-ō-nē-ás (Othoinas, Othoino): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Ed 9:28) "Mattanib" of Ex 10:27.

OUCHES, out'ches, -iz (רעהש, miḥārərōth [Ex 28:13.14.16-18]; ARV "settings", but in Ex 39:13, "inclosing"): The secondary meaning of this now archaic word is the gold or silver setting of a precious stone. In Ex, where it occurs 8 t, 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 two onyx or beryl stones set, but the 12 stones forming the front of the breast-plate were "inclosed in gold in their settings" (Ex 30:20). 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, wreathed round the stones, in a sort of filigree. See also STONES, PRECIOUS.

OUTCAST, out'kast: Represents some form of סִתָּה, dābāh, or נׇתָה, nābāh, both meaning "thrust
Ostrich

OVERSEER, ő- vér-sè'ér, or -sèr'. One who overlooks, inspects; in the OT from יְסֵר, nāṣaq (2 Ch 21 18; in 2 Ch 34 13 RV changes to "set forward"); and פָּקָד, pāqad (Gen 39 4; 2 Ch 34 12.17; RV has this word for AV "officers" in Gen 42 34, and for "rulers" in 1 Ch 26 32); in the NT once for εἰργαστήριον, episkopos, in Acts 20 28, where RV has "bishops" (in "oversers"); cf 1 Pet 5 2). See Bishop.

OWL, owl (יוֹיָד הַזָּעַדְנוּ; beth ha-ya'ānāh; Lat Ulula); The name of every nocturnal bird of prey of the N.O. Striges. These birds range from the great horned owl of 2 ft. in length, through many subdivisions to the little screech-owl of 5 in. All are characterized by very large heads, many have ear tufts, all have large eyes surrounded by a disk of thin, stiff, radiating feathers. The remainder of the plumage has no aftertaste. So these birds make the softest flight of any creature traveling on wing. A volume could be written on the eye of the owl, perhaps its most wonderful feature being in the power of the bird to enlarge the iris if it wishes more distinct vision. There is material for another on the prominent and peculiar auditory parts. With almost all owls the feet are so arranged that two toes can be turned forward and two back, thus reinforcing the grip of the bird by an extra toe and giving it unusual strength of foot. All are night-hunters, taking prey to be found at that time, of size according to the strength. The owl was very numerous in the caves, ruined temples and cities, and even in the fertile valleys of Pal. It is given place in the Bible because it was considered unfit for food and because people dreaded the cries of every branch of the numerous family. It appeared often, as most birds, in the early VSS of the Bible; later translators seem to feel that it was used in several places where the ostrich really was intended (see Ostrich). It would appear to a natural historian that the right bird could be selected by the location, where the text is confusing. The ostrich had a voice that was even more terrifying, when raised in the night, than that of the owl. But it was a bird of the desert, of wide range and traveled only by day. This would confine its habitat to the desert and the greenery where it joined fertile land, but would not bring it in very close touch with civilization. The owl is a bird of

out." In Jer 30 17 "outcast" means "thrust out of society" "degraded person" elsewhere it means "exile" (Ps 147 2; Isa 16 3 f; Jer 49 36).

OUTER, out'ër: This adj. is used 12 t by Ezekiel of the outside court of the temple. In Mt we find it 3 t (8 12; 22 13; 25 30) in "outer darkness" (vā ἀγνώριον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν ἀχείρεσάν τοῦ ἐκκλησία τοῦ ἐξοχοῦ, which typifies the utter darkness of the doom of the lost.

OUTGOING, out'gō-ing: In Ps 65 8, "Thou makest the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice," the Heb is יְרָכָה, yērāḵah. The word (from yādā, "to go forth") refers to the "going forth" of the sun, and so means "east" (as in Ps 76 6). The connection of yērāḵah 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 רָכָה עַל רָכָה (also from yādā), where the meaning in "extremity" (RV "goings out," as in Nu 34 5, etc.). "Outwent" occurs in Mk 6 33. 

OUTLANDISH, out-land'ish (Neh 13 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, "strange women," ARV "foreign women," Heb נָוְיָד, noyāḏ, "foreign." OUTRAGE, out'rej, OUTRAGEOUS, out-rā'jeas: The noun (from the Fr. outré-rage, "that which goes beyond") only in the heading to Ps 10 AV; the adj. in Prov 27 4, AV and ERV, for מַרְאֵה, merēwāh, "foul," "Anger is overwhelming" (ARV), is much better.

OUTROADS, out'rödz (ἐξωδέου, exoideō, "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'wərd, MAN (גָּאוֹן, ġāoḇn, "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, ő- vér-châr'jī: Lk 21 34, "lest haply your hearts be overcharged with drunkenness" (βασάνω, barānō, "burden," here with the force "be occupied with"); 2 Cor 2 5, AV "that I may not overcharge you" (ἐπιβαρήσω, epibarēwō, "overload"); RV "that I press not too heavily." See Charges.

OVERPASS, ő- vér-pas': A special tr. of the very common vb. יָבַש, 'āḇar, "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 over-flow."

OVERPLUS, ő-vér-plúss: Lev 25 27, for יָבַש, 'āḇarhaph, "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 could be 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 *yashāph,* derived from a root meaning twilight, is *tr*"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* (*ves- τρεπατε, νυκτικοραξ*) 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 *tr* that place it in deserted temples and cities are beyond all doubt correct. Kīppālī (*κιππαλί, ecounter*) occurs once (Isa 34 15), and is *tr*"great owl" in former versions; lately (in ARV) it is changed to "dart-snake!" (ERV "arrow-snake"). In this same description *lithū* (*λιθοθραύσος, onakēntaurōle*), "a specter of night," was formerly sereech-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 Scripture that produced such impressions of desolation 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-Porter**

**OWL, GREAT (יָשָׁפ, *yashāph;* LXX *φαος, ἰθι, or ιθίος, εἶθι*):** 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-Porter**

**OWL, LITTLE (יִנִּית, *ynīt; νυκτικόραξ, νυκτικόραξ;* 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, o'ei.** See Ships and Boats, III, 2.

**OX.** See Antelope; Cattle; Wild Ox.

**OX, oks (יָשָׁפ, *yashāph;* LXX *φαος, ἰθι, o'xm):** One of the ancestors of Judah (Jth 8 1). The name is not Heb. Perhaps the Itala Ozi and the Syr *Uz* point to the Heb *Uzziz.

**OZGOAD, oks'gōd.** See Goad.

**OZEM, o'zem (יָשָׁפ, *yashāph, o'zem, meaning unknown):**

1. The 6th son of David (1 Ch 2 15). LXX (Ἀκο, ἀκόσ) and Vulg suggest that the name should be pointed *iances,* "great.

2. A "son" of Jerahmeel (1 Ch 2 25).

**OZIAS, o'zi'as:**

1. (Oţēs, Oţēs, Oţēs, Oţēs, Oţēs, B a b): The son of Micah, a Simeonite, one of the 3 rulers of Bethuliah in the days of Judah (Jth 6 15 16; 7 25; 8 9f; 10 6).

2. (Oţēs, Oţēs, B and Sweet; AV Ezias [1 Esd 8 2], following A, "Eźias, Ezias"): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esd 8 2; 2 Esd 1 1)="Uzzi" of Ex 7 4; 1 Ch 6 51.

3. Head of a family of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 31)="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, o'zī-el (Ovēiā, Ovēīl):** An ancestor of Judah (Jth 8 1); another form of the OT name "Uziel."

**OZNI, o'zi'nī (יָשָׁנ, *yashān, "my hearing," or "my ear"): A "son" of Gad (Nu 26 16)="EZbon" of Gen 46 16 (cf 1 Ch 7 7).

**OZNIDES, o'znits (with the art. יָשָׁנ, ḫō- "onzit [collective], "the Oznites": Of the clan of Ozn (Nu 26 16). See Ozn.**

**OZORA, oz-o'ra.** See Ezora.

---

**P**

**PAARAL, pā'a-ri (Actualizar, "pa'arag, "devoee of Poor"): One of David's 37 valiant men (2 S 23 35). Doubtless the "Naarah" of 1 Ch 11 37.

**PACATIANA, pāk-ka-ti'āna, paku-a'ta-na (Pakati'na, Pakatiana):** About 295 AD, when the province of Asia was broken up, two new provinces were formed, Phrygia Prima (Pacatiana), of which Laodicea was the "chiefest city" (subscription to 1 Tim AV), and Phrygia Secunda (Satalitarsis). See Perga, and HDB, III, 865.

**PACE, pās (πασ, "pāsh): A step in 2 S 6 13, hence about one yard.

**PACHON, pāk'kon (Pāxōn, Pachōn): The name of a month mentioned in 3 Mac 6 38.

**PADDAN, pad'an (Gen 48 7; AV Padan, pā-dan). See next article.

**PADDAN-ARAM, pad'an-āram or p-āram (יָשָׁנ, *yashān, pānā;* LXX Μεσοπόταμια τῆς Συρίας, Mesopotamia tēs Suryas; AV Padan-aram): In Gen 46 7, Padan stands alone, but as the LXX, Sam, and Pesh read "Ar̄am" also, it must in this verse have dropped out of the MT. In the time of Abraham, pādanā occurred the Bab contract-tablets as a land measure, to which we may compare the Arab. faddān or "ox-gang." In the Assyrian syl­labaries it is the equivalent of ِكت "a field," so that Padan-aram would mean "the field of Ar̄am," and with this we may compare Hos 12 12 (Heb 12 13) and the use of the Heb ṣdlīk in connection with Moab and Edom (Jgs 5 4; Ruth 1 6).**
Furthermore, *padanu* and *harranu* are given as synonyms with the meaning of "road."

**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 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 Harran-el-Awamid, an ancient site 10 miles to the E. of Damascus, which satisfies all the demands of history. See *ARAM*. W. M. CHRISTIE

**PADDOLE,** pad'el (עַדֶּל, yâdôhel): Dr: 23 13 (Heb 14), RVm "shovel."

**PADON,** pâ'dón (פָּדְון, pâdhôn, "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 "Padon").

**PAGIEL,** pâ'gi-el, pâ'gil, pa-gîl (פַּגִּי-אֵל, Pagî'el, "God's intervention"): Son of Ocran, of the tribe of Asher, among those enrolled by Moses at the numbering of Israel (Nu 1 13; 2 27). When the tabernacle was set up, the heads of the families of Israel 'brought their offerings' in rotation and presented in the presence of his tribe, came on the 11th day (Nu 7 72). Nu 7 72-77 describes his offering. In the journeyings of Israel he was "over the host of the tribes of the children of Asher" (Nu 10 25), and possibly standard-bearer (cf Nu 10 14-22.25).

**HENRY WALLACE**

**PAHATH-MOAB,** pâ'hat-mô'ab (פַּחַת מֹאָב, pa-hath mo'ab), pa-hath mô'dbh, "sheek 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, Jeshua 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,** pâ'i (פַּי, pâ; פָּוֶפֶּה, Pophô): The royal city of Hadad or Hadar, king of Edom (1 Ch 1 50). The name is given as "Pau" (פָּו, pâ) in Gen 36 39. There is no indication of its position. It is not identified.

**PAIN,** pân (פָּן, bân, rân, ān, hêbbel, הָלָח, hâlah, halhâlah, כָּלָח, kalâch, כֹּלָה, kolâh, פָּאָר, pa'ar, כְּבָּר, kibhar, הַמָּכָה, mak'hah, הָמַּלְלָא, yâmâl, יָמָל, yâmâl, פָּאָר, Barakûz, bōzanîh, nöso, pânos, ööv, ödâs). 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 prophetic books and refer to conditions of mental disquiet or dismay 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 word יָם (yâm) is used figuratively in Isa 13 8; 21 3; 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 הֶבֶל, 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 בָּל (bâl), sometimes with the addition as of a wound infliction (Jer 20 8; 21 4; 25 17); Jer 6 34; 22 23; Mic 4 10. This pain is referred to the heart (Ps 11 9) or to the head (Job 30 16; Eccl 3 4). In Ezek 30 4, it is the penal affliction of Ethiopia, and in ver 16 AV "Sin [Tani] shall have great pain." (RV "anguish"). In Ez 33 5 Ezeckiel says great pain to the news of the fall of Tyre. Before the invading host of the Assyrians locute the cities of Syria with much joy, Pain in the sense of toil and trouble in Jer 12 13 is the tr of קָלָה, a word more frequently rendered grieving or sickness, as in 1 K 14 1; Ps 43 25; Cant 2 5; Jer 5 3. The reduplicated form קָלָה is esp. used of a twisting pain usually referred to the loins (Isa 21 3; Ezk 30 10).

Pain in the original meaning of the word (as it has come down to us through the Old Fr. from the Lat *pœna* as a penalty inflicted for personal sin is expressed by the words קָלָה or קָלָּה in Job 14 22; 15 20, and in the questioning complaint of the prophet (Jer 15 18). As a judgement on personal sin pain is also expressed by קָלָה in Job 32 19; Jer 51 8, but this word is used in the sense of infliction in Job 1 12 the reception language of "man of sorrows." The Psalms (Ps 25 18) praying for deliverance from this affliction is the afflicting hand of God, which rests on him in turn uses the word אָמַל, and this word which primarily means "toil" or "labor," as in Eccl 1 3, or "travail," as in Is 51 11, is tr "painful" in Ps 73 16, as expressing Asaph's disquiet due to his misunderstanding of the workings of Providence, of which the words, as in Ps 116 3 AV, which got hold of the Psalmist in his sickness, is the rendering of the word מָכַה: the same word is tr "distress" in Ps 116 6 AV. All these words have a primary meaning of physical twisting, constriction or restricting.

In the NT ὄδις is tr "pain" (of death, RV "pang") in Acts 2 24. This word is used to express any sort of pain, such as the pangs of childbirth (as in Aeschylus, *Chœphori*, 211) the pain of intense apprehension. The vb. from this, σκόννομαι, is used by the Rich Man in the parable to describe his torment (RV "anguish") (Lk 16 24). The related vb. σκόνναίομαι is used in Rom 8 22 and is tr "travailing in pain together." In much the same sense the word is used by Euripides (Helena, 727).

In Rev 12 2 the woman clothed with the sun (βασιλικότατα) was in pain to be delivered; the vb. (βασιλικότατα) which means "to torture" is used both in Mt 8 6 in the account of the grievously tortured centurion's servant, and in the description of the laboring of the apostles' boat on the stormy Sea of Galilee (Mt 14 24). This pain 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 πόνος, 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 *Hind* xxi.526, but it is used by Hippocrates to express disease (Ἀπαθείαν 44).

**ALEX. MACALISTER**

**PAINFULNESS,** pân'ful'-nes (πάθος, möchhòs): 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 Rev 8 3; "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, 196), where it refers to that care for her children which she had lost in her madness. Tindale uses "painsfulness" in 1 Jn 4 18 as the tr of ἐρασις, ἐκλαιμις, which RV renders "tortment" and RV "punishment."

**ALEX. MACALISTER**
PAINT, pānt. (From Old Fr. peindre, frequentative of peindre, Lat. pingere, "to paint"; (1) From Heb. וְנַחֲשָׁב, māshēb, "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 Niniveite soldiers were red, presumably painted (Nah 2 3). (2) From noun פָּקָח, pākh, "paint," "anointy," "esthetic," "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 unwholesome character. Jezebel "painted her eyes, and attired her head" (2 K 9 30), lit. "put pākh into her eyes." Toad of the Barton city Jesus, Jeremiah (4 30) says, "deceast thee . . . en-largest thine eyes with paint" (pākh). AV renders "rentest thy face," as if the stain were a cut, or the enlanging done by violence. (3) From Heb. כְּהָל, kāhal, "to smear," "to paint." Ezekiel says to Oholah-Oholibah (Judah-Israel),"didst wash thy self, paint [kāhal] thine eyes," as the adulteress prepares herself for her paramour (Ezk 23 40). The antimony, in an extremely fine powder (Arab. کُحْل, from kāhal), 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 EYE PAINT; COLORS. PHILIP WENDELL CHANNELL

PAINTING, pānt'ing. See CRAFTS, II, 12.

PAIR, pār: The m of Cant 4 2 (but not of the 16 6) reads, "which are all of them in pairs," while the text has, "whereof every one hath twain." The Heb. מַעָֽרָם, ma'aram, is from a וָרָם, "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 pair is paired with the corresponding lower pair.

PALACE, pal'ās: In Heb chiefly צְבָֽארָם, 'armôn, in RV text τυρ' in 1 K 16 18; 2 K 15 25; צְבָֽארָה, bārah, צְבָֽארָ, kāhal, the same word often rendering "court," "palace," "court," as in RV "court" (Mt 26 35; 58, 69; 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" (πραξιδιον, Mt 27 27; Jn 18 28; 32; 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), Susa, etc. See HOUSE.

JAMES OHR

PALAESTRA, PALESTRA, pa-lees'tra. See GAMES, II, 3, (6).

PALAL, pālāl (פָֽלָל, pālāl, "judge"): Sea of Uzal, and one of the repairers of the wall (Neh 3 25).

PALANQUIN, pal-ān'kwın: In Cant 3 9 occurs צָכַרְיָון, appāryon, a word that has no Sem cognates and is of dubious meaning. In form, however, it resembles the Gr. παλαγιτ, and still more closely the Gr. φωκόν, phōkon, both of which mean "liter bed." Hence RV "palanquin" (ultimately derived from παραγόντα). The m "ear of state" and AV "chariot" are mere guesses.

PALESTINA, pal-es-tī'na (ΠΑΛΑΣΤΙΝΗ, plesheeth): Ex 15 14; Isa 14 29-31 AV; changed in RV to PHILISTIA (q.v.).


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 (Rendel, 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 related to, and so important that, for general criticism, 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.
bottom of the lake) is 2,600 ft. below the Mediterranean.

(2) W. of the valley the mountain range, which is a continuation of Lebanon, has very steep slopes on the E. ang to 3,800 ft. above sea-level at the foot of the hills (Heb sapheláh or "lowland") form a distinct district, widening gradually southward, while between this region and the sea the plains of Sharon and Philistia stretch to the sandhills and low cliffs of a barren coast.

(3) In Upper Galilee, on the N., the mountain range rises to 4,000 ft. above the Mediterranean. Lower Galilee, to the S., includes rounded hills less than 1,000 ft. above the sea, and the triangular plain of Esdraelon drained by the River Kishon between the Gibbon watershed on the E. and the long spur of Carmel on the W.

(4) In Samaria the mountains are extremely rugged, but a small plain near Dothan adjoins that of Edreanlon, and another stretches E. of Shechem, 2,500 ft. above the level of the Jordan valley. In Judaea the main ridge runs toward Hebron and then sinks to the level of the Beersheba plains about 1,000 ft. above the sea. The desert of Judah forms a plateau (500 ft. above sea-level), between this ridge and the Dead Sea, and is throughout barren and waterless; but the mountains—which average about 3,000 ft. above the sea—are full of good springs and suitable for the cultivation of the vine, fig and olive. The richest lands are found in the sh'pheldh, in Judæa (esp.), and in the corn plains of Edreanlon, Sharon, and Philistia.

(5) E. of the Jordan the plateau of Bashan (averaging 1,500 ft. above the sea) is also a fine corn country. S. of this, Galilea presents a mountain region rising to 3,000 ft. above sea-level at Jebel Osha', and sloping gently on the E. to the desert. The steep western slopes are watered by the Jabbok River, and by many perennial brooks. In North Gilead esp. the wooded hills present some of the most picturesque scenery of the Holy Land. S. of Gilead, the Moab plateau (about 2,700 ft. above sea-level) is now a desert, but is fitted for corn culture, and in places for the vine. A lower shelf or plateau (about 500 to 1,000 ft. above sea-level) intervenes between the main plateau and the Dead Sea cliffs, and answers to the Desert of Judah W. of the lake.

The water-supply of Pal is abundant, except in the desert regions above noticed, which include the Jordan valley 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 1,200 ft. below the Mediterranean, whereas the Sea of Galilee (580 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 wadis, 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. These are contrasted 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 of the Miocene, and sediment. In the Eocene age, the great crack in the earth's surface occurred, which formed a narrow gulf stretching from that of the 'Akabah on the S. almost to the foot of Hermon. Further upheaval, accompanied by volcanic outbreaks which covered the plateau of Gilead, Bashan, and the higher Galilean valleys with lava, cut off the Jordan valley from the Red Sea, and formed the long lake, the basin of which has been dammed by the S. to its present level during the Pleistocene and Pluvial periods, after which—its peculiar fauna, having developed meantime on the lake ground—was represented only, as it now is, by the swanly Hâlap, the pear-shaped Sea of Galilee, and the Dead Sea. These changes would have occurred long ages before the appearance of man. The beds upheaved include: (1) the Nubian Sandstone (of the Gresivand period), which was sheared along the line of the Jordan fault E. of the river, and which only appears on the western slopes of Hermon, Galilee, and Bashan; (2) the limestone (Miocene) of the former Tertiary age, including the hard dolomite, and softer beds full of characteristic fossils; (3) the soft Eocene limestone, which appears chiefly on the western spurts 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 (Bos primigenius) were exterminated within historic times, but have left their bones in the Jordan gravel. 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 to the fertile 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 crops has often been plowed up or abandoned 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

5. Climate

fevers of mosquito districts in the plains, it is much better than that 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 about 5 AM, blows to the west and fertilizes the fields 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 oppressive. The valley, 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 Taurus mountains, but 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 fruits 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, but falls begin 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 and excessive in all times (Gen 12:10; 26:2; 41:50; 7:1, 8:11; 28:20; 35:1; 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. 1, 4-7) as occurring even during the rainy season 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 likely to a "faithful messenger," and the reference is to the use 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 this region still healthier, 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 comments and traditions connected with the memory of the Heb patriarchs. In the time of

1. Places visited by Abraham

Abraham the population consisted of visited by tribes, mainly Sem, who came originally from Babylon, including Canaanites ("the Canaanites", 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 Babylon.

(1) Shechem.—The first place noticed is the shrine or "temple (holy place)" of Shechem, with the Elon Moreh (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 town of the "Shechem" in Sam. The "Canaanite was then in the land" (in Abraham's time), but was exterminated (Gen 34:25) by Jacob's sons. From Shechem Abraham journeyed southward and raised an altar between Bethel (Betlis) and Hai (Haydon), the name of which still survives hard by the spring of Loez (Gen 12:8; 13:3; 28:11; 36:2). (2) The Negeb.—But, on his return from Egypt with large flocks (12:10), he settled in the pastoral region, between Beersheba 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" (zikhrar) were clearly in this valley, and Sodom must have been near the river, since Lot's journey to Zoar (19:22) occupied only an hour or two (vs 15:23) through the plain to the foot of the Moab mountains. These cities have been identified by some from near the Hebron; but, from the hilltop E. of the city, Abraham 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; 18:1; 23:19), with the cave tomb 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 is not the "Tamar, The Samaria 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 (14:18; 33:18), but see Jerusalem.

When Jacob lived in the northern plains, and "sojourned in Gerar" (20:1), now Umm Jerrel, 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 now seen on 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 is modern. The planting of a "banyan tree" 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 Elon Moreh—a summit which could certainly have been seen "far off" (ver 4) on "the third day to Isaac, Isaac's sheep, the sheep of his father's 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. From Beersheba (28:10) he slept at the "place" (or shrine) consecrated by Abraham's altar near Bethel, and—

2. Places visited by Isaac

(1) Haran to Succoth.—His return journey from Haran to Gilad (Gen 18), which he renewed twenty years later (35:14) when God appeared to him "again" (ver 9).

When Jacob fled to Haran from Beersheba (28:10) he slept at the "place" (or shrine) consecrated by Abraham's altar near Bethel, and—

3. Places visited by Isaac

(1) Haran to Succoth.—His return journey from Haran to Gilad raises an interesting question. The distance is about 350 miles from Haran to the Galed or "witness heap" (31:48) at Mizpah—probably Sāf in North Gilad. 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 3d 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 Mitzpah still presents ancient monuments like the "pillar" (ver 45) round which the "memorial cairn" (ḡhar-sâhâdâhâth) was formed. From this place Jacob journeyed to Mahamah (probably Arämah), 8 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 (35 17), believed to be Tell Der'âlu, N. of the stream.

(2) From Jordan to Hebron.—Crossing the Jordan by one of several fords in this vicinity, Jacob approached Shechem by the perennial stream of Wâdy Fârâh, and camped at Shalem (Sâlim) 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 Ebron Moreh where were buried the târâfîm (Gen 35 4) or "spirits" (Assy r târu) from Haran (31 30) under the oak of Abraham. These no doubt were smaller than and more often unearthed 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 "water of Arâmah," probably Aram (Gen 11 169) is still shown at Tell Dothan, and the Ishmaelites, 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 Sinai (West Egypt) campaign (15.29.22).

The episode of Judah and Tamar is connected with a region in the Shērēthāh, or low hills of Judaea.

4. Mentioned in connection with this latter being in a pastoral valley where with Judah Judah met his "sheep shearsers," 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 Timoth. She was mistaken for a kebēthâhâ, or "virgin of Ashereth" (Gen 38 15.21), and we know from Hammurâbi's laws that such virgins were already recognized. The mention of Judah's signet and staff (ver 16) also reminds us of Bab customs as described by Herodotus (4 15.12), and "signet" and "staffs" of Bab style, and of early date, have been unearthed in Pal at Gezer and elsewhere (of 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 period. The Assy is easily understood, and one difficulty needs notice, where Atad is mentioned (15.24) on the way from Egypt to Hebron as described as "beyond the Jordan." In this case the Assy language perhaps helps us, for in that tongue "Atad" means "the cresses," and the reference may be to the Nile itself, which is called Yârî in Heb (yârî) and Assy r alike.

Ex is concerned with Egypt and the Sinaitic desert, though it may be observed that its simple agricultural laws (chs 21-23), which are so often recall those of Hammurâbi, and would have been found once on the conquest 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 'Ar'obah 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 Bashar and Gilead, but the "wild goat" (ibex), "wild ox" (bubal), "pygarg" (addax) and "chamois" (wild sheep), are found in the 'Ar'obah 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, I, 221). The view of Israel, in camp at Syria by Balak (22 41), standing on the top of Pisgah or Mt. Nebo, has been thought to be possible by the discovery of Gebel Neba, where also rude dolmens recalling Balak's altars have been found (SEP, I, 202). The plateau of Moab (32 5) is described as a "land for cattle," and still supports Arab flocks. Though Israel left their cattle, women and children during the wars, for 6 months, stretched (33 49) from Beth-jeshimoth (Swainheim), near the northeastern corner of the Dead Sea over Abîl-shittim ("the scacia measure,"—a name usual in Pal) is a plain watered by several brooks, and having good heritage 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 the regions in 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 out of whose earth 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 Punon N. of Petra in the 4th cent. AD, as described by Jerome (Onom, s.v. "Phœnin"). 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 (2,650 ft.) are the two highest tops in Samaria, and Shechem lies in a rich valley between them.

The first sacred center 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 24 26). The last chapters of Dt record the famous Persian view from Mt. Nebo (34 1-3), which answers in all respects to that from Gebel Neba, except as to Dan, and the utmost (or "western") sea, neither of which is visible. Here we should probably read "toward" rather than "toward," gene r there being no hills over 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 Gilba and Tabor, and of the slopes of Gilead.

(2) Archaeology.—But besides these physical
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allusions, the progress of exploration serves to illustrate the progress of Dt. Israel was commanded (12 3) to overthrow the Can. altars, to break the standing stones which were emblems of superstition, to burn the ḳāḥērāh 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 ḳāḥērāh poles have disappeared, the images are found, only deep under the sand. The three- or four-lettered tablets which remain at Damascus, and in Phoenicia and Syria, representing the gods of Canaan or of the Hittites, have no counterpart in the Holy Land. Again when we read of ancient landmarks (Dt 19 14; Prov 22 25; 23 10), we are not to understand a mere boundary stone, but rather one of those monuments common in Babylonia—as early at least as the 12th cent. BC—on which the boundaries of a field are minutely described, the history of its grant by the king, the case of any dispute in the matter, and the judgment 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 names of places, rivers and mountains of Joshua in Psalms mentioned in the Bible are to be found in this book.

1. Book of Joshua.—This book contains a full account of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites under Joshua, and of the division of the land among the various tribes. The conquest was completed in 1194 BC, and the division was completed in 1193 BC. The book is divided into two parts: the first part (ch. 1-11) contains the account of the conquest; the second part (ch. 12-21) contains the account of the division of the land.

The conquest of Canaan was accomplished by the Israelites under Joshua, who was the commander-in-chief of the army. The conquest was completed in 1194 BC, and the division was completed in 1193 BC. The book is divided into two parts: the first part (ch. 1-11) contains the account of the conquest; the second part (ch. 12-21) contains the account of the division of the land.

The region left unconquered by Joshua (13 2-6) were those afterward conquered by David and Solomon, including the Philistines, and the Sidonian coast from Mount Carmel to Ashtoreth, which was the border of the Amorite country which lay S. of the 'land of the Hittites' (14). Southern Lebanon, from Gebal (Jubal) and the 'entering into Hamath' (the Eliphethus Valley) on the W. and the Bashan-gad (possibly at 'Ain Judeid) on the northwestern slope of the Kingdom) was also included in the 'land' by David (2 8 6-10). But the whole of Eastern Palestine (12 7-25), and of Western Palestine, excepting the shore foothills, was allotted to the tribes of Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh). The strongest, appear to have occupied the mountains and the ṣḥāphēlāh, as far N. as Lower Galilee, before the final allotment.

Thus the lot of Simeon was within that inherited by Joseph (11 17), and that of Dan partly taken from Ephraim, since Joseph's lot originally
reached to Gezer (16: 3); but Benjamin appears to have received the land of the Canaanites (cf 15: 9–19; 18: 11–25).

This lot was larger than that of Ephraim, and Benjamin was not then the "smallest of the tribes" (cf 12: 7). Since the distribution of the tribes did not occur till after the death of Joshua and Eleazar (20: 28).

The twelve tribes were distributed in various regions which may here briefly be described. Reuben held the land of the Maonites (Wady el Arûb) on the south and the "river of Gad" (Wady Nabûr e) on the north, and the "Jordan valley" E. of the river was included in this lot. Manasseh held Bashan, but he did not complete his lot. Simeon had the negeb plateau N. of Beersheba. Judah occupied the mountains S. of the Jordan, with the "Naphtali tributaries" to their W., and claimed Philistia S. of Ekron. Benjamin had the Jericho plains and the mountains between Jerush and Bethel. The border ran S. of Jerush to Rachel's tomb (1 S 19: 2), and thence W. to Kirath-jeearim (Kirma) and Ekron. Dan occupied the lower hills W. of Benjamin and Ephraim, and claimed the plain from Ekron to Rakkon (Tell el Rakîkh) N. of Joppa. Manasseh had a large region, corresponding to Samaria, and laid claim also to the Negeb and half a dozen of 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). Ephraim also complained of the smallness of its lot (ver 15), which lay in rugged country. Judeth and Simeon, however, the corn plateau E. of the latter city, Issachar the mountains of Gedor and Mahanaim, with a large district in the Jordan valley to the E., but soon became subject to the Canaanites. Zebulun had the hills of Lower Galilee, and mentioned only his "valley." Naphtali occupied the mountains of Upper Galilee, and the rich plateau between the Sea of Galilee and Asher. He had the lower hills W. of Naphtali, and the narrow shore plains from Acco to Tyre. Thus each tribe possessed a proportion of mountain land at suitable cultivation of fles, olives, and vines, and of arable land fit for corn. The areas selected by each tribe correspond with the present distribution of population that the various regions were fitted to support.

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 with his course annually to the sacred center, before they retreated to Jerush on the destruction 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 Anatoth (1 K 2: 26) are expressly named a 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 side of the Jordan: Gilead (Hebron), and Abel-meholah and in the plains, namely Hebron, Shechem and Kadish on the W., and Bezer (unknown), Ramoth (Reinon) and Joan (probably Sahem el Joulân) E. of the river. Another less perfect list of these cities, with 4 cities respectively to the tribes of 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 wall, the fields, to about half a mile distant, also belonged to the Levites (2 Ch 23: 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" (Judges) the Canaanites appear to have recovered power, and to have rebuilt some of the cities which he had ruined. Judah fought the Perizzites ("villagers") at Berek (Beqheh) in the lower hills W. of Jerush, and even set fire to that city after a distant (Nu 21: 2–15), which is identified (of Josh 15: 15–19) as lying in a "dry" (AV "south") region, yet with springs not far away. The actual site (edh Dhibehârî) 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 mound still strong with "upper and lower springs." As regards the Philie cities (Jgs 1: 18), the LXX reading seems preferable; for the Gr says that Judah "did not take Gaza" nor Ashkelon nor Ekron, which agrees with the story of Rahab "lying in the "valley" (ver 19) due to 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. Manasses, 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 wandering groups found a home under Hermon (1: 134; 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 (Sâlam, N. of Tannach), Anem (A'sûn), Dapur (Delbârih, at the foot of Tabor), with Bethanath (Arûntah) in Upper Galilee (Brugæs, Hist Egypt, II, 64). Sisera may here have been an "Egypt" resident at the court of Jabin (Jgs 4: 2); his camps occurred near the foot of Tabor (ver 14) to which he advanced E. from Haroschet (al Harathîyeh) on the edge of the sea plain. His host "perished at Endor" (Ps 83: 9) and his chariots of iron were destroyed in the open plain 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 Kades, 3 miles N. of Tannach, for the plain is here swampy in parts. The march of "some" of the army is thought from Tannach to Megiddo (6: 9), but the old identification of the latter city with the Rom town of Legio (Legiôn) was a mere guess which does not fit with Egypt accounts placing Megiddo near the Jordan. The large site at Mig’didâ, in the Valley of Jerceil seems to be more suitable for all the OT as well as for the Egypt accounts (SWP, II, 90–99).

3. 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 Minepeth (see EXXOXS, Tuz). Gideon's home (Jgs 6: 11) at Ophrah, in Manasses, is placed by Sam tradition at Fer'ata, 6 miles W. of Shechem, but his victory was won in the Valley of Jerceil (7: 1–22), the sites of Beth-shittah (Shefoh) and Hazor (8: 4–11). As Gideon perished at the "raven's rock" and the "wolf's hollow" (7: 25), W. of the Jordan. It is remarkable (as pointed out by the present author in 1874) that, 3 miles N. of Jeriel, a sharp peak is now called "the raven's nest," and a ravine 4 miles farther north 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. Gilgoth," unless the name survives in corrupt form at Atû Jalûd ("Goliath's spring"), which is a large pool, usually supposed to be the spring of Harod (7: 1), where Gideon camped, E. of Jerceil.

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
Beeroth (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 **Tubsa**, 10 miles N.E. of Shechem.

The Ammonite oppression of Israel in Gilead occurred about 300 years after the Heb conquest (11 20), and Jephthah the deliverer returned to Beeroth (ver 29), which was probably the present village **Saf** (already noticed), from his exile in the "land of Tob" (vs 36). This may have been near **Tayibeh**, 9 miles S. of Gadara, in the extreme N. of Gilead—a place notable for its ancient dolmens and rude stone monuments. It occurs also at Mizpah. Jephthah's dispute with the men of Ephraim (12 1) indicates the northern position of Mizpah. Jero (11 33) is known, but lay near Rabbath-ammon (Josh 13 25; 2 S 54 5); it is to be distinguished from Jero (Ar'air) in the Arnon ravine, mentioned in Jgs 11 26.

The scene of Samson's exploits lies in the shireh -lah of Judah on the borders of Philistia. His home at Zorah (Sor'ah) was on the hills N. of the Valley of Sorek, and looked down on "the camp of Dan" (14 3), which is traditionally on the salt valley near Beth-shemesh. Eshtaol (Esho'ah) was less than 2 miles E. of Zorah on the same ridge. Timnah (14 1) was only 2 miles W. of Beth-shemesh, at the present ruin **Tubnah**. The region was one of vineyards, and the name Sorek (Sork) 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 Philistian corn 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 **Bet 'Athph**, 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" (**Bit el Hassiath**), 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 tower, to the river (S 77); and probably is still the way for a small quantity of wine; but has never 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 ma'kram), "God be with you." But the thin wine (ver 14) is the cup of the peasant, 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 (1 S 1 2) was the founder of a pious Levite (1 S 6 27)—descended from Zuph who had lived at Ephrathah (Bethlehem; cf 1 S 9 45,5), had his house at Ramah (1 19) close to Gibeah, and this town (er -Rôm) was Samuel's home also (7 17; 25 1). The family is described as "Ramathites, Zuphites of Mt. Ephraim" (1 1), 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, Elkanah obeyed the law of making annual visits to the central shrine, though his family had not 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 from Joshua from Shechem to the remote site of Shiloh (Josh 18 1), perhaps near the temple (ver 19) was pitched (cf 1 S 2 22) and remained for 4 centuries till the death of...
of Eli. The great defeat of Israel, when the ark was captured by the Philis, took place not far from Mizpah (1 4). Jonathan, with the stone of help (Ehern-esh), which was in the mountains, so that its inhabitants “came down” from “the hill” (6 21; 7 1) to fetch the ark, which abode there for twenty years, till the beginning of Saul’s reign (14 18), when, after the war, it may have been removed to Ramah. But which place 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 Gibeah, where it was laid out close to the massacre of the priests (1 51 1; 22 0 18; 2 Ch 1 3), when the ark was again taken to Kirjath-jearim (2 6 2). Mizpah (Tell en-Nasheb) was the gathering-place of Israel under Samuel and the “stone of help” (Ehern-esh) employed, after his victory over the Philis, “between Mizpah and Shen” (1 7 12)—the latter place (see LXX) being probably the same as Jeshannah (‘Ain Sinai), 6 miles N of Mizpah which Samuel visited yearly as a judge (ver 16).

The journey of Saul, who, “seeking asses found a kingdom,” presents a topography which has often been misunderstood. He started (9 4) from Gibeath (Jebra) and went first to the land of Shalisha through Mt. Ephraim. Baal-shalisha (2 K 4 42) appears to have been the present Keft Thilth, 18 miles N of Lydda and 24 miles N W of Gibeath. Saul then searched the land of Shalim—probably that of Shuah (1 5 17), N E of Gibeath. 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 Bethlem, whence (as above remarked) Samuel’s family—descendants of Zuph—came originally. If so, it is remarkable that Saul and David were reared in the same city, one which Samuel visited later (16 1 2 f) to sacrifice, just as he did when meeting Saul (9 12), who was probably known to him, since Gibeath and Ramah were only 2 miles apart. Saul’s journey home thus naturally lay on the border of Benjamin (1 2), and so along the Bethel road (10 2 3) to his home at Gibeath (v 5 10). It is impossible to suppose that Samuel met him at Ramah—a common mistake which creates great confusion in the topography.

Saul’s coronation and first campaign. The Lenten note—Saul 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 Jehovah” (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 campaign, 10 miles in length, and connecting the Jezreel and Jordan valleys, occupied only 7 days’ respite was allowed to the men of Jabez in Gilead (11 3), during which news was sent to Saul at Gibeath, and messengers dispatched “throughout the borders of Israel” (ver 7), while the host gathered at Beth-shemesh on the 7th or 8th day (v 8 10) at dawn. Bezeek 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 Jabez, which probably lay in the upper part of Gilead, 20 miles distant 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 Bezeek 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 Geba (or Gibeath, 13 3), or a governor (of LXX), whom Jonathan slew. They came up to Michmash (Mochmids) 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 Bozez (“shining”) in contrast to the south (Gath), wherein the Philis were described as “star-nosed” or “thorn” (14 4). Jos (Jr, V, ii, 2) says that Gibeath 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 Suweinit, or “the valley of little thorn trees.” Jonathan climbed the steep slope that leads to a small flat top (1 14 14 AV), and surprised the Phili and their forces. The pursuit was by Bethel to the Valley of Ajalon, down the steep Beth-horon pass (v 23 31); but it should be noted that there was no “wood” (v 25 26) on this bare hilly ridge, and the word (of 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.

David’s early life—Doe. The period of Saul’s reign, the wilderness below Bethlehem, where many a silent and dreadful “Valley of Shadows” (cf Ps 23 3) might make the stoutest heart fail. The lion crept up from the Jordan valley, and (on another occasion) the bear came up through the rugged moun- tain above (1 17 34). No bears are now known S. of Hermon, but the numerous references (2 K 2 21; Isa 59 11; Hos 13 8; Prov 17 12; 28 15) show that they must have been exterminated, like the lion, in comparatively late times. The victory over Goliath, described in the chapter containing this allusion, occurred in the Valley of Elah near Shocoth (Shuweteke); and this broad valley (Wady es Sulit) ran into the Phili plain at the probable site of Gath (Tell es Sib) to which the pursuit led (1 17 1 252). The watercourse still presents “smooth stones” (ver 40) fit for the sling, which is still used by Arab shepherds; and the valley still has in it fine “terebinth”-like trees from whose shades David took his support in his armor of the giant (v 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 narrative 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 Assyr) 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 Ahab’s sons were sent from Samaria to Jezebel to be exposed at the gate.

David’s outlaw life began when he took refuge with Samuel at the “settlements” (Nadish) near Ramah, where the company of prophets lived. He easily met Jonathan near Gibeath, which was only 2 miles E.; and the “stone of departure” (“Ezel,” I S 20 19) may have marked the Levitical boundary of that town. Nob also (21 1) was, as we have seen, not far off, and reached Jabez on the 7th or 8th day (v 8 10) at dawn. Bezeek appears to be a different place from that W of Jerus (Jgs 1 4) and to have been in the middle of Pal at Betk, 14 miles N. of Shechem, and 25 miles W. of Jabez, which probably lay in the upper part of Gilead, 20 miles distant 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 Bezeek to Jabesh, there would have been just time for the gathering of Israel at this fairly central meeting-place.
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side of the same valley, 3 miles farther up; and Hereth (22 5) was also near, but "in Judah" (22 3), as at the passage Kerohai on a wooded spur 7 miles N.W. of Hebron, and then the "dovens" (ver 4) to Keilah 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" (háres) may more probably be a proper name, represented by the ruin of Khoreis, 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 called Maon (Mr. Maon) 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 wells 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). Maon of Maon (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 is a large (impossible 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.

Defeat and Death of Saul.—The site of Ziklag is doubtful, but it evidently lay in the desert S. of Beer-sheba (Josh 16 31; 19 5; 1 Ch 4 30; 1 27 6 12), far from Gath, so that King Achish did not know whether David had railed the S. of Judah, or the tribes toward Shur. Saul's power in the mountains was irresistible; and it was for this reason perhaps that his fatal battle with the Philis occurred far N. in the plain near Jezreel. They camped (1 28 4) by the fine spring of Shunem (Šulam), and Saul on Gilboa to the S. The visit to Endor (Adufr) was thus a perilous adventure, as Saul must have been visited by night round the Phili host to visit this place N. of Shunem. He returned to the spur of Gilboa on which Jezreel stands (29 1), and this spring (now Jezreel) is a copious and only N. of the village Zeror (31 12) was at the mouth of the valley of Jezreel at Beisán, and here the bodies of Saul and his sons were burned by the men of Jabesh-gilead; but, as the bones were preserved (ver 13), 1 Ch 21 13), it is possible that the corpses were cremated in pottery jars afterward buried under the tree. Excavations in Pal and in Babylonia show that this was an early practice, not only in the case of infants (as at Gezer, and Taanach), but also of grown men. See PALESTINE (RECENT EXPLORATIONS). The list of cities to which David sent presents at the time of Saul's death (30 26 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.

(6) Wellhausen's 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 sultan and public chieftain of Saul, and on the fact that the gloomy 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, 429 430; and David as a "youth" of twenty years, may yet have been called a "man of war," while "transplanted" (p. 67) will hardly be recognized by the reader of this genuine chronicle. Nor was there any "Ašpek in Sharon" (p. 260), and David not "amused himself by going first toward the north" from Gilbeah (p. 267); his visit to Ramah does not appear to be a "worthless anachronistic anecdote" (p. 271); and no one who has written in the terrible Jeshimon could regard the meeting at Hachilah as a "jest" (p. 265). Nor did the hill ("the ducy top") "take its name from the "dovens" (p. 272)"—probably means the Sālāḥa-māḥikbākh ("cliff of slipping" or "of slipping away") near the valley of Maon (1 S 33 19 24 25), which lay farther S. than Zipp.

(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 1 13), where the pool was very near the only N. of David's capital at Hebron. Nothing more is said about the Philis till David had captured Jerus, when they advanced on the new capital by the valley of Rehphaim (5 22), which apparently ran from S. of Jerus to join the valley of Elah. If David was then at Adullam ("the hold," ver 17 AV; of 1 S 22 5), it is easy to understand how he cut off the Philis retreat (2 S 25), and thus conquered all the hill country to Gezer (ver 7). After this campaign, brought from Baale-judah (Kiriath-jearim) to Jerus (6 2), and further wars were beyond the limits of Western Pal, in Moab (8 2) and in Syria (vs 3 12); but for "Syrians" (ver 13) the more correct reading appears to be the Eomites (1 Ch 12 21 and the "Valley of Salt" was probably S. of the Dead Sea. Another war with the Syrians, aided by Arameans from E. of the Euphrates, occurred E. of the Jordan (2 S 10 16 18), and was followed by the siege of the Mabhabh-замра ("Amman), the gateway where they have notice of the "city of waters" (12 27), or lower town by the stream, contrasted, it seems, with the citadel which was on the northern hill.

(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 Cananaeans wrote letters on clay tablets in cuneiform script. These, however, were penned by special scribes; and such a scribe is mentioned elsewhere (Jes 8 14). In addition, we have noticed these, where they have employed a professional writer (2 S 8 17), while Uriah, who carried his own letter in the letter, was probably unable to read. Even in Isaiah's time the art was not general (Isa 29 12), though Heb kings could not apparently write at all (Jer 17 18; 2 K 19 14); to the present day the accomplishment is not general in the East, even in the upper class. It should be noted that the first evidence of the use of an alphabet is found in the early alphabetic Ps and the oldest dated alphabetic text yet known is later than 900 BC. The script used in the time of Moses may have been cuneiform, which was still employed at Gezer for traders' tablets in 409 BC. The alphabet may have come into use first among Hebrews, through Phoen influence in the time of David; and so far no script except this and the cuneiform has been unearthed in Pal, unless it is to be recognized in signs of the Hitite syllabary at Lachish and Gezer. Another interesting point, is, that Hebrew civilization in David's time, is the first mention of "malchus" (2 S 13 20; 18 9; 1 K 3 33 38), which are unnoticed in the Pent. They are represented as pack animals on an Assyrian bas-relief; but, had they been known to Moses, they would probably have been condemned as unclean. The sons of David fed on mules from Baal-hazor (Tell jājār) to Eribhaim (now probably Tā'ā'ibeh), N. of Bethel, where Absalom murdered Amnon.
(9) Later Years of David's Reign.—On the rebellion of Absalom David retreated to Mahanaim, apparently by the road N. of the Mount of Olives, if the Tg. of Judith (14 15 5) is correct in placing Bahurim at Almon (‘Almût), N.E. of Jerus. It is not clear where the "woe 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 (‘Abîth), 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 went S. of the Jordan to Arerō (perhaps the city on the Arnon), to the "river of Gad" (Wâdy Nâ'âdr) near Jazer, and through Gilead. Tahsim-hodshi (24 6) is believed (on the authority of three Gr MSS) to be a corruption of "the Hittites at Kadesh" (Kodesh), the great city on the Orontes (see Hittûttes), which lay on the northern boundary of David's dominions, S. of the kingdom of Hamath. Thence Joab returned to Zidôn and Tyre, and after visiting all Judah to Beersheba reached Jerus again within ten 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 Zebulûn (the text is doubtful, for the order of ver 17 differs in LXX), (k) Benjamin, (l) Reuben. LXX renders the last clause (ver 18), "and one Naphsh [i.e. officiate] 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 Tishphah on the Euphrates (vs 21 24; of 9 18=Tamar; 2 Ch 8 4=Tadmor). Another Tishphah (now Tashkhar) 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.—Jero- boam was an Ephraimite from Zereda, probably within 4 miles N.M. of Bethel, but the LXX reads "Sarîna," which might be Sarro, 1½ miles E. of Shiloah. 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). Ramash (er-Râm) being a frontier town with Qina and Mizpah (16 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 Tell Mâsir, 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 main road 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 (Sourphûd), S. of Sidon, to Madânah. 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 Makrâkhah ("the place of burning") at the southeastern end of the Carmel ridge. Some early king of Israel perhaps, or one of the judges (of Dt 33 19), had built an altar to Jeh above the Kishôn (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 Shumammite 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 Zerûîn), where rock-cut 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 Jîfîtlûn, 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 Arûn (Aroer), 10 miles S. of Beth-shan. If we suppose that Ophel (2 K 5 24 Rvr), where he lived, was the present "Afulâh, it is not only easy to understand that he would often "pass 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 Reîmûâ) 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 (Kûrân), 4 miles W. of Ibleam (Yebôn), on the road to "the garden house" (Beit Jeneû), and thence by Megiddo (Mu-ribûd) down to 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 Mesha's account on the M S agrees with the OT, even in the minute detail that "men of Gad dwelt in Ataroth from 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 Benjamites built up Loed (Laud), Ozo (Kafir 'Anat) and Ader (Adar), which in the list of towns in the books of the Lists of Thothmes III, a century before the Heb conquest, on the shores of the Dead Sea (cf. access 8.5.13), is known to us from the first signs of the OT. His list of Rehoboth's fortresses (2 Ch 11 6-10) includes 14 towns, most of which were on the borders of the diminished kingdom of Judah, some being noticed (such as Ash and Mearah) in the lists of Edom. He speaks of the "valley of Ziphathiah" (14 10), now Wady Safah, which is otherwise unnoticed, and places it correctly at Mearah (Meara'ab) on the edge of the Philistian. He is equally clear about the topography in describing the attack on Jezreel by the Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites. They camped at En-gedi ('Atin Jidy), and marched W. toward Tokok (Edom) captivity and sanctuary, after the Heb victory, was in the valley of Beraea (2 Ch 30 20; 4.28), which retains its name as Beershe'l, 4 miles W. of Aijalon.

IV. Palestine in the Poetic Books of the OT.

In Job the scene is distinctly Edomite. Uz (Job 1:1; cf. Gen 22 21 ETV; Jer 25 20; of Job 46 11) are the Assygr Hezu and Bazu reached by Earhart in 1673 BC S. of Edom. Tema and Sheha (Job 6 19) are noticed yet earlier, by Tiglath-pileser III, and Sargon, who conquered the Thamudites and Nabataeans. We have to place the conquest 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 Yezre'l or E. There were mines, not in the Sinaitic 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 (33 13) are known only in the desert E. of Edom, while the stork (33 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 25; Dt 33 17), though such bones occur in the 1.700 BC in Syria by Tiglath-pileser I (cf. Pss 29 6), and is mentioned as late as the time of Isaiah (34 7) in connection with Edom; its Heb name ("kayn") is often compared to 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. Beheroth (40 15), 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 tamed in the upper 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 Jewish tradition in the 4th cent. (St.Silva, and W. Delitzsch) traced Uz in the LXX (42 18) defines it as lying "on the boundary of Edom and Arabia." None of these allusions serves to fix dates, nor do the peculiarities of the language, though they suggest Amarn. and Arab. influences. The mention of Babylonians (1 17) (Kadisz) 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 Kadesh-barnea) and of Nebuchadnezzer, at least clear (24 12-13) that this great poem was written in a time of general anarchy, and of Arab lawlessness.

In the Ps there are many allusions to the natural phenomena of Pal, but there is very little detailed topography. The Ps of David's conquest of Damascus (Ps 22 11, 13) refers to the time of Solomon, being the last in the original collection of "prayers of David" (ver 20). In Ps 24 we find a confederacy of Edom, Ishmael, Moab and the Hagarites (or "wanderers") E. of Pal; cf. Ps 1 19-22 with Gen (in Lebanon), Ammon, Amalek, and Tyre, all in alliance with Assyria—a condition which first existed in 732 BC, when Tiglath-pileser III conquered Damascus. "Edom is the hidden" (Ps 16 11; Isa 9 1) by Prov the allusions are more peaceful, but not geographical. "I only refer to Edom in Ps 8, 12, 13; 15 11, 13, to trade (7 16; 13 14); and to Edom and to Tyre (33 10, 15) as the inaccessible passage (38 6) reads literally, "As he that packs a stone into the stonecutter's manger, so is he that gathers". Jerome said that this referred to a superstitious custom: and the erection of stone heaps at graves, or round a funeral pyre (Gen 31 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 Zep 1 18, 399, 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 (6:5-7:14). It is not confined, as many say it is, 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 heena (Arv mphimos) and the vineyards of En-gedi (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 (Assyr Sinor) and Hermion (4 8) above Damascus (7 4). He speaks of the 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 pacifici) are like the thick copes of Carmel; the king is in sight in the gallery (6 4). She is "beautiful as Tirzah (in Samaria), comely as Jezus, terrible to look at" (6 4 AV). She is a garden and a "paradise" ("orchard") of spices in Lebanon, some of which spices (calamus, cinnamom, 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 (3 6); and the dust raised by his followers, is like that of the wild ass, which stalk which 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 "paradise" (Hb Hekhalot) is also not Pers (6 11), for the Arar, word שָׁם, jash, is Sem, and means a "pair," implying 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 Assyr (habal будал), as noted by Delitzsch (quoting WAF, V, 32, no. 4), referring to a white bulbous plant.
Sharon in spring is covered still with wild narcissi, Arab. *būsel* (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 rose 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 (1-8) 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 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 (Mukhmās), and Geba, S. of the Michmash valley (Jeho), leading to the flight of the villagers, from Ramah (er-Rám) and the region of Gebesh—which included Ramah, with Geba (1 S 22:6) and Migron (1 S 14:2) or “the precipice.” They were alarmed also at Gallim (Bait Jāla), and Anathoth (‘Anadā), 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-Nasbeh). The main north road leading W. of Ramah.

Another passage refers to the towns of Moab (Isa 15:1-6), and to Nimrin (Tell ‘Nīmīn) and Zoor (Tell esh-Shāghār) in the valley of Shittim. The ascent of Luhith (ver 5) is the present Ta‘al 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 EGLATH-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, surviving in the central group of three rude pillars, which still remain in Moab (SEP, I, 187, 203, 293) near Nebo and Zoor. Sīmāh—probably ostrich want of care for her young, because she endeavors (like other birds) to escape, and thus draws away the hunter from the nest. 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 Ezek (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 2:13; 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 Eleutherus River toward Zedad (Sīdād). It is described also in Nu 34:8-11 as passing Riblah (Riblōh) and including Ain (el ‘Ain), a village on the western slopes of the Anti-Lebanon, E. of Riblah. In this passage (as in Ezek 47:18) the Hazmon (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 Havoth-jair (Nu 32:41; Dt 3:14; Josh...
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 running from Kadesh to Bethel. From Cederon (Køthah, 5 miles E. of Jamnia) southeast of the present village of el Mughir on the low hills with a sea view, 17 miles from Jerus and 6 miles south of Lydda, near Cedron (Okom s.v. "Modeim") places Modin. The first victory of Judas (3:24) was won at Beth-horon, and the second at Emmaus, "Caesarea", by the Greeks, the latter scene of Joshua's victories also.

The Green text attempted to reach Jerus from the S., and were again defeated at Beth-zur (4:29), now Beit-Sfir, on the wetside, 15 miles S. of Jerus, where the road runs through a pass. In the year 165 BC Judas was defeated at Bethsacharias (6:32), now Beit-shärâb, a mile S. of Jerus, but the cause was saved, and the whole of the kingdom was in the hands of the Jews. In the year 159 BC Judas was defeated at Kaphath-salama (perhaps Melkhat-salama) and penetrating to the Moab border, 36 miles S.E. of Beth-horon, in the year 153 BC, the battle in which Judas was killed (9:5:15) was fought also near Beth-horon. He came upon the Greeks from the east close by, and defeated the Greeks on his right, driving them to Mt. Aretus (or Beth-zetho, according to Jos. Ant. XII. 6:1), seven years later he won a final victory at Cedron (Køthah), near Jamnia (Yebrah), but was murdered at Dedor (16:15), near Jericho, which site was a small fort at Ain Dâbîk, a spring N. of the city.

The second book of Maccabees presents a contrast to the first in which, as we have seen, the geography is easily understood, and the site of Caphänit at the mouth of the river. It seems to be placed in Idumæa, and Charax Pericandus—still the usual names (Jerusalem (16:17). Ephrôn, W. of Asher-thor-Karnaim (26:27), is unknown; and Beth-shemesh is called by its later name Bethshan (14:27; Jgs 1:27) and in Jos (Ant. XII. viii. 5:6; vi. 1). A curious passage (Ant. XII. viii. 6) seems to refer to a certain tower (still used by Parsees), one of which appears to have existed at Berea (Aleppo), though this was a Greek custom.

VII. Palestine in the NT.—We are told that Our Lord was born in "Bethlehem of Judæa"; and the theory of Neubauer, adopted by 1. Synoptic Grits, that Bethlehem of Zebulun Gospels (Josh 19:15)—which was the present Beth, Lod, 7 miles N.W. of Nazareth—

is to be understood, is based on a mistake. The
Jews 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 (Geog. du Talm, 189), but the Talm (Talm Jerus, M’shālāh 11) calls the place Bethlehem-gīrād ("of balms"), 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 at Nazareth in Zebulun, and the ministry at Capernaum in Naphtali (of Mt 4:13-15; Is 9:1), with yearly visits to Jerusalem. 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 fishers; the east nets and drag 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.

The name (Heb nāqārād) 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" (nēger, 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 wherein their city was built" (4:29) is traditionally the "hill of the leap" (Jebel Kafṣa), 2 miles to the S. edge of 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 Galilean (Jn 1:40) 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 (Nāṣūrah) 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 been planted in the 4th cent. BC. It was identified doubtfully 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 6:58), Christian tradition, since the 4th cent. AD, has placed the site at Tell Hum, where ruins of a synagogue (probably, however, not older than the 2nd cent. AD) exist; but this site is not in the plain of Gennesaret, and is more probably Kfar 'Aḥim (Talm Bab, M’shālāh 80a). Jewish tradition (Gihon Tikkunoth, vii.20) connects Capernaum with Minim or "heretics"—that is to say Christians—whose name may yet linger at 'Ain Minyeh at the north end of the plain of Gennesaret. Jos states (2B, III, x, 8) that the spring of Capernaum watered this plain, and contained the carpos (coracinus) which is still found in 'Ain el Mudawwarah ("the round spring"), which is the principal source of water in the Gennesaret oasis.

(4) The site of Chorazin (Kerāzēh) has never been lost. The ruined village lies about 2 miles N. of Tell Hum 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 (Pa‘l Il‘uṣur, 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; B, 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 (Mt 14:13-21) and the 4,000 (Mk 8:19-21) as both done E. of the Jordan, the former (Lk 9:10) in the desert of Golon ("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. Ms), probably at Keras on the eastern shore opposite Tiberias, where there is a steep slope to the water. It should be noted that this was in Decapolis (Mt 5:20), a region of "ten cities" which lay (except Seythopolis) in Southwest Bashan, where a large number of early Gr inscriptions have been found, some of which (e.g. Vogē-Waddington, nos. 2412, 2413) are as old as the 1st cent. BC. There was evidently a Gr population in this region in the time of Our Lord; and this accounts for the feeding of swine, otherwise distinctive of "a far country" (Lk 16:15-16); for, while no Hebrew would have tended swine, the uncircumcised of the North 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 Genesaret plain (Mt 16:39). In Mk 8:10 we find Dalmanutha instead. Magdala was the Heb mgideh ("townhouse") which stands at the head of the stream (Mo-jackson) that runs thence to the sea N. of of Acts oppa, and it was thus a half-way station between Jerusalem and the seaside capital of Caesarea, and the lake, called el-Ain ("head of the spring"), and a cairn, built in the 12th cent., stands above the waters. The old Rom road runs close by (SWP, II, 258). Caesarea was a new town, founded by Herod the Great about 20 BC (SWP, II, 13-20). It was even larger than Caesarea on the older harbor. Thence we may leave Paul with Paul in 60 AD. The reader must judge whether this study of the country does not serve to vindicate the sincerity and authenticity of Bible narratives in the OT and the NT alike.

LITERATURE. Through the years the number of really original and scientific sources of knowledge is (as in other cases) not large. Besides the Biblical text, the Mishnah contains a great deal of valuable information as to the cultivation and civilization of Pal about the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. The following 20 works are of primary importance: The Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome shows intimate acquaintance with Pal in the 4th cent. AD, though the identification of Bible sites is as often wrong as right. The rabbinical geography is discussed by Leibniz, Neuland, Talmud, 1868), and the scattered notices by Gr and Rom writers were collected by H. R. Palmer, The termss or minimus eucteris itulatores, 2 vols, 1714). The first really scientific account of the country is that of Fr. J. Robinson Bib. Researches, 1836, and Later Bib. Researches, 1852; in 3 vols, 1856). The Survey of Western Pal (7 vols, 1853) includes the present writer's account of the natural features, topography and surface remains of all ages, written while in command (1872-78) of the 1-inch topographical survey. The Survey of Eastern Pal (1 vol, 1889) gives his account of Moab and Southern Gilead, as surveyed in 1881-82. The topographical history is to be studied in the same series, and in Canon Tristram's Natural History of the Bible, 1868. The geology is best given by L. Lartet (Essai sur la géologie de la Palestine) and in Professor Hall's Memoir on the Geol. and Geog. of Arabia Petraea, etc., 1886. The Archeological Researches of M. Clermont-Ganneau (2 vols, 1896) include his discoveries of Gezer and Adullam. Much information is scattered through the PEQ (1864-1910) and TDVP. G. Schumacher's Across the Jordan, 1885, Pella, 1885, and Northern 'Ajlun, 1890, give detailed information for Northeast Pal: and Lachish, by Professor Flinders Petrie, is the memoir of the excavations which he began at Tell el-Hesi (identified in 1874 by the present writer), the full account being in A Mound of Many Cities by P. E. Newberry, 1895-99. Other excavations, at Gaza, etc, are described in Excavations in the Delta (1895-1900), by F. J. Bliss, R. S. A. Macalister, and Professor W. M. R. Smith; and for the Mesopotamian excavations, that are not recently been published by Rev. W. M. R. Smith. For those who have access to these original sources, The Historical Geography of the Holy Land and Halbfass, A. Smith, 1889, and the essay (300 pp.) by Professor D. P. Duh (Geographie des alten Palastien, 1890) will be found useful. The best guide book to Pal is still that of Bieder, written by Dr. A. Sohn and published in 1876, 1912. This author had personal acquaintances with the principal routs of the country. Only standard works of reference have been here mentioned, with which French, German, American, and British explorers and scholars have alike contributed. See Jerusalem.
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LITERATURE

Previous to the last century, almost the entire store of knowledge concerning ancient Pal, including its races, physical language, and the more modern history and manners, was obtained through discoveries of Palestine in other countries; but due in many cases to Bib. influence. All the most important Heb and Gr MSS and VSS of the Bible and most of the Jewish Talm and apocryphal and Wisdom books were found outside of Pal. The pictures of its population, cities, fortresses and armies give a color and perspective to its ancient history far more vivid than can be found on any of its own contemporary monuments. The records of Thothmes III (15th cent. BC) describing the capture of Megiddo in the plain of Esdraslon with its vast stores of "chariots wrought with gold," bronze armor, silver and ebony statues, ivory and ebony furniture, etc., and of his further capture of 118 other Can. towns, many of which are well known from the Bible, and from which he takes an enormous tribute of war materials, golden ornaments and golden dishes, "too many to be weighed," find no parallel in any indigenous record—such records even if written down have been destroyed or lost because of the soil, climate and character of the rocks W. of the Jordan. So c 1400 BC, the Am Tab (discovered in 1887) mention by name many Bib. cities, and give much direct information concerning the political and social conditions of Pal during the time of the Hebrews. (Breasted, Ancient Records, 1, 490). A few other Egypt visitors (1300-1000 BC) add little to our knowledge. The principal sources of historical information are the Old Heb. writings, which are the most important observations, although they can only humorously be called "immediate explorers." Some of Bunsen's list of cities and tribes, although their boundaries are correctly described (chs 13-21), are naturally excluded from this review.

The record of early Christian travel begins with the Itinerarium Peregrinorum (352 AD), and during the next two centuries scores of others write out their observations in the Holy Land, but for 1000 years there is scarcely a single visitor who looks at the country and pays attention to the eyes of the monks. A woman traveler of the 4th cent. reports some interesting facts about the early status of the Jerusalem church and the catechumen teaching, and surprises us by locating Pithom correctly (although the site was totally forgotten until one of the mariners in 1853), and the Epitome of Eusebius (5th cent.) gives a clear description of the holy places in Jerus.; but almost the only other significant sign that anyone at this era ever made serious observations of value comes from the very large, though false, description of the 5th cent. recently discovered at Magdala, which gives a good impression of ancient Jerus. with its buildings, and a careful bird's-eye view of the surrounding country. By the middle of the 6th cent. the old "Holy Places" were protected, and new churches, which turned on the marble, were built. Later discoveries, like the CH at Suss (1901), the Sendjirli and other Aram. texts from Northern Syria (1890, 1908), and the Elephantine papyri, some of which are addressed to the "sons of Sanballat" and describe a temple in Egypt erected to Yahu (Jehovah) in the 5th cent. BC, may not give direct information concerning Pal, but are important to present explorers because of the light thrown upon the laws of the land in patriarchal times, upon the thought and language of a neighboring Sem community at the time of the Monarchy; upon the religious ritual and festivals of Nehemiah's day, and upon the general wealth and culture of the Jews of the 3rd cent.; opening up also for the first time the intimate relations which existed between Jerus. and Samaria and the Jews of the Dispersion. So the vast amounts of Gr papyri found recently in the Fayum probably have only preserved the "Login" and "Lost Gospels" and fragments of Scripture texts, early Christian Egypt ritual, etc., but have been given to scholars for the first time contemporaneous examples of the colloquial language which the Jews of Pal were using in the 1st cent. AD, and in which they wrote the "memoirs" of the apostles and the Gospels of Jesus.

1. Early Christian period.—At this time, during the first three or four centuries the ancient sites and holy places were identified, giving some valuable information as to the topographical and historical map of the early church. By far the most valuable of these carefully prepared summaries of ancient Bible places, with their modern sites, and the distances between them, was the Onomasticon of Eusebius, as it was enlarged by Jerome, which attempts to seriously the identification of some 300 holy places, most of these being vitally important for the modern student of the Bible. While some of these identifications were "curiously incorrect" (Bliss) and the distances entirely too large, these few satisfactory additions were made to the list for 1,500 years; and it was certainly a splendid contribution to Palestinian topography, for the list as a whole has been confirmed by the scientific conclusions of recent investigators.

2. Period of curiosus observatio.—The earliest traveler who has left a record of his journey into Pal was Sinunhit, who, perhaps a century after Abraham, mentions a number of places known to us from the Bible and describes Canaan as a "land of figs and vines, . . . where wine is more pleasant than wine, and honey and oil in abundance . . . all kinds of fruit upon its trees, barley and spelt in the fields, and cattle beyond number on each day. . . . There is cornbread, wine, cooked flesh and roasted fowl . . . wild game from the hills and eels in the sweet English" (Breasted, Ancient Records, 1, 490). A few other Egypt visitors (1300-1000 BC) add little to our knowledge. The principal sources of historical information are the Old Heb. writings, which are the most important observations, although they can only humorously be called "immediate explorers." Some of Bunsen's list of cities and tribes, although their boundaries are correctly described (chs 13-21), are naturally excluded from this review.

The record of early Christian travel begins with the Itinerarium Peregrinorum (352 AD), and during the next two centuries scores of others write out their observations in the Holy Land, but for 1000 years there is scarcely a single visitor who looks at the country and pays attention to the eyes of the monks. A woman traveler of the 4th cent. reports some interesting facts about the early status of the Jerusalem church and the catechumen teaching, and surprises us by locating Pithom correctly (although the site was totally forgotten until one of the mariners in 1853), and the Epitome of Eusebius (5th cent.) gives a clear description of the holy places in Jerus.; but almost the only other significant sign that anyone at this era ever made serious observations of value comes from the very large, though false, description of the 5th cent. recently discovered at Magdala, which gives a good impression of ancient Jerus. with its buildings, and a careful bird's-eye view of the surrounding country. By the middle of the 6th cent. the old "Holy Places" were protected, and new churches, which turned on the marble, were built. Later discoveries, like the CH at Suss (1901), the Sendjirli and other Aram. texts from Northern Syria (1890, 1908), and the Elephantine papyri, some of which are addressed to the "sons of Sanballat" and describe a temple in Egypt erected to Yahu (Jehovah) in the 5th cent. BC, may not give direct information concerning Pal, but are important to present explorers because of the light thrown upon the laws of the land in patriarchal times, upon the thought and language of a neighboring Sem community at the time of the Monarchy; upon the religious ritual and festivals of Nehemiah's day, and upon the general wealth and culture of the Jews of the 3rd cent.; opening up also for the first time the intimate relations which existed between Jerus. and Samaria and the Jews of the Dispersion. So the vast amounts of Gr papyri found recently in the Fayum probably have only preserved the "Login" and "Lost Gospels" and fragments of Scripture texts, early Christian Egypt ritual, etc., but have been given to scholars for the first time contemporaneous examples of the colloquial language which the Jews of Pal were using in the 1st cent. AD, and in which they wrote the "memoirs" of the apostles and the Gospels of Jesus.
gathered from the multitude of pilgrims between the 6th and 15th centuries. The text mentions Henry Thode, who noticed certain inscriptions and tombs, describes accuracies in the observation of sites, and discusses the importance of light. The text highlights the contributions of C. H. Rickman to the study of ancient sites and their identification. It also mentions the work of B. F. Lynch, who accurately identified and published important archaeological observations. The text notes the importance of the work of Lieutenant Lynch (1810-1875), who made accurate identifications and published important observations.

2. Era of Scientific Exploration.

(a) First Travelled Area. The scientific exploration opened with the excavation at Pal, in which men had to think of the human activities on the seacoast, and not as a short episode in a life devoted to more serious pursuits. The text mentions the work of Lieutenant F. F. Klein (1838-1852), who was able to set a large number of successful identifications of sites and contributing much to the general knowledge of Pal. The text also mentions the work of Theodor Koepcke (1838-1872), who popularized results and made a considerable number of discoveries. The text notes the work of C. H. Rickman (1800-1875) and B. F. Lynch (1810-1812) in Pal, who accurately identified and published important observations.

(b) Fourteen Years of Scientific Work. The text mentions the work of Lieutenant Lynch (1810-1875), who was able to set a large number of successful identifications of sites and contributing much to the general knowledge of Pal. The text also mentions the work of C. H. Rickman (1800-1875) and B. F. Lynch (1810-1812) in Pal, who accurately identified and published important observations.

(c) The monuments of Central Asia and remaining accounts. The text mentions the work of Lieutenant Lynch (1810-1875), who was able to set a large number of successful identifications of sites and contributing much to the general knowledge of Pal. The text also mentions the work of C. H. Rickman (1800-1875) and B. F. Lynch (1810-1812) in Pal, who accurately identified and published important observations.

(d) The monuments of Central Asia and remaining accounts. The text mentions the work of Lieutenant Lynch (1810-1875), who was able to set a large number of successful identifications of sites and contributing much to the general knowledge of Pal. The text also mentions the work of C. H. Rickman (1800-1875) and B. F. Lynch (1810-1812) in Pal, who accurately identified and published important observations.

(e) The monuments of Central Asia and remaining accounts. The text mentions the work of Lieutenant Lynch (1810-1875), who was able to set a large number of successful identifications of sites and contributing much to the general knowledge of Pal. The text also mentions the work of C. H. Rickman (1800-1875) and B. F. Lynch (1810-1812) in Pal, who accurately identified and published important observations.

With the foundation of the Palestine Exploration Fund, it took on an entirely new phase, since in this case, 2. Scientific not a single individual, but a large cooperative company of specialists entered the Surface Exploration work, having behind them sufficient exploration funds for adequate investigation in each necessary line of research, and with the British War Office furnishing its expert Royal Engineers to assist the enterprise. Under the auspices of this society during the next 12 years, Jesus was explored as never before, and all Western Pal was topographically surveyed (see below); a geological survey (1883-1894) of Sinai, Wady Arabah and the Dead Sea, and later of Mt. Seir (1885) was accomplished. During this period of time, the natural history of the country was treated with great thoroughness by several specialists; Palmer and Drake in the desert of Syrain natives, without servants, risked the dangerous journey through the desert, guided by old Palestinian custom to the actual point of the route of the Exodus; Clemente-Guerino, who had previously made the discovery of the Jewish pilgrimage from the Temple, forbidding strangers to enter the sacred enclosure, added greatly to archaeological knowledge by gathering and deciphering many ancient inscriptions, uncovering buried
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 "gate, the house," "Zoeth," etc., and made innumerable plans of churches, tombs, gates, 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 palm-names and have gathered, 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 débris and traced its approximate outline; examined underground rock chambers; opened ancient streets; discovered many thousands of pieces of pottery, glass, stone, etc., just to Jewish by Byzantine, and the region in the Tyropeon Valley, where Robinson's arch had rested, and also parts of the ancient bridge; traced the line of several important ancient walls, looking gates and towers, and fixed the date of one wall certainly as of the 8th cent. B.C, 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 Midday's (1875), in his masterly memoirs on the examination of the Temple area in Great Cafar and Guthrie (1881), who made fine additional discoveries at Ophel, as well as War 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 (1881–86), accomplished for Jundia and Samaria by Col. Conder, and for Galilee by Lord Kitchener, 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 magnificently engraved memoirs, furnish the strong 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 published large quantities of tracts 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 to 860 than in the 17 centuries before.

The next ten years (1890–90) did not furnish as much new material from Pal exploration, but in 1880 the Silasam Inscription (of 2 K 20 20; 2 Ch 32 30) was accidentally found in Jerus, showing the accuracy with which the engineers of Hezekiah's stone of Bethphage, which in the 18th cent. (1724), at least, occasionally, cut long tunnels through the rock (see also Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Research, 313); and in 1881–85 Conder and Schumacher attempted their difficult task of making a scientific topographical map of Eastern Pal. In 1881 H. Clay Trumbull rediscovered and properly described Kadesh-barnes, settling authoritatively its location and thus making it possible to fix previously obscure places mentioned in the account of the Exodus. The tombs, gates, etc., and many 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 of the Jordan and through Petra down into Sinai have yielded important results, and many discoveries of surface tombs, ossuaries, mosaic, 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 the four Boundary Stones of Gezer (1874, 1881, 1889) by Conder and company, and, in 1886, of the very large mosaic at Madaba 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, esp. 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, and the foot 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. Era of Scientific Exploration. —(1) Tell el-Hes (Palestine Exploration Fund).—Expedi must always continue, but excavation

1. Southern is a vast advance. The modern era in Palestinian study begins with Petrie at LACHM (q.v.) in 1880. Though Renan was the first (1850) to put any study into the soil (1890), 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 around 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 ("tell") being artificial (of Josh 8 28; Jer 30 18); but not even Robinson or Guérin suspected that these were the necrophors of buried cities, but had believed them. The more natural and easy 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, c 30 miles SSW. 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, found at el-Asnam, that the site had been marked a city covering 1,000 years of history, the limits of occupation being probably 1500 BC to 300 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 had the good fortune to able out positively for the Gr epochs at Nauctri a year or two before, and for the epochs preceding 1100 BC at Ilhban in the Fayyam only a month or two before. The potsherds were fortunately very numerous and several of them had, in 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-Hes that all excavators have been forced to admit 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 of the absolute ages of the objects. He 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 Ionic volute, which the Greeks borrowed from the Assyrians, was brought here well over 1000 years before the ionic, while one pilaster 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 this 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 Pharaohs often mention it, and it is represented in a picture on an Assyrian monument, under which is written, "Sennacherib . . . receive the spoil of Lachish" (see 2 K 18 14). It was strategically a strong position 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, and the earliest importation of iron 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 such occupation were more exactly fixed and the beginning of the oldest city was put 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 of the party, and also from the great discipline of digging which had to be carried 6 miles, and from the sirocco (see my report, PEFS, XXI, 160–70 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. The burnt base 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 1,500 sq. ft., the latest only one-third of that. 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-Israelitic period (1550–500 BC) shows such importations and also local Cypriot influence. In the "Israel" period (800–300 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 tranch 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 pt ovens were found in the later ruins and most of the houses, animal 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 ears, and many Egyptian figures, symbols and animals 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 to which (one Bible) 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 empty Eudocia (650 AD), and under this the line of wall which Titus 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 dressed," with a gateway which must be either the remains of a wall of Solomon or some other pre-exilic fortification not later than the 8th cent. He found gates and ancient paved streets and manholes leading to ancient sewer systems, and many inscriptions, 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 Nehe- miah'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 located it on the Southwestern Hill where the citadel stands, probably lay on the Eastern Hill above the Virgin's Spring (Gihon). On this Eastern Hill at Ophel lay the Temple, and S. of the Temple on the same hill 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, where five or more small mounds were tunnelled, but without important results. The four chief sites were *Tell Zakariya*, lying about midway between Jerus and *Tell el-Hesy*; *Tell es-Sâ'teh*, 5 miles W. of *Tell Zakariya*, and *Tell Sandahannah*, about 10 miles S.; while *Tell el-Judeidah* lay between *Tell Zakariya* and *Tell Sandahannah*. As *Tell el-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-Israelithish town was found under some 20 ft. of débris, containing pre-Israelithish, Jewish and Seleucidan pottery. Many vaulted cisterns, partly hewn from the rock, were found in the lowest level, and later Jewish pit ovens were found and inscribed jar-handles with winged Egypt symbols, implements of bronze, iron, bone and stone, and Egypt images of Helios and the Horus eye, etc., besides a strange bronze figure of a woman with a fish's tail which seems to represent 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-Sâ'teh*. The camp was pitched near here in the Vale of Elah. From a depth of 21 ft. to the rock, the ancient town was excavated and was found the characteristic pre-Israelithish pottery and much imported pottery of the Mycenaean type. A high place was also found here, containing bones 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 Egypt and later Gr relics were also found, and four Bab seals and the usual pottery of the pre-Seleucid and later periods. 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 two smaller towers. The strongest wall averaged 30 ft. thick. The work done here was "unique in the history of Palestinian excavation" (Bliss). At *Tell el-Hesy* 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 Maresah (Josh 15 44), with its inner and outer walls, its gates and streets, the lowest mound being 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 yard was formed in the lowest perfectly rectangular 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 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 headress 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., un doubtfully 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-Hesy*, but 77 were found in these 4 sites, in connection with 2- or 4-winged symbols (Egypt scarabaeus or winged sun-disk). Writing-materials (stylis) were found in all the four towns, as well as iron, wine-pots, jars, vessels, etc. The remains were of the 2d, 1st half, 1st cent. BC, 2nd cent. AD, and many inscriptions dating from 1st cent. BC to 2d cent. AD were found in a small cabinet (Sp. 18). The inscriptions are in great variety, and are considered by some to be among the most important in the world. The inscriptions were mostly names of "Egyptian" type, and were found on pottery, jars, sailors, etc. A member of this town was buried with a sword and a necklace of precious stones. The town was destroyed by fire and then inhabited by Jewish and Roman settlers. The discovery of the town is of great importance to archaeologists, as it is the earliest town in the ancient world known to be inhabited by Jews.

**Stamped Jar-Handles, Lamp and Iron Implements from Tombs at Beit Jibrin.**

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
age more than this Phoen colony, living in Pal, using the Gr language but employing Egyp and Libyan characters freely in their funeral art.

(1) Tell Ta’anek (Austrian government and Vienna Academy).—During short seasons of three years (1902–4) Professor Ernst Sellin made a rapid examination of this town (Bib. Taanach), situated in the plain of Esdraelon in Northern Pal, on the ancient road between Egypt and

2. Northern Palestine. Many of the discoveries at K Talmi, rock-hewn (1000–1400) altars, having no bottom but with holes in its sides, in which adorers would cast when fire was kindled below; in its ornamentation showing a mixture of Bab and Egyp 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 heads of which are 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 Gezer. 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 (?). Egyp 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 “teraphim” (Gen 31:19,34; 1 Sam 6:22; Or. Research, 57 etc.), such as Rachel, being pregnant, took with her to protect her on the hard journey from Haran to Pal (Macalister).

The high place, with one or more steps leading up to it, suggesting “elevation, isolation and mystery” (Cicero, De leg. 4), was, like so 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 be an indication of the entrance of a different race, which doubled Pal. An interesting discovery was that of the dozen cuneiform tablets found in a terra cotta chest or jar (cf Jer 33:14) from the pre-Israelite city. These few letters cannot accurately be called “the first literary found daily”; but they show that there were there, since the personal and comparatively unimportant character of some of these notes and their easy and flowing style prove that literate hands and literary 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 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 Ashirah,” this deity recalling the Asherah or sacred post of the OT (see Images); another note is written by Abi-Yawi, a name which corresponds to Heb Abiah, thus indicating that the form of the Divine name was then known in Canaan, though its meaning (i.e. the essential name, Ex 6:3; 34:6; Neh 1:9; Jer 44:26) may not have been known. Abi-Yawi invokes upon Tishar—washur the blessing of the “Lord of the Gods.”

On the same level with these letters were found two subterranean ovens with a platform 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 building of which the city is entirely harmonious with the Bible accounts of its history (Josh 12:21; 17:11; Jgs 1:27; 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
between c 600 BC and 900 AD, i.e. it became a desolation about the time of the Bab 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 1905–6 by Dr. Andrae of the German expedition. The digging was conducted under the auspices of His Majesty the Kaiser and the Ger. Pal Society. The mound, about 5 miles N.W. from Ta'anach, stood prominently 120 ft. above the plain, the ruins reaching 1,405 ft. 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 x 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 Egyptian remains to go back as far as the 20th cent. BC, showed Hebrew habitation at a spot, indicating a surprising civilization, building magnificent city gates (57 x 36 ft.), large houses and tombs with vaulted roofs, and adorning their persons with fine scarabs of white and green steatite and other jewelry, bronze. It had very rich and 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 boulders were two children wearing beautiful bronze bracelets. The city lying above this begins as early as the 15th cent. BC, as is proved by a scarab of Thothmes III and by other signs, although the scarabs, while Egyptian in form, are often foreign in design and execution. Anyhow, bezel and other Egyptian features 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 (bronze?) tripods supporting lamps, on one of which is the figure of a warrior, being stratigraphically similar to pictures of Delphic oracles and to representations lately found in Crete (MDPV, 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 remarkable for 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 (medjed), 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 person of a 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, and a most elegant one ever engraved (see MDPV, 1906, 33). After seeing it the Sultan took it from the museum into his own private collection.

A second seal of lapis lazuli, which Schuch- masher and Kautzsch date from about the 7th cent. BC, also contains in Old Heb the name "Asaph" (cf M u. N, 1906, 334; MDPV, 1904, 147). There are several other remarkable works of art, as e.g. a woman playing the tambourine, wearing an Egyptian headdress; a series of at least several Astartes, and esp. a series of six terra cotta heads, one with a prominent Sem nose, another with Egyptian 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 basin set with three feet, a plate having a handle in the form of a flower, etc. Seemingly connected with the former town, this religious center was probably covered by a fourth, and one with a pyramidal top; so here several monotheists 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 dish rests on a base, and in some strata showing a surprising civilization, building magnificent city gates (57 x 36 ft.), large houses and tombs with vaulted roofs, and adorning their persons with fine scarabs of white and green steatite and other jewelry, bronze. It had very rich and 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 boulders were two children wearing beautiful bronze bracelets. The city lying above this begins as early as the 15th cent. BC, as is proved by a scarab of Thothmes III and by other signs, although the scarabs, while Egyptian in form, are often foreign in design and execution. Anyhow, bezel and other Egyptian features 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 (bronze?) tripods supporting lamps, on one of which is the figure of a warrior, being stratigraphically similar to pictures of Delphic oracles and to representations lately found in Crete (MDPV, 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 remarkable for 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 (medjed), 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 person of a 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, and a most elegant one ever engraved (see MDPV, 1906, 33). After seeing it the Sultan took it from the museum into his own private col-

lection. A second seal of lapis lazuli, which Schuch-
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, H Gut). 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 8 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 stonework and masonry" (The Builder): "Taken as a whole it may justly be regarded as a triumph of engineering skill which a modern nation, under the same conditions, could scarcely excel" (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 250 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 Can. 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 represent 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 with the tin and, when, according to the pottery, Israel ought to have captured the city, and it was confidently said that the distinctively Can. 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 1 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, cornmills, 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 cent. little Roman influence is discernible; the Assyrians and Egypt 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. But at Sendjirli that has "been copied from Syrian plantings" (Vincent). Absolutely unique was the series of 12 Rhodian jars handles stamped in Aram., "To Jehovah" (Yah, Yahu). 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-exile 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 Maccebean era (MNDPY, 1907; MDO, 1908-9; PEPS, 1910; Rev. biblique, 1907-9).

(1) Jerusalem.—See above, III, 1, (2).

(3) 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 Jerus. Ancient Samaria was very famous in Israel for its frugality and wealth, special mention being made of its expenditure of gold on the Temple and the Temple of Baal and palace were constructions of Ahab (1 K 15 32; 22 39); it continued prosperity down to the Assyr exile, 722 BC (1 K 22 to 2 K 17); Sargon and Esarhaddon established a Bab colony and presumably fortified the town (720-670 BC); Alexander the Great captured it in 331 BC, and established there a Syrio-Maccabean colony; it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 109 BC, but rebuilt by Pompey in 60 BC, and again by Herod (30-1 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 ruins lay immediately under the Bab and Gr buildings, must necessarily be Heb, the relative order of underlying structures thus being "beyond dispute" (Reisner). During 1908-9 George Reisner with a staff of specialists, including David G. Lyon of the Harvard University Museum, G. Schumacher, and an expert architect, undertook systematically and thoroughly to excavate this large detached "tell" bying 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, 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 Roman ruins. Many fine Roman 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 stadii 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 single floor. An altar, "an anchiravine 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 cela 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 retaining traces of color. Discovery of this temple was made close to 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, 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 potsherds. A few Gr g seal with a cartouche of 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-handles but ostraca, inscribed with records or memorials in ancient Hebrew. The script is Phenomenal, and valuable to such experts as Lyon and Driver, practically identical with that of the Silean Inscription (c 700 BC) and M S (c 590 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 Phen
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-ezer. For'Assl, Akhelemu (and) Ba'ala; From 'Elathan (?), . . . In 9th yr. From Yasst. For 'Abino'am. A jar of old wine. . . . In 11th yr. For Hotyo. 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 ordinarily in compounds. It is interesting to note the dates from 130–43; of Driver, PEFS, 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 inscrip
ions; 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; Reisner, ib, III, 246–63; also Theol. Literaturblatt, 1919, 126; Driver in MNOF, 1911, 23–27; Rev. biblique, VI, 435–45). (3) 'Ain Shems (Beth-shemes, 1 S 6 1–21; 2 K 14 11).—In a short but important campaign, during 1911–12, in which from 36 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 Egypt images, Syrian Astartes, imported Aegean vases and a remarkable series of inscribed royal jar-handles, the name of a "goe to the great archy" (Vincent), as also what seemed to be an ancient Sem tomb with façade entrance. The proved Cretan relations here are esp. important. The town was suddenly destroyed, probably in the era of Seti-marcher (PEFS, 1911, LAH, 1911, 12; 1911, XII, 145). (4) Gezer (Palestine Exploration Fund).—Tell el-Jezar occupies a conspicuous position, over 250 ft. above the plain, and 750 ft. over the sea, on a ridge of hills some 20 miles N.W. of Jerus, overlooking the plain toward Jaffa, which is 17 miles distant. It is in plain sight of the two chief trade caravans roads of Southern Pal which it controlled. The ancient Gezer was well known from many references to it in the text. The Egyptian gods Baal and Astarte, the two most powerful names here, are found in the names of several of the governors of Gezer being given in letters dating from c 1400 BC and Memphitis (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. The discoveries have thrown much light upon the development 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
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 XIlth Egypt Dynasty; (c) second Sem city (c. 1800–1400 BC), to the end of the XVllth Egypt Dynasty; (d) third Sem city (c. 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) Roman phase (100 BC–330 AD); (h) Byzantine (330–600 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 aboriginal non-Sem inhabitants of Gezer were troglodytes (Gen 14:1) living in the cave one honeycomb this district (cf ZDPV, 1909, VI, 12), modifying the cave or hewing out cells for homes. This was not always the case, for a small race 5 ft. 4 in. to 5 ft. 7 in. in height, slender in form, with rather broad head and thick skulls, who built or hewed caves and huts of rock, dug wells, gathered fire and cooked food; possessed no metals, made by hand a porous and gritty soft-baked pottery which they decorated with simple lines and dots; and were capable of a certain art—the oldest in Pal—in which drawings of various kinds and in some cases pictures of animals (possibly phallic); they probably offered sacrifices; they certainly cremated their dead, depositing with the ashes in a square cell about 4 ft. long by 2 ft. wide, and in it the bodies were burned while still in an upright posture. This tiny cup mound in the rocks suggests 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 highly organized, having their 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 height, having broader and thicker skull faces. They did not burn but buried their dead carelessly, the natural deposits of the grave and the deposits are the same as before; occasionally some heads are found with the body. The former race had surrounded their settlement with a wall 6 ft. high and 5 ft. thick, mostly earth, though faced with selected stones; but this race built a wall of hammerd stones, though irregularly cut and laid, the wall being 10 ft. thick, and one gateway being 42 ft. wide, flanked by two towers. While flutes were always the common residences (as in later eras), yet some buildings of stone were erected toward the close of this period and one large palace was found, built of large-boned, thicker-skulled, adobes and stone blocks, with a central, and containing a complex of rooms, including one rectangular court surrounded by a row of columns, long by 24 ft. wide. Remarkable of all were their works of engineering. They hewed enormous cisterns, square, rectangular and circular, out of the soft chalk and limestone rocks, of which contained 60 chambers, one chamber being 42 ft. in one room, however, was a tunnel which was made c 2000 BC, passing out of use c 1450–1250 BC, and which shows the power of these early Pal architects. About 2500–1500 BC a roadway cut through the hill of rock some 47 ft. to an inclination of 50°, high and 10 in. in breadth, 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 space 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. broad, connected the top of the passageway with a section of a tunnel 94 ft. above. Beyond the spring was a natural cave 80 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 place to answer? Can we certainly say that the tunnel was designed to bring the entrance of the water passage within the courtyard protected by the palace walls?"

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 once covered with layers of cement and surrounded by a wall; they would hold 60,000 gals.

(c) The second Sem city, built on the ruins of the first, was smaller. There were fewer buildings but larger rooms. The potter's wheel was used with the pottery becoming 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 (XVIIth and XVlth Dynasties) there was close intercourse with Pal, and many of Egypt articles show that this was also true before and after the Hyksos. The Cretan scarabs found and the Assyrian trade, e.g., show the introduction of new art ideas which soon brought local attempts at imitation. Scribers implement writing in wax and clay begin here and are found in all strata hereafter.

With the pottery is elaborately painted, it is but little molded. The "combed" pottery which is now rare disappears, while burnished ornament reaches high-water mark. As in other districts in Egypt the pottery is elaborately modeled and stuck on; but it is infantile art. Burials still occur in natural caves, but also in the rock itself; generally, the bodies were deposited on the floor without coffins, generally in a crouching position, 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 with the disappearance. 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 is found in an ivory 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 10 16, is the large increase of the town shortly after the Hebron 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 seals begin (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 c 1000 BC); a cooking-pot of bronze was found, and spoons of shell and bronze; modern methods of making buttons and button holes are used from this period.) The pottery buttons are being introduced in the next city. One interesting little reference 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
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 Egypt 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 tomb but there was 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 tombs, 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 court evil.

(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 mortality was excessively high, few old men being found in the cemeteries, while curvature of the spine, syphilis, brain disease, and esp. broken, unset bones were common. Tweezers, pins, needles, 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, 287–91; E. J. Pilcher, *PEFS*, 1912; A. R. S. Kenyon, *Expo T. 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 burnished as a rule was limited to random scratches. Multiple lamps became common, and a large variety of styles in small jugs was introduced. The motives of the last period survive, but in a degenerate form. The yellow friezes so characteristic of the 3d Sem 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, pentacles, etc.) or of names in Old Heb script. These Heb-inscribed stamps were found at many sites and consist of two classes,

(i) those containing personal names, such as Azariah, Haggai, Menahem, Shebannah, etc., (ii) those which are confined to four names, often repeated—Hebron, Socoh, Ziph, Mamsith—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 (of 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 names are prefixed to symbols which 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 by the kings of the time of the Assyrians, until after Israel entered Pal; but soon afterward we find an Assyrian colony settled in Gezer “using the Assyrian language and letters . . . . and carrying on business with Assyrian methods.” In one tablet (649 BC), which is a bill of sale for certain objects with a description of the same, appeared the name of the buyer, seal 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 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
oblong or rectangular, covered with large horizontal slabs, each tomb containing but a single body, stretched out with the head to the E. or W. One tomb was that of a girl of 18 with articles of alabaster and silver about her, and wearing a Cretan silver mouth plate; another was a man of 40 with agate seal of Assyrian design, a two-handled glass vessel, etc.; another was a woman surrounded by handsome ornaments of bronze, lead, silver, and gold, with a basalt sarcab between her knees. The richest tomb was that of a girl whose head had been severed from the body; with her was a hemispherical bowl, ornamented with rosette and lotus pattern, and a hoard of beautiful things. The iron in these tombs was noticeable (cf 1 S 17 7), and in one tomb were found two ingots of gold, one of these being of the same weight almost to a fraction as that of Arhan (Josh 7 21). The most impressive discovery was the high place. This began as early as 2500-2000 BC, and grew by the addition of monoliths and surrounding buildings up to this era. The eight huge uncult pillars which were found standing in a row, with two others fallen (yet cf Benzinger, Heb Archaeology, 320), show us the actual appearance of this ancient worshipping-place so famous in the Bible (Dt 16 22; 2 K 17 9.11; 23 8). The top of one of these monoliths had been worn smooth by kisses; another was an importation, being possibly, as has been suggested, a captured "Aril"; another stone, near by, had a large cavity in its top, nearly 3 ft. long and 2 ft. broad and 1 ft. 2 in. deep, which is differently interpreted as being the block upon which the 'debaerah, so often mentioned in connection with the mention of the bebahoth, may have been erected, or as an altar, or perhaps a laver for ritual 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 foundation 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 3d 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 overthrow all other Sem religions" (George Adam Smith, P.B.S., 1906, 288).

(1) During the Maccabean epoch the people of Gezer built reservoirs (one having a capacity of 4,000,000 gals.) used well-paved rooms, favored complex house plans with pillars, the courtyard becoming less important as compared with the rooms, though domestic fowls 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 imprecation 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 scrawled 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 run 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 akkhan, shafts, were collected into ossuaries, the inscriptions on these ossuaries showing clearly the transition from Old Hebr to the square character. After the Maccabean time the town was deserted, though a small Christian 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 (1890).; Ernst Sellin, Tell Ta'anak (1904).; Eine Nachlass auf dem Tell Ta'anak (1905).; G. Steuernagel, Tell el-Mutesellim (1888).; Mommer, "Tomb of the alien Jerus. (1906-7)."; B. Goite, Bibliaiás (1911).

Most important periodicals: PEFJ, ZDPV; Mitteilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina-Vereins; Palaestina-Jahrbuch (MNDPV); Revue Biblique.

Most important general works: L. E. Paton, Early History of Syria and Pal (1892); Chipatt, Bybl, Liban et Pal (1894-9); H. V. Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands during the 16th Cent. (1903).; H. V. Hilprecht, Canaan, d'apré l'exploration récente (1907).; G. A. Smith, Jerus (1908).; S. R. Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible (1909).

Camden M. Cobern

PALLU, pal, pALLUtes, pal'-ties (ST 2, 18, 19).; distinguished): A son of Reuben (Gen 46 6 18; "Pallu").; Ex 5 14; Nu 26 5; 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) (nāph, kaph): The Heb word which is used in a variety of senses (see Hand; Paw) is usually t4 "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 nāph, "hand," 1 S 5 4; 2 K 9 35; Dn 10 10. It would properly mean the "hollow hand" (root kāphāph, "to break to pieces," which receives or grasps things. It is therefore used in reference to filling the priest's hands with sacrificial portions (Lev 14 15).

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 Jehovah (1 S 5 4), from which may be inferred that this Semitic 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 Jehovah had forgotten and forsaken them: "Behold, I have gaven thee upon the palms of my hands" (Isa 49 16; see also Eclesus 18 3). Daniel is touched upon the palms of his hands to wake him from sleep (Dn 10 10).

In the NT we find the phrase, "to smit with the palms of the hands," as a tr of the Gr vb. παλατίνος, rhaphanos (Mt 28 57), see also 5 39; 1 X X X Hos 11 4; 1 Ess 4 30), and, derived from the same vb., παλατίνη, rhaphismon, 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 stroke with the palm" (Mt 28 57; Jn 18 22; 19 3) and "strokes of rods" (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. LLEERING

Palm Tree, pām'trē (παλαιν, tāmār, same as the Aram. and Ethiopic, but in Arab. = "date"); φοινίκ, phoínix (Ex 16 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; Joel 1 12); mārāh, tāmār, Deborah, "dwelt under the palm-tree" (Jgs 4 5); "they are like a palm-tree [in "pillar"], of turned work" (Jer 10 5); mārāh, tīmarāh [only in pl.], the palm tree as an architectural feature [1 K 6 29.32.35; 7 36; 2 Ch 3 5; Est 40 16]; Gr only Eclesus 50 12; Jn 12 13; Rev 7 9); The palm, Phoenix dactylifera (N.O. Palmen), Arab. nakhūl, 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 PEF, Gezer Misc., 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 30; 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 be full of sap and grace" (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 Judaean 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 Hosten (Caperneum). 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 Assyrian 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.
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 courtyards of mosques (cf Ps 92 13). Abundance and houses even in the mountains.

2. Their palms flourish 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 B.I, IV, viii, 2-3), but today the only palms are scarce and small; under its name Hazazon-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 Tammar ("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" or 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 lulabh carried daily by every pious Jew to the synagogue, during the feast. Later it was connected with the idea of triumph and victory. Simon Maccabaeus entered the Akra at Jerusalem after its capture, "with thanksgiving, and branches of palm trees, and with harps, and cymbals, and with violets and roses; 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.

See also Tamar as a proper name.

E. W. G. Masterman

PALMER-WORM, pám'ér-wúrm (277, gizám; LXX kámpé, kämpté (Am 4 9; Joel 1 4; 2 25)): "Palm-worm" means "eaterpillar," but the insect meant is probably a kind of locust. See INSECT; LOCUST.

PALSY, pól'zi, PARALYSIS, pa-rál'í-sis (παραλίως, paráliaasia): The Eng. word "palsy" is derived from the Gr. "paralía" 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-

PAPYRUS, páp'ə-rus (παπύρος, pàpyroς, PAPYRUS, PAPYRUS): A country lying along the southern coast of Asia Minor, bounded on the N. by 1. Physical Pisidia, on the E. by Isauria, on the Features S. by the Mediterranean Sea, and on the W. by Lydia (Acts 2 10; 27 5). In the earliest time Pamphylia was but a narrow strip of low-lying land between the base of the mountains and the sea, scarcely more than 20 miles long and half as wide. A high and imposing range of the Taurus Mountains practically supports it upon three sides, and, jutting out into the sea, isolates it from the rest of Asia Minor. Its two rivers, the Cestrus and the Cataractas, are said by ancient writers to have been navigable for several miles inland, but now the greater part of their water is diverted to the river Lycus for navigational purposes, and the general surface of the country has been constantly changed by the many rapid mountain streams. The level fertile coast land is therefore well watered, and the moist air, which is excessively hot and evaporating, has always been laden with fever. Several roads leading from the coast up the steep mountain to the interior existed in ancient

wiktos or of the part. of the vb. paralíaasia. The disease is one characterized by extreme loss of the power of motion dependent on the most delicate cells of the brain or of the spinal cord. It is always serious, usually intractable, and generally sudden in onset (1 Macc 9 55 f). Miraculous cures by Our Lord are related in general terms, as in Mt 4 24; Acts 8 7. Aeneas (Acts 9 33) was probably a paralytic eighty years bedridden. Though the Lord addressed the paralytic let down through the roof (Mt 9 6; Mk 2 3; Lk 5 18) as "son," it was not necessarily a proof that he was young, and though He procures the cure by declaring the forgiveness of sin, we need not infer that the disease was the result of an evil life, although it may have been. Bennett conjectures that the centurion's palsied servant grievously tormented was suffering from progressive paralysis with respiratory spasms (see PALM). The subst. paralía is only once used in the LXX in Ezk 21 10, but here it refers to the loosening of the sword, not to the disease.

ALEX. MACALISTER

PALTII, paľ'ti (παλτί, palêt, "Jeh delivers!"); (1) One of the "searchers" of Canaan sent by Moses (Nu 13 9), representing Benjamin in the expedition against Canaan.

(Paltiel, "Palmer-worm"); (2) The man to whom Saul gave Michal, David's wife, after the estrangement (1 S 25 44). He is "the captain of the people" of 2 Esd 6 16 ("Phaltiel," in "Psaltiel"). In 2 S 3 15, he is named ("Phaltiel") (AV), "Paltiel" (RV), and is there mentioned in connection with David's recovery of Michal.

PALTIEL, paľ'ti-el (παλτί-ελ, pal'ti-el, "God's deliverance"); (1) A prince of Issachar (Nu 34 26).

PALTITE, paľ'tit (παλτίτη, pal'tit [as Paltai]; LXX B, Káthal, Kôthal, A, Pálti, Pálti, Pálti): The description occurs but once in this form and is then applied to Helez, one of David's 30 valiant men (2 S 23 26). Helez' name, however, occurs in 1 Ch 11 27 and 27 10 as the "Pelonite." Doubtless there is some confusion of words. The word may be given as a patronymic of Palti, or it may designate a warrior of which there is none mentioned in Josh 15 27 and Neh 11 26 as being in Lower Judah. Helez, however, is described as "of the children of Ephraim" in 1 Ch 27 10.

PAMPHYLLIA, pam-fil'i-a (Παμφυλία, Pamphyli-a): A country lying along the southern coast of Asia Minor, bounded on the N. by 1. Physical Pisidia, on the E. by Isauria, on the Features S. by the Mediterranean Sea, and on the W. by Lydia (Acts 2 10; 27 5). In the earliest time Pamphylia was but a narrow strip of low-lying land between the base of the mountains and the sea, scarcely more than 20 miles long and half as wide. A high and imposing range of the Taurus Mountains practically surrounds it upon three sides, and, jutting out into the sea, isolates it from the rest of Asia Minor. Its two rivers, the Cestrus and the Cataractas, are said by ancient writers to have been navigable for several miles inland, but now the greater part of their water is diverted to the river Lycus for navigational purposes, and the general surface of the country has been constantly changed by the many rapid mountain streams. The level fertile coast land is therefore well watered, and the moist air, which is excessively hot and evaporating, has always been laden with fever. Several roads leading from the coast up the steep mountain to the interior existed in ancient
times; one of them, called the Kimax or the Ladder, with its broad stair-like steps 2,000 ft. high, may still be seen ... 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, Pergamos and Rome. Because of its comparatively isolated position, civilization there was less developed than in the neighboring countries, and the Asiatic influence was at most times stronger than the Gr. As early as the 5th cent. BC a Gr colony settled there, but the Gr language which was spoken in some of its cities soon became corrupt; 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 Leto, was the goddess. Coins were struck also in that city. Somewhat later the Gr city of Attalia, which was founded by the Gr colonists in Pamphylia (159–188 BC), 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, probably 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 into Pamphylia by Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13 13; 14 24), but because their stay in the country was

3. Introduction 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 hakkirim refers, not to the pan itself, but to the cakes baked in the flat pan or griddle which was called mahhath (Ex 27 3; 1 K 7 50, etc.), which seems to have been used to carry burning coals, we note the following words:

(1)  מָפָח, mahkhaḥ, "pan" AV, "baking-pan" RV, a dish of uncertain shape and size which was used in the preparation of the minhāḥ, or vegetable offering. See Lev 2 5; 6 21; 7 9; 1 Ch 23 29.

On the basis of Exk 4 3 it might be assumed that the pan was rectangular in shape and of good size.

(2)  מַפַּח, maḵāḥ, 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 transliterated 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)  מַפְּחָה, masærāh (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 מָפַח, māḵ, "leaven," and think that this pan was like the kneading-trough in shape.

(4)  מַפַּח, māḵ, rendered "pan" in Ex 27 3 AV, "pot" RV (see Port).

(5)  מַפָּר, pāṟār, "pan" in Nu 11 8 AV, "pot" RV (see Port).

(6)  דַּדְוֶח, ḏāḏhōk (2 Ch 35 13). Some kind of dish or pot. Slightly different forms of the same root are rendered "cruse" (Mark 7 27), "dish" (2 K 21 13 [gēlōdāḥ]), and also in RV in Prov 19 24; 26 15, instead of the probably incorrect "bosom" of AV.

(7)  מַפַּח, māḵ, rendered "pan" in 1 Esd 1 12 AV (RV "cauldron").

PANNAG, panicus (πᾶνναγ), panagh: καῖα, καισά; Ezk 27 17 m., "Perhaps a kind of confection": One of the articles of commerce of Judah and Israel. The καῖα of the LXX is said to be a similar shrub to the laurel. Nothing is known of the nature of pannag. Cheyne (EB, 3505) thinks the Heb letters have got misplaced and should be ἱδω, gopher, "vine," and he would join to it the מֶשֶׁר, mishār, "honey," which follows in the verse, giving a "grape honey," the ordinary dōba of Pal—an extremely likely article of commerce. See Honey.

PANOPLY, pan'ō-pli: 1 Mac 13 29 RVm. See Armor.

PAP (πᾶπ, shōdā, τῶ, shōdē), "breast" [Ezk 23 21; παρῶτας, mastōs, "the breast" [I K 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, 527) 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, păpēr. See Crafts, II, 13; Papirus; Reed; Writing.

PAPER REEDS, rēdās: In Isa 19 7 AV (RV "meadows").

PAPHOS, pa-fōs: The name of two towns, Old (πάφος Παλάτη, Palaīd Paphos), New (Πάφος, Paphos) and New Paphos (Nā Pāfōs), 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 Buffo), 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 Koudia) is situated on an eminence more than a mile from the sea, on the left bank of the Dirirzo, probably the ancient Bocaros.

It was founded by Cinyras, the father of Adonis, or, according to another legend, by Acris, and was renowned for 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 the city of its eastern boundary to the range of Troodos. Among its last kings was Niccolas, who ruled shortly after the death of Alexander the Great. In 310 BC Nicocreon 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 ( Dio- dorus xx. 21, who wrongly gives the name as Nicae; see Cyrenae, 228) or Syracuse ( Diodorus, X.XII, 203 f.), and from that time Paphos remained under Egypt rule until the Rom 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 re- mained 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 them (Tacit. Hist. ii. 2-4; Suetonius Titus 5).

New Paphos, originally the seaport of the old town, was founded, according to tradition, by Agapenor of Arcadia (Hiald ii. 600; Strabo, v. 962). 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 Augustus (Or Septimius Severus) Felix, or the Roman emperor was the head of the admininistrative capital of the island and the seat of the governor. The extant remains all date from this period and include those of public buildings, private houses, city walls and the mole of the harbor.

The history of Paphos is the history of its temple. The source of its fame was the local cult, of which the kings and their descendants remained hereditary priests down to the Rom seisure of Cyprus. The goddess, identified with the ancient Cypr. Astarte, 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. vii. 8; Tacitus Hist. ii. 3; Servius Ad Aen. i. 724), of which models were on sale for the benefit of pilgrims (Athenaeus xlv. 18); her worship was especially popular among the sailors and she is referred to by Athanasius as the déification 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 colon- nades 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 with incense burning"; no wood might be shed thereon, and although it stood in the open it was "wet by no rain" (Tacitus, 1.c.; 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, IX., 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 a distance to the N. of Kouklia (D. G. Hogarth, Times, August 5, 1910), or possibly on the plateau of Rhaniti, 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. Olmefusl richer, Times, July 10, 1910).

After visiting Salamis and passing through the whole island, about 100 miles in length, Barnabas, Paul and Mark reached Paphos, the capital of the Roman province. The Apostle Sergius Paulus (for the title see visit Cyprus). Here too they would doubt- less begin by preaching in the syna- gogue, but the governor—who is probably the same Paulus whose name appears as procurator in an in- scription of Soli (D. G. Hogarth, Deva Cypria, 114)—hearing of their mission, sent for them and questioned them on the subject of their preaching. A Jew named Bar-Jesus or Elymas, who, as a Magian or Syriac, was called a "wicked man," 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 searing 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 procurator, who professed his belief in the apostle teaching. From Paphos, Paul and his companions sailed on an early direction to Corinth (Acts 15. 1-3).

Papyri


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 became the common writing-material for the Egyptian scribe. The cellulair path of the long triangular papyrus stalk was stripped of its bark or skin and sliced into thin strips. Two layers of these strips were laid at right angles to each other, pasted together (Pliny, says with the aid of starch dried and smoothed). The sheets thus formed were
ANCIENT MANU
posed one to another to form a roll of any length desired. The process and the product are described by Pliny the Elder (NH, xiii. 11-13).

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, 138 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, papyri are relatively numerous, and their contribution important for Egyptian 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 papyri have escaped destruction only in Upper Egypt, where climatic conditions esp. favored their preservation.

In very recent years (1898, 1904, 1907) several Aram. papyri have been found on the island of Elephantine, just below the First Cataract, dating from 494 to 400 BC.

They show that between 470 and 408 BC a flourishing colony of Jews existed there, doing business under Pers. sway, and worshipping their god Yahw, 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 Ye, and the Jews appealed for address to the Pers. governor. It is well known that some Jews had taken refuge in Egypt in 556 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 Kgs XXIX, 1907, 306 ff; XXXI, 448 ff; chief publications by Euting, Sayce and Cowley, and esp. Sachau, Drei aramaische Papyriwurkundsn aus Elephantine, 2d ed, 1908; Aramische Papyri aus Ostraka, 1911).

With Alexander’s conquest of Egypt (322 BC), and the subsequent Ptolemaic dynasty, Greeks came more than ever before into Egypt, and from Gr centers like Alexandria and Arsinoe in the Fayum the Gr language began to spread. Through the Ptolemaic (275-30 BC), Rom (30 BC-293/9 AD), and Byzantine periods (292/93-640 AD), that is, from the death of Alexander to the Arab conquest, Gr was much used in Upper and Lower Egypt, and Gr papyri from these times are now abundant. The 300 Aphrodisio Gr and Coptic papyri published by Bell and Crum (1910) date from 668-722 AD, and show how Gr persisted in the Arab period.

The first important discovery of Gr papyri made in modern times was among the ruins of Heracleanum, near Naples, where in 1752 the ruins of a house of a philosopher which had been destroyed and buried by volcanic ashes from Vauvius (79 AD) a whole library of papyrus rolls was found, quite charred by the heat. With the utmost pains many of these have been unrolled and deciphered, and the first part of them was published in 1793. They consist almost wholly of works of Epicurean philosophy. In 1778 the first discovery of Gr papyri in Egypt was made. In that year some Arabs found 40 or 50 papyrus rolls in an earthen pot, probably in the Fayum, where Philadelphus settled his Gr veterans. One was purchased by a dealer and found its way into the hands of Cardinal Stefano Borgia; the others were destroyed as of no worth. The Borgia Papyrus was published 10 years later. It was a document of little value, recording the forced labor of certain peasants upon the Nile embankment of a given year.

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 from the 1st cent. 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 xxivth book of the Iliad, 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 of the xixth book of the Iliad, and parts of Iliad ii, iii, ix. In 1855 Mariette purchased a fragment of Aleman 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 Arsinoe. The bulk of this collection passed into the hands of Archduke Rainer of Vienna, and 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

Papyrus Antiquorum.
until 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 Oxyrhynchos, and unearthed the greatest mass of Gr 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 Oxyrhynchos 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, comp-

Timomethes Papyrus.

portible in importance with their great discovery at Oxyrhynchos. 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 Oxyrhynchos 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 1905 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, Jouquet, 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 muns over which sand has drifted, or occasionally in cartumen pots buried in the ground. Despite government efforts to stop indiscriminate
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 Alemann and Sappho, fragments of the comedies of Menander and the idamb of Callinachus, Mimes of Herodas, poems of Bacchylides, parts of the lost Antiope and Hypsippyle of Euripides, Aristotle On the Constitution of Athens, the Parva 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 Herodides. In 1906 Grenfell and Hunt discovered at Oxyrhynchus the unique papyrus of the lost Paean of Pindar, in 380 fragments, besides the Helene of Theopompus (or Cratippus?), 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 (5) (7th or 8th cent.) preserves Cant 1.6-9. An Amherst papyrus (6) (9th cent.) contains Job 1.21f; 2.3. There are several papyri of parts of the Ps. An Amherst papyrus (7) (5th or 6th cent.) has Ps 5.6-12, etc.
These documents give 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, 657, 1058, 1099, 1078, 1195, 1381, 1405, 1510, 1711). The individual pieces range in date from the 3d to the 6th cent.

Their locations, dates, and contents are:

   13-14 20 (O.P. 402).
2. London. 3d or 4th cent. Mt 11 2-15.
   12-19 their (O.P. Kiew. 1 1-5).
   Widely 1-5. Cent. Paris. NT Lk 1 14-20; 2 3-6. 4.
   Accounts, The 3d or 4th cent. Mt 1 23-31.33-41;
   20 11-17.19-25 (O.P. 208).
   St. Petersburg. 3d cent. Mt 11 45.
5. Cambridge, Mass. 4th or 5th cent. 1 Jo 11 12-17 (O.P. 402).
7. St. Petersburg. 5th cent. 1 Cor 1 17-20; 6 13.
8. Alexandria. 3d cent. He 1 1 11-15; 8 5-10.
15. Berlin Pap. 13,269 (7th cent.) is a liturgical paraphrase
   of the 3d cent.

Further details as to nos. 1-4 may be found in Gregory, P. 1096-92, and for nos. 1-25 in Kenyon, Handbook to Text. Crit., or Milligan, NT Documents, 249-54.

Among other theological papyri, the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus (O.P. 1,554), dating from the 2d and 3d cents., are probably the most widely known (see Logia). Other
tological 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 (3d cent.; it appears in its last form, if at all: 3d cent.: O.P. 655); the Acts of John (4th cent.; O.P. 850, cf 851); the Shepherd of Hermes (3d or 4th cent.; O.P. 494); Irenaeus, Ad. Haer., iii.9 (3d cent.; O.P. 405). Other small fragments of the Shepherd and Irenaeus 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 major-
ity 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 over-
estimated. 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 from these periods have no literary papyri at all, but are rich in documentary. 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 know-
ledge 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 Philadelphus (250 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 Constitutio Antoniniana, by which the imperial powers were confered on 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. For

11. Contr. tuation to For other early Christian lit. their

NT Study testimony has been of surprising inter-
est (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 uncial and the hand of the inscrip-
tions, and puts us in a better position than ever before to fix the dates of uncial MSS. Minuencule or cursive hands, too, so common in NT MSS of the 10th and later cents., appear in a new light when it is seen that such writing was not a late invention arising out of the uncials but rather grew side by side with it from at least the 4th cent. BC, as the ordinary, as distinguished from the literary, or book, hand. See Wmmt. The lexical contribu-
tion of these documentary papyri, too, is already considerable, and is likely to be very great.

of the NT writings, they reflect the common as dis-
tinguished 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 historical notices sometimes light up dark points in the NT, as in a
British Museum decrees 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 1-3).

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 light sometimes thrown upon the social evil of the time, of which Philo speaks so sternly. The child, the prodigal, the thief, the host with his invitations, the steward with his accounts, the thrifty householder, the soldier on service receiving his viaticum, or retired as a veteran upon his farm, the Jewish merchantman, the hus-
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 inter-
pretation of the NT is very great.

The principal collections of Gr papyri with their editors are Schor, Hericleanum Papyri; PeYron, Turin
Papyri; Leemans, Leyden Papyri; Wes-
sel, Rainer and Paris Papyri; Kenyon and Bell. British Museum Papyri; Ma-
habby and Smyly. Pietro Papyri; Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus. Amherst and Hilde Papyri (with Hogarth), Papyrus Papyri, and (with Smyly and Conze), Thebes Papyri, Hunt, Rhylanc Papyri; Nicola, Geneve Papyri; Krebs, Wicleen, Vereck, Schubars and others, Berlin Papyri; Meyer, Hamburg and Gissens Papyri, Deissman; Berlin Papyri; Vi-
tell and Comparede, Florence Papyri; Mattils, Leipzig Papyri; Prisseau, Strassbourg Papyri; Metz, Nijnam, Papyri; Jouguet and Lesquier, Lille Papyri; Rubensohn, Elephantine Fragments; Masspero, Callo Papyri; Goodspeed, Callo and Chicago Papyri. The papyri have been described by Wicleen. Milligan's Gr Papyri. Ken-
yon's Palaeography of Gr Papyri. Papyri from the Ancient East are useful introductions to the general subject. Mayer has prepared a Grammatik der Ptolemäischen Papyri.

Coptic, Arab., Heb and Demotic papyri are
numeros; 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 (Ahkâmî) codex of 1 St. Pappys, 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 Coptic codex (the White Convent, near Akhmî); indeed, Bib. papyri in Coptic are fairly numerous, and patristic lit. is being rapidly enriched by such discoveries of Coptic papyri, e.g. the Di. Acts papyrus, 1912 (cf. Sahidic 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, the Arab. papyri at Heidelberg, and Karabacek 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).

PARABLE, par'-a-b'l: 1. Name 2. Historical Data. 3. Christ's Use of Parables 4. Parables in Using Parables 5. Interpretation of the Parables 6. Doctrinal Value of the Parables ETYMOLOGICALLY THE WORD "PARABLE" (παράβολα, parâbolâ) 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, Cr., s.v.). This is also what substantiates 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, a parable, however, at its details may 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 that as those who regard the 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 8 8 ff; 2 K 14 9; Ex 27 21). The parable is often described as a "parable with a moral". 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 religious and ethical traditions of His own day the materials that He employed to convey the higher and deeper truths of His gospel, giving them a world of meaning they never had 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 in the preexistent 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. "Talmud," Literature, Remains). The parable was employed both in the OT and in contemporaneous Jewish literature (cf. e.g. 2 S 12 1-4; Isa 5 1-6; 28 24-28, and for details see Koenig's art., i.e.). Jewish and other non-Bib. parables are discussed and illustrated in Lacht's Nude and 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 absolutely new and are, as 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 Lost Sheep, the Unmerciful Servant, 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 closely connected with the changes which about that time He made in His attitude toward the people in general. It evidently 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 clung tenaciously to their carnal Messianic ideas and ideals. Christ, in return, ceased to appeal to the masses, and, by confining His instructions chiefly to His disciples and special friends, saw the necessity of organizing an ecclesia 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 Lk 8 10. 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, that is, who are no longer capable 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 that form of the Christian who had been led to wound 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 therefore interpreted as we remember that in Mk 4 12 and Lk 8 10, the ἀποκράτιστος, need not express purpose, but that this particle is used here to express mere result only, as is clear too from the passage in Mt 13 18, where the ὅσον, ὅσί τις, 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 will hide the truth from all those who have not yet been imbued by it, and this new method is that of the parable.

5. Interpretation of the Parables, which are all intended primarily and in the first place for the disciples, are furnishing the key to 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 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 conclusion 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 ascertained only from an 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). The parable is to use other things in the universe as the analogy 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. One of the spiritual lessons; 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 ψηφιακά parable—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, sometimes 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, while those which are not so immediately related to that purpose, but even with this rule there remain many exegetical cruxes or difficulties. Certain, too, it is that not all of the details are capable of interpretation. Some are added of a nature that indeed illustrate the story as a story, but, 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, of the Christian who make 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, has a meaning beyond 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 “loon” belong to the parable? The parable of the Good Samaritan is the same. 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 interpretations of former generations laid down the rule, theologica parabolae non est argumentation, i.e., the parables, very rich in mission 6. Doctrinal thought, do not furnish a basis for the Value 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. Omnibus similibus claudscunt, “all comparisons limp,” is applicable here also. No point of doctrine can be established on figurative passages of Scripture, as then all elements of doubt would not be eliminated, this doubt being based on the nature of language itself. The argumentative and doctrinal value of parables is found in this, that they may, in accordance with the meaning 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,
The word "Paraclete" occurs 5 times in the NT, all in the writings of John. Four instances are in the Gospel and one in the First Ep. of John. The Gospel passages are Jn 14:16; 16:26; 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 ἄναγκαιον, paraklidōs, the root applied to Christ in EV in the tr of the Gr word paraklētōs, in 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, determined then that the meaning "comforter" is not the primary significance, as we have seen. It is very probably, 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 1:3-4). 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 paraclete or advocate, and a transgression was an accuser. Reconciliation and good works were called paraklētēs, the favors of benevolence and mercy done by the people of Israel in this world become agents of peace and intercessors [paracletes] between them and their Father in heaven. The sin offering is paraclete; the paraclete 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. Joseph is represented as bestowing forgiveness on his brethren who had wronged him and saying to them: "No one else is as paraclete," or intercessor (De Joseph c. 46). In his Life of Moses, III 14, is a remarkable passage which indicates Philo's spiritualizing methods of interpreting Scripture as well as reflects his philosophic tendency. At the close of a somewhat elaborate 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 loincloth, being also an emblem of that reason which holds together and constitutes the universe. For it was indispensable [ἀναγκαιόν, ἀναγκή] that the man who was consecrated to high office should, in his capacity as a paraclete, his son, the being most perfect in all virtue, to procure the forgiveness of sins, and a supply of all good things."

This is rather a patching together of a word or formal parallel to the statement in 1 Jn 2:1 where Christ says "Every one that has been born of God keeps his spirit, although once Philo's conception 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 will convey an element of the sense 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 that 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. 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 Paraclete. 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 Christian spirit and its work is 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. It would 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 John 16:7 the word may very clearly be trd "Advocate" or "Intercessor." We look next at the contents of the words as employed by Jesus in reference to the Holy Spirit. In Jn 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 to be 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 Himself be the Spirit's action in history. The promise of Jesus in 14:18, "I come unto you," 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), (5), (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 remained 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 as in 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'-deis (ὢθήν, παράδεισος, parádeisos): A word probably of Pers origin meaning a royal park. See Garden. The word occurs in the Heb Scriptures but 3 t: Cant 4 13, where it is tr"an orchard"; Neh 2 8, where it is tr"a forest" (RVm "park"); Ecc 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 Arab. i.2, § 7; 4, § 9; Cyrop. 1.3, §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 19). In Ezek 31 8,9, according to LXX, there is no tree in the 'paradise of Eden' but the prophet's vineyard 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 pseudographical 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. 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; 13; De Anim. c. 55; Tertullian's treatise De Paradiso is lost). Clement of Alexandria (frag. 51), and John of Damascus (De Orthodox. 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 destined for me;
Where loyal hearts and true
Stand ever in the light,
All capture thro' and thro',
In God's most holy sight."


G. F. Wright

PARAH, pārā, pārā (παρα, ha-pardh; B, Φαρά, Phard, A, Α'Αφρ, Aphd): A city named as in the territory of Benjamin between Avim and Ophrah (Josh 15 23). It may with some confidence be identified with _Pārah_ on Wady Pārah, which runs into Wady Suweinīt, about 3 miles N.E. of _Anātā_.

PARALYSIS, pαραλίας, PARALYTIC, parali'ik. See _Falyt_.

PARAMOUR, para'mōr (πάρμος, pilleghesh, "a concubine," masc. or fem.): A term applied in Ezek 23 20 to the male lover, but elsewhere tr "concubine."

PARAN, pārān, EL-PARAN (παράν, pārān, παρ'αν, 'el-pardh; B, Φαραν, Pharins, Phrad):

(1) _El-paran_ (Gen 14 6) was the point farthest S. reached by the kings. LXX renders it by τερεβήνιος, τερεβίνθιος, and reads, "unto the terebinth 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 (παρ'αν with 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 (33 10; 13 21; 27 14; cf 13 3 26, etc). It is identified with the high limestone plateau of _El-Thā_, stretching from the S.W. of the Dead Sea to Sinai along the west side of the Arabah. This wilderness offered hospitality to Ishmael when driven from his father's tent (Gen 21 21). Hitherto also came David when bereaved of Samuel's protection (1 S 25 1).

(3) Mount Paran (Dt 33 2; Hab 3 3) may be either Jebel Mokar, 29 miles S. of _'Ain Kādis_ (Kadesh-baanea), 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 probably 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 doubltless refers to the district W. of the Arabah.

W. EWING

PARBAR, pārbar (παρβάρ, parbar [1 Ch 26 18], and παρβαρ, παρβάραν, tr4 "precincts" [AV "suburbs" in 2 K 23 11]; LXX φαρούσα, _pharoureim_): 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 _Parvār_, meaning "possessing light," and hence the meaning has been suggested of "colonomade" or "portico;" some place open to the light. In the pl. form (2 K 23 11) the situation of the house of _"Nathan-meelah"_ is described, and the tr. in "the colonnades," should, if the above origin is accepted, be more than simply _EY_. It is difficult to understand 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-meelah_, _ba-parvārān_ being a misreading for _ba-parvadhim_, meaning "who was over the walls.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

PARCEL, pār'kal: 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 הַדָּבָּר, ḥalkāh; Ju 4 5 of _xoplar, chā'lon_—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, pār'kht: Four different root words have been tr4 "parched" in EV (1)

הָרָך, ḥērāk, "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 toasted over a fire of brushwood or a burnt-out fire. 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, however, 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 rooted or un-rooted is called _ḥomos_ (from Arab, "to roast" or "parched"). 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 9 14; Ruth 2 14). It was a useful food supply for armies, as it required no further cooking (1 S 17 17). It was frequently included in _γίτα_ or _hostages_ (1 S 26 18; 2 S 17 28).

(2) הָרָך, ḥārēk, "burned" or "parched" (of Arab. _ḥark, "burnt"_), is used in the sense of dried up or arid in Jer 17 6.

(3) הָרָך, ḥērēk, is used in Isa 5 13, AV "dried up," RV "parched"; סֵבִּיתָה, _seḇīthā_, in Ps 68 6, AV "dry," RV "parched."

(4) שָׁרָב, _shārab_, 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, _ṣarbāh, "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, pār'kkht, CORN. See Food.

PARCHMENT, pār'kment (μπαρμαν, membrāna [2 Tim 4 13]): The word "parchment," which occurs only once (2 Tim 4 18), is the common form by that time _pergama_ (Gr _περγαμός_, Pergamos), i.e. pertaining to Pergamus, 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 rubbing the skin repeatedly with water and washing. The skin is then stretched on a frame and treated with powdered chalk, or other absorptive 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 replaced 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 article.

JAMES A. PATCH

PARCHMENTS, parchments (μεμβράναι, 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 2nd 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 34,473, consisting of two leaves of Demosthenes, De Pales. 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 "clout," which 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 references in his Ep., 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 Grundherrn 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 tot membrawus I understand the proofs of his citizenship."

Whatever their contents may have been, they were of such nature as to make it unsafe to have them with him in his prison at Rome, so that, if life were spared for even a few weeks, he wished and parchments might be a hinge for reference. Perhaps in the fact that the books and the parchments and the cloak had been left at Troas with Carpus, there may be a hint that his final arrest by the Rom authorities took place at that city, and that it was the suddenness of his arrest that caused him to be unable to part with books and parchments and the cloak with him. "The police had not even allowed him time to find his overcoat or necessary documents" (Workman, op. cit., 39; see p. 1586, 14).

To this it may be, 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 he is influence reached, and could also find relaxation among "the books, esp. the parchments."

JOHN RUTHERFORD

PARDON, pār'dn, pār'dun. See FORGIVENESS.

PARE, pār (THE NAILS) (πάρ, "da'dh, "to fix," "manipulatio"): The word, which in Heb has a very wide range of application, and which is of very frequent occurrence in the Heb Bible, is found in the above meaning in but one passage of EV (Dt 21 12; see NnI). In a similar sense it is found in 2 S 19 24, where it is used to express the dressing of the foot and the trimming of the beard.

PARENT, pār'ent. See CHILDREN; CRIMES; EDUCATION; FAMILY; PUNISHMENTS.

PARK, pārk (יו, "parlē; LXX παράδεισος, paradeisos; cf. Arab. پاریش, farea): "I made me gardens and parks," AV "orchards" (Ecel 2 5); "Asaph the keeper of the king's forest," RVm "park" (Neh 2 8). The same word occurs in Cant 4 13, "Thy shoots are an orchard [RVm "paradise"] of pomegranates." According to Liddell and Scott, paradeisos occurs first in Xenophon, who always uses it of the parks of Pers kings and noblemen. Like many other quadriliterals the word is undoubtedly of eastern origin. It seems to connote an inclosure. It is used in LXX of the Garden of Eden. Cf Lk 23 43; 2 Cor 12 4; Rev 2 7. See PARADISE. ALFRED ELY DAY

PARLOR, pāl'lor: This word in AV, occurring in Jgs 3 20-25; 1 S 9 22; 1 Ch 28 11, is in every instance changed in RV: in Jgs into "uppper room," in 1 S into "guest-chamber," in 1 Ch into "chambers," representing as many Heb words. See HOUSE.

PARMASHA, pār-mash'ā (נַחרָשָׁה, par- māshāh; LXX Μαρμασία, Marmasimā, or Μαρμασίαδ, Marmasimād): One of the sons of Haman (Est 9 9).

PARMENAS, pār'm-e-nas (Παρμενᾶς, Parmenās): A Gr name, an abbreviated form of Parmenedes. Parmenas was one of the "seven" chosen by the people and appointed by the apostles to superintend the daily distribution to the Christian poor of Jerus (Acts 6 5). Tradition states that he was martyred at Philippi, in the reign of Trajan, but his name does not appear again in Scripture.

PARNACH, pārn'āk (παρναχ, parnakh, "gifted"): Father of Elizaphan, the prince of Zebulun (Nu 34 25).

PAROSH, pār'osh (παροσ, parōsh, "flee" [leap]); A family that in part returned under Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 3; Neh 7 8); and in part under Ezra (Ezr 8 3); there spelt "Parosh, AV." Some of the families had foreign wives (Ezr 10 26). One descendant, Pedaiah (see PEDAIAH, [3]), helped to rebuild the city walls (Neh 3 25), and others were among those who "sealed" the covenant of Nehemiah (Neh 10 14). In 1 Esd 5 9; 8 30; 9 26, "Pharaoh."
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1. The Apostolic Doctrines: —The Second Coming of Christ (a phrase not found in the Bible) is explained by the following terms:

1. Terms special terms: (1) "Parousia" (πα-ρωσία, parousia), a word fairly common in Gr, with the meaning "presence" (2 Cor 10 12; 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; Phil 1 26. And still more particularly it is applied to the Coming of Christ in 1 Cor 16 23; 1 Thess 2 13; 1 Thess 3 13; 1 Thess 4 13, 18; 2 Thess 2 3. "Here the word denotes the coming of Antichrist. This word for Christ's Second Coming passed into the early Patristic lit. (Diognetus, vii. 6, e.g.)" This sense is not invariable. For instance the word in Ignatius, Philadelphians, ix. 2, means the Incarnation. Or the Incarnation 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 epidaurus inscription of the 3d cent. BC (Dittenberger, Sylloge, 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 surveyed in Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 372-78, Ger. ed., 251-87.) (2) "Epiphany" (ἐπιφάνεια, epiphaneia), "manifestation," used of the Incarnation in 1 Cor 1 10, but of the Second Coming in 2 Thess 2 8; 1 Tim 3 16; 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) "Apolcalypse" (ἀποκάλυψις, apokalupsis), "revelation," denotes the Second Coming in 1 Cor 1 7; 2 Thess 1 7; 1 Pet 1 7, 13; 4 13. (4) "Day of the Lord," more or less modified, but referring to Christ in 1 Cor 1 5; 6 15; 2 Cor 1 14; Phil 1 6 10; 2 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 the eschatology (Matt 24, Acts 20 30; 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.

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 special to a determined number of martyrs must be filled up (Rev 6 11; cf. 2 Esd 4 35.36). There is need of patience (Jer 5 7, etc.; cf. 2 Esd 4 34; Bar 83 4). But it is at hand (1 Pet 4 7; Rev 1 20; 2 10; cf. 2 Esd 14 17). "Yet a little while" (He 10 37,25), "The night is far spent" (Rom 13 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 comms. on 1 Cor). Indeed, there is hardly time for repentance even (Rev 22 11, ironical), certainly there is no time left for self-indulgence (1 Thess 5 3; 1 Pet 4 7; 2 Pet 3 11; Rev 3 5;cf. Bar 83 5), and watchfulness is urgently demanded (1 Thess 5 6; Rev 3 3).

An outpost of the apocalyptic of the end (Acts 2 17,18; cf. 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 the precise is spared suffering (Rev 3 10; cf. Bar 29 2). This is the beginning of Judgment (1 Pet 4 17; cf. En 99 10). Iniquity increases and false teachers are multiplied (Jude 18; 2 Pet 3 3; 2 Tim 3 5; esp. 19; cf. 2 Esd 30 7; Bar 70 5; 2 Esd 10 9). Above all there is to be an appearance of the Antichrist (1 Thess 2 8; 1 Tim 4 1; cf. 2 Thess 2 7). But the Antichrist in the Book of Revelation (1 Thess 2 8, Rev 19 19; cf. Bar 36 8-10, Sib Or 36-70, 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 will fall upon men (Rev, passim; cf. esp. Philo, Eater), and natural portents occur (Acts 2 19,20; Rev; passim; cf. 2 Esd 5 4 3; En 80 5-8). But the conversion of the Jew (Rom 11 29) is brought about by these plagues (Rev 11 13; cf. the Jewish 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; 2 Esd 13 10.11). In Rev 19 3 the Millennial follows (of 2 Esd 17 12; 34.56; cf. 2 Esd 17 12; and often in rabbinic lit.; the "millennium" in Slavonic, ch. 33, is of very dubious existence), but other traces of millennial doctrine in the NT are of the vaguest (cf. the comm. to 1 Cor 16 14, 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 He 10 30; 12 23; 13 4; Heb 9 28; 20 11; and probably in Rom 2 6-8. The two concepts are interwoven in Rom 14 9.10. God mediates judgment through Christ 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 familiar uncertainty is manifest in the 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 5; 1 Cor 3 17; 2 Thess 1 7,8). The NATURE is of God in En 45 4.5 or completely destroyed (1 Cor 7 31; Heb 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 Slavie En 33 1-2). And the righteous receive the New Jerus (Gal 4 26; He 12 22; Rev 3 12; 21 2.10; cf Bar 4 2-6; 2 Esd 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 proximity of such an undertaking is more than dubious, for the traditional nature of these details is abundantly clear—a tradition that is not 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 they used, already symbolized, 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 merely 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 little disturbed by St. John’s interpretation of the last supper. The writer of the Apocalypse was perfectly aware of the various ordinary human beings (1 Jn 2 18.19).

The symbolism, then, in which the Parousia is described was simply that held by the apostles in their pre-Christian days. This symbolism, to be sure, has been thoroughly purified from such puerilities as the feast of Leviathan and Behemoth of Bar 29, or the “thousand children” of En 10 17, and, all the more remarkable as 20th. Christianity has enough of this and to spare (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 (or of God in such schemes as we have none). 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 5 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. Remembering that when 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 one of the NT writers think of Christ’s messianic work as completed, or, if the problem of exact terminology be pressed, of the strict Messianic work as done at all. Even the Atonement belonged to the preliminary acts, viewed perhaps somewhat as En 33 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 aid 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 apologetic idea of the word “Messiah” is the opposite of that which it had, 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 exponent 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 having 7.39.21 as the most transparent 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 its king (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 2-9.11-20.24-27.30-31 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 king walking on earth in glory to later realization:” everything in the Gospels that contradicts this assumption. But then there are difficulties. The various concepts involved are mentioned directly or indirectly so often that the number of passages be multiplied the more so that 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 title of the Cross, the “Parousia” of the “Messianic Kingdom,” the fact of resurrection, etc.) that conflict a priori with the whole of Christ’s teaching. And, finally, the most unoffended critic finds himself confronted with a last stubborn difficulty, the unanswerable 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 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 their problems so complex that any detailed discussion is prohibited here.

2. Summary Moreover, the symbolism presents nothing novel to the student familiar with the usual schemes. Forces of evil increase in the world, the state of the righteous grows harder, distress and natural portents follow, at the climax Christ appears suddenly with His angels, bringing the Kingdom of God, gathering the elect into the Kingdom, and dismissing the wicked into outer darkness (or fire). The Father is the Judge in Mt 10 32.33, but the Son in the in Lk 12 8.9, and in Mt 13 41; 16 27; 25 32; probably in Mt 24 50 Lk 12 46; Mk 8 38 and its Lk 9 26 are uncertain. At all events, the eternal destiny of each man depends on Christ’s attitude, possibly with the Father’s (invariable) ratification considered.

How far Christ connected the Parousia and the fall of Jerusalem, it is not easy to say. Various sayings of Christ about the future were certainly famous before 70. John’s teaching that “the kingdom of God is at hand” (Mt 4 17) is a mixture of the teachings, and the words “must appear” (Mk 13 26) is almost a quotation from Dan 7 14. The sayings of Christ about the future were certainly taught by the apostles, and Mark’s version of the “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, Mt 10:23 before all the cities of Judaea are closed to Christ's apostles (cf. Acts 21:5). There is no reference to the fall of Jesus. 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 13:35-37; Lk 12:40; Mt 24:44, etc., with many parables, such as the Ten Virgins). Now Mk 13:32 | Mt 26:36 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 Mk 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 | Mt 24:14 has no clear purpose 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 of as worriers and 'Rome 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 overwhelming. For the presuppositions, GJV (HJP is antiquated); Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie: Bouset, Religion des Judentums. General discourse: Mathews, 'The Parousia in the NT (best in Eng.); Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research; Holtzmann, Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu (a classic); von Dobschütz, The Eschatology of the Gospels (popular, but very sound). Eschatological extreme: Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus; Bultmann,kr held a belief 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); Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie: Bouset, Religion des Judentums. General discourse: Mathews, 'The Parousia in the NT (best in Eng.); Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research; Holtzmann, Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu (a classic); von Dobschütz, The Eschatology of the Gospels (popular, but very sound). Eschatological extreme: Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus; Bultmann, the Parousia, in HJP.

BUTLON SCOTT EASTON

PARSHANDATHA, pār-shan-dā-tha, pār-shan-

dā-tha (N.T.; ἐπαρθανθάθα; LXX פָּרֵשָׁנְדָה, פָּרְשָׁנְדָה; Pharshanda, Pharshanda; perhaps from the Pers. parsha-data, 'given by prayer'); One of the sons of Haman (Est 9:7).

PART, part: As a vb. it is no longer in good use (except in a few special phrases, of Ruth 1:17), but is obscure only in Prov 18:18, where the meaning is "break up their quarrel" (cf. 2 S 14:13). It has not changed AV's usage, except (strangely) in 1 S 30:24, where 'share' is written. For the noun see Portion.

PARTHAINS, pār-thi-an (Παρθίαι, Parthoi): 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

History regions included in the Parthian empire, and lacked the

empires. They are mentioned as having

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 are in connection with the history of the Jews, on account of the

large colonies of the latter in Mesopotamia, and

quantity, through which a Divine Head works, whose reaction on men settles their eternal destiny, and the place of our judgment. This is

begun, to the people of God. 18), John's

Mk 18), Jesus is said to have been accused of blasphemy (Mk 14:10; Mt 26:63)

for the important event.

is assured that the apostles

will come of transcendent

the Parousia would occur of so transcendent.

1. Solution a nature that it could be expressed of Problem only in the terms of the fullest eschatological symbol. St. John has a clear interpretation of this. In place of the long Parousia discourses in the Synoptics, we have, in the corresponding part of the Fourth Gospel, chs 13-17, dealing not only with the future in general but concretely with Christ's coming and the Judgment. Christ indeed came to His own (Jn 14:18), and not He only but the Spirit (Jn 14:16), and even the Father (Jn 14:23). When the disciples are so equipped, their presence in the world subjects the world to a continual sifting 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 him (Rom 8:10, 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 were caught up in 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 Parousia would occur of so transcendent.
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 Arses II who established the dynasty of the Arsacids, which continued for nearly 5 centuries. His capital was Hecatompyle, but his reign continued only about 3 years, and his brother Tirdates succeeded him as Arses 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. Arsanax 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) re-commenced aggressions on the Seleucid empire which were continued by Mithridates I (174–187), who added to his dominions a part of Bactria, on the E., and Media, Persia and Babylonia 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 129 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 Scythians, who turned him in 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 leaving Phraates restored 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, after Pompey 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, subdued the Euphratians and obtained 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 it 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, Parthia, 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 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 Parthia remained without. Parthia had to retire within her own borders and remain on the defensive. 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 Tirdates drove the king Phraates IV from the throne, but he recovered it by the aid of the Scythians, and Tirdates took refuge in Syria with the youngest son of the king. Augustus afterward restored him without ransom, and obtained the last 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, or until the reign of Trajan. Parthia was not at peace with herself, however. Dynastic troubles were frequent, and the reigns of the kings short. Arshakun III, who reigned 122–37 AD, was expelled from his kingdom and twice recovered his throne. In his days occurred a terrible massacre of Jewish colonists in Mesopotamia, as narrated by Jos (Ant, XVIII, ix). The contest with Rome over Armenia was settled in the days of Nero in a manner satisfactory to both parties, so that peace was not broken for
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 subdued Armenia, took Upper Mesopotamia, Adiabène (Assyria), Ctesiphon, the capital, and reached thePers Gulf, but was obliged to turn back by revolts in his rear and famine in his camp. The Parthian conquered provinces were restored, however, by Hadrian, and the Parthians did not retaliate until the reign of Aurelius, when they overran Syria, and in 162 AD Lucius Verus was 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 anticipated. Forthwith 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 the Parthians, as was feared, left 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 in the reign of Macrinus was unable to put down the revolt of the Persians under the lead of Artaxerxes, who overthrew the Parthian empire and established the dynasty of the Sassanides in its place (226 AD).

4. Fall 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 the Parthian language. In this 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. Porter

PARTICULAR, pär-tik'-lär, par-tik'-lär, PAR-TIC-U-LaRY: The adverbial phrase "in particular" occurs twice in AV (1 Cor 12 27, 2 k μὲνουs, κὲ μὲνoυs, RV "severally," RV"each in its part"; and Eph 5 33, ἐν τῇ ἱνή, kath' hēn, RV "separately"); in both cases it has the obsolete meaning of "severally," "individually." The advb. "particularly" occurs in the same sense in Acts 21 19 AV, καθ' τὰ ἐκκλησίαν, kath' hēn ἡκαστάν, RV "one by one," and He 9 5 AV, καθ' ἅπαν, kath' ἅπαν, RV "everywhere." In the participle "particular," the participle, and in the sense in particular" in the first Prologue to Sirach (AV, Vulg peculiaria; the whole section omitted in RV).

D. Miall Edwards

PARTITION, pär-tish'-ən, pär-tish'-ən, THE MIDDLE WALL OF (φῶς ἐπιστολής τοῦ φαραώ, τὸ μέσον τοῦ πληρόμενος ἡμῶν; Eph 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 wall 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. The argument of these similes refers to an actual wall in the temple of Jerusalem, beyond 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 both Philip's conversion and the Gentile mission, for the multitudes 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 Tiberius and the Ephesian past this barrier into the temple (Acts 21 29), and that he had in this manner profaned the temple (24 6), as, it is put in 21 28, he had "brought Greeks into the temple and polluted this holy place." Severus, the procurator, had made Paul on his trial, and when he saw that 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 infantile bravado put on his uniform and pretended that he was an army 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 only, and the Holy of Holies, to which the high priest entered alone once every year. The outer court was called the Court of the Gentiles; its walls were 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 8 steps and through gates in a lofty way, to find yourself overlooking another huge 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 4 feet high. In height, it was the bottom of 14 more steps" (J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Sir Johnstk's Commentary on the Epistle, see also Enderleiner, The Temple, Its Ministry and Services as They Were at the Time of Jesus Christ, 46).

The middle wall of partition was called sōdēgh, 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 750 ft.

It was in this court that the oxen and sheep and the doves for the sacrifices were sold as in the temple. 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 been greatly excited on occasions such as the Passover and Pentecost and at the other great feasts, and the din of voices must oftentimes have been almost deafening. And yet 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 standing on the very barrier or middle wall of partition, to which Paul refers. This pillar is now at Constantinople and is inscribed with a Gr inscription in capital or uncial letters, which is translated as follows: NO MAN OF ANOTHER NATION ENTER WITHIN THE FENCE AND TOUCH THE STONE ROUND ABOUT THE TEMPLE WHICH BELONGS TO THE LORD, AND WHOEVER IS CONDEMNED 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 Jerus 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 anciently possessed by Israel alone; that separation between a 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 Rom 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 Rutherfurd

PARTRIDGE, pär'traj (ܢѸܬ, kō rebate; Lat. perdix; LXX. Is 26. 20. νυκτικόρας, νυκτικόρας, "owl"; Jer 17:11. πατρίς, perdix): A bird of the family Tetraonidae. The Heb word for this bird, kōreb, 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 Pal, 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 deft 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 they 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 tr* these 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 thunder storm 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 Eclesus (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-roo’ah (ضارع, pārāḇāh, “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’îm (תמרע, par'awîm):** 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 पर्व, “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 Parvaïn in Yemenah. Some have considered the name a shortened form of סַפְרָוַיִם which occurs in the Syr and Tg Jonathan for the “Sephar” of Gen 10:30.

A. S. Fulton

**PAS-DAMMIM, pas-dam’îm.** See Ephes-dammim.

**PASEAH, pa-se’a, pas’-a (פשאות, pāṣēḇ, “divider”):** Son of Japhlet, descendant of Asher (1 Ch 7:33).

**PASSAGE, pas’aj.** See PESAH, PESAHIM.

**PASSAGING OF MARY, THE.** See Apocryphal Gospels.

**PASSION, pas’’un, PASSIONS, pas’’unz:** “Passion” is derived from Lat passio, which in turn by the “house of Jehovah” in the “gate of Benjamin” (Jer 20:2). When released, Jeremiah prophesied Divine judgment on him and the people. Future captivity and an exile's death are promised to Pashur whose name he changed from its masterful significance to a covering one. “Terror on every side” (מְגֹיהַרָה, meger‘ah) is to take the place of “stable strength” (Jer 20:3 ff).

(2) Son of Melchiah, a prince of Judah, and one of the delegation sent by Zedekiah, the king, to consult Jeremiah (Jer 21:1). It looks like a larger and later delegation, similarly sent, to which this Pashur belongs, whose record is given in Jer 38:1-13. Accompanying them was one, Gedaliah, who was a son of (3).

(3) Another Pashur (Jer 38:1), who may be the person mentioned in 1 Ch 9:12; Neh 11:12.

(4) A priest, of those who “sealed” Nehemiah’s covenant (Neh 10:13), who may, however, be the same as (5).

(5) The chief of a priestly family called “sons of Pashur” (Ezr 2:8; 10:22; Neh 7:41; 1 Esd 5:25 [“Phassur,” m ?Pashhur”]; 9:22 [“Phair,” m “Parshur”]). Doubtless it is this Pashur, some of whose sons had “strange wives” (Ezr 10:22).

**HENRY WALLACE**

**PASS, pas, PASSAGE, pas’aj, PASSENGER, pas’en-jîr:** “To pass” bears different meanings and corresponds to various words in Heb and Gr. It occurs frequently in the phrase “pass, and something after” (lit. and it was). This is simply a Heb idiom linking together the different paragraphs of a continuous narrative. As a rule “pass” renders the Heb word צָאַר, ‘abar. This vb. has various meanings, e.g. “to pass over” a stream (Gen 31:21); “cross” a boundary (Nu 20:17); “to pass through,” or “traverse,” a country (Nu 21:22); “to pass on” (Gen 18:5); “to pass away,” “cease to exist” (Job 30:15). The word is used metaphorically, “to pass over,” “overstep,” “transgress” (Nu 14:41). In the causative form the vb. is used in the phrase “to cause to pass through fire” (Dt 18:10; 2 K 16:3). In AV “pass” sometimes has the force of “surpass,” “exceed,” e.g. 2 Ch 9:22, “King Solomon passed all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom”; or, more literally, of also Eph 6:18, “the love of Christ which passeth knowledge,” and Phil 4:7, “the peace of God, which passeth all understanding.”

**Passage in AV renders צָאַר, ma‘āḇār, or צָאָר, ma‘āḇārō.** The former word denotes (1) the ford of a river (Gen 32:23 AV’m); (2) the pass of a mountain range, and (3) any other instance of the use of the shorter form (Isa 30:32 m), AV renders “where the grounded staff shall pass.” A more correct tr would be, “and every sweep of stroke of the appointed staff.” The longer form bears both meanings, viz. “ford” (e.g. Josh 2:7; Jgs 3:28, etc) and “pass” (1 S 14:4; 1 Sa 10:29). In Josh 22:11, the rendering “towards the region opposite the children of Israel” would be more correct than AV, “at the passage of the children of Israel.” In AV of Nu 20:21 “passage” seems to mean “right of way,” and renders the infinitive of the Heb vb. In Jer 22:20 AV the word rendered “passage” should be tr “from Abiram” (as in RV), a mountain range in Moab, N.E. of the Dead Sea.

**PASSENGER in AV means a “passer-by.”** In Ezk 39:11,14,15 where the word occurs 4 times in AV, RV translates “them that pass through.” T. Lewis

**PASSING OF MARY, THE.** See Apocryphal Gospels.
is derived from the vb. potior, with the √ pot. The Lat words are connected with the Gr √ παθ, path, which appears in a large number of derivatives. And Gr, the name of the festival (as well as many other languages in addition) words connected with this √ pot, path, are often susceptible of a great variety of meanings, for which the dictionary 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, "unto him whom he also showed himself alive after his passion." This is a paraphrase (Gr παθήσαντι, "suffered") due to the Vulg (post passionem suam), and in Eng. as old as Wycliff, 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," and Jas 5 17, "a man of like passions," Gr άνθρωπος, homoioptathēs; RVM "of like nature" gives the meaning exactly; "men with the same emotions as we." (3) From "emotion" a transition took place to "to have one's own emotion," 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 tr of παθός, pathos, in its three occurrences: Rom 1 20 (AV "affection"); Col 3 5 (AV "passion"); 1 Thess 4 5 (AV "lust"). It is used also for two occurrences of παθον, pathēma (closely allied to pathos) in Rom 7 5 (AV "motions," 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 comments. 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 EATON

PASSION, GOSPEL OF THE. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

PASSOVER, pasôv-ver (πάσχα, pesah, from pâshâ, "to pass" or "spring over" or "to spare") (Ex 12 23; 23 27; cf. Is 31 5). Other conjectures connect the word with the "passing over" into a new year, with Asyry pâshû, meaning "to placate," with Heb pâshâ, meaning "to dance," and even with the skipping motions of a young lamb; Aram. נָפָח, pâshâ, whence Gr Ναράχ, Pâshâ; whence Eng. paschal. In early Christian centuries folklore mythology connected pâshà with Gr pâshâ, "to suffer" [see Passion], and the word was taken to refer to Good Friday rather than the Passover:

1. Pesah and Mâçgôth
2. Pesah micrajym
3. Pesah dôrôth
4. Mâçgôth
5. The Omer
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 founded, it could be done only, a 7 day festival of mâcghôth, 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 being in the instruction 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 ff); the mâcghôth 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 micrajym, the last meal in Egypt, included the following provisions: (1) the eating of a lamb, or lamb, and unleavened bread, 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 nor sodden (bâshâl) with water; (5) the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs; (6) eating in haste, with loins girded, shoes on the feet, andстал 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 lēl shimmôrîm, "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 dôrôth, or later observances of the Passover, seem to have differed slightly from those of the Egypt Passover (Mish, P'gâbhîm, 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 11). The details, however, may be stated in an entirely different way, and judging from Dt 16 7, the prohibition against seething (Hb bâshâl) was not understood to apply (unless, indeed, the omission of the expression "with water" gives a more general sense to the Heb word bâshâl, 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 (De 16 2; cf. Ex 4 11). The details, however, may be stated in an entirely different way, and judging from Dt 16 7, the prohibition against seething (Hb bâshâl) was not understood to apply (unless, indeed, the omission of the expression "with water" gives a more general sense to the Heb word bâshâl, 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 (De 16 2; cf. Ex 4 11).
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 the burnt offering, 2 young bullocks, 1 ram, 7 lambs of the first years, and various other offerings and drink offerings and a goat for a sin offering.

During the week of the Passover festival comes the beginning of the barley harvest in Pal (Mount of Olives) which lasts from the end of March to the beginning of May in the low Jordan valley to the beginning of the elevated portions.

The offering on the first day was the standing corn (Dt 16:9) and of bringing the sheaf of the peace offering is spoken of as the sacrifice after the Sabbath (Lev 23:15), that is, according to the Jewish tradition, the day after the first day, or rest-day, of the Passover (Neh. 69; My Tan’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 an 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 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 Dew (al) which grew up in Pal on the basis of the needs of an agricultural people.

Many writers, however, eager to explain the entire festival or even all the agricultural calendar (presumably a Canaanite one, though there is not a shred of evidence that the Canaanites had such a festival), have seized upon the Pesah as the basis of the Pesah (festival), and have attempted to explain the Passover as bread hastily baked in the busy harvest times, or as bread quickly baked from the freshly exempted first-fruits. Wherein these theories are superior to the traditional explanation so consistently adhered to throughout the Pent it is difficult to see. In a similar vein, it has been attempted to connect the Passover with the sacrifice or redemption of the firstborn of man and beast (both institutions being traditionally traced to the judgment on the firstborn of Egypt: Ex 13:11-15; Ex 11:18; 12:31; 13:9, 10, 20), so as to characterize the Passover as a festival of redemption from the birth of the high-god, so venerated as very little that is positive 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 earlier literature of the Old Testament it is natural to expect fewer ritual details than in a manual of sacrificial service; according to the view here taken, we must distinguish between the pesah mitzrayim and the pesah derabim. Nevertheless, great stress is laid on the variations in the several accounts, by certain groups of critics, on the basis of which they seek to support their several theories of the composition of the Pent or Hev. 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) mere omissions, (2) differences of emphasis, and (3) conflicting statements. The letters A, B, P and H will be used here to designate passages assigned to the various sources by the higher criticism of today merely for the sake of convenience. There is no meaning in the terms A, B, P, and H as applied to the Pent. There is no meaning in the terms A, B, P, and H as applied to the Pent. There is no meaning in the terms A, B, P, and H as applied to the Pent.

The Higher Criticism.

The Critical Literature.

During the entire week, additional sacrifices were offered in the temple: an offering for the burnt offering, 2 young bullocks, 1 ram, 7 lambs of the first years, and various other offerings and drink offerings and a goat for a sin offering.

During the week of the Passover festival comes the beginning of the barley harvest in Pal (Mount of Olives) which lasts from the end of March to the beginning of May in the low Jordan valley to the beginning of the elevated portions.

The offering on the first day was the standing corn (Dt 16:9) and of bringing the sheaf of the peace offering is spoken of as the sacrifice after the Sabbath (Lev 23:15), that is, according to the Jewish tradition, the day after the first day, or rest-day, of the Passover (Neh. 69; My Tan’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 an 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 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 Dew (al) which grew up in Pal on the basis of the needs of an agricultural people.

Many writers, however, eager to explain the entire festival or even all the agricultural calendar (presumably a Canaanite one, though there is not a shred of evidence that the Canaanites had such a festival), have seized upon the Pesah as the basis of the Pesah (festival), and have attempted to explain the Passover as bread hastily baked in the busy harvest times, or as bread quickly baked from the freshly exempted first-fruits. Wherein these theories are superior to the traditional explanation so consistently adhered to throughout the Pent it is difficult to see. In a similar vein, it has been attempted to connect the Passover with the sacrifice or redemption of the firstborn of man and beast (both institutions being traditionally traced to the judgment on the firstborn of Egypt: Ex 13:11-15; Ex 11:18; 12:31; 13:9, 10, 20), so as to characterize the Passover as a festival of redemption from the birth of the high-god, so venerated as very little that is positive 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 earlier literature of the Old Testament it is natural to expect fewer ritual details than in a manual of sacrificial service; according to the view here taken, we must distinguish between the pesah mitzrayim and the pesah derabim. Nevertheless, great stress is laid on the variations in the several accounts, by certain groups of critics, on the basis of which they seek to support their several theories of the composition of the Pent or Hev. 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) mere omissions, (2) differences of emphasis, and (3) conflicting statements. The letters A, B, P and H will be used here to designate passages assigned to the various sources by the higher criticism of today merely for the sake of convenience. There is no meaning in the terms A, B, P, and H as applied to the Pent. There is no meaning in the terms A, B, P, and H as applied to the Pent. There is no meaning in the terms A, B, P, and H as applied to the Pent.

The Critical Literature.

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 9:5). In the very beginning of their national life in Pal we find them celebrating the Passover under the leadership of Moses. Two later Passover celebrations are particularly noted (Josh 5 10). History records but few 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 8 13). The later prophets speak of appointed seasons for pilgrimages and sacrifices (cf Isa 1 12-14), and occasionally perhaps even 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 recorded since the days of the Judges. After the fall of Jerus, the priests, and the prophecies of Ezekiel's are also significant as another indication of the Passover. Ezekiel, 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 35 1 ff). The continued observance of the Passover is best 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 Talmud, which devotes to this subject an entire tractate, Pesahim, on which NT Times.

The NT Times.

The NT Times.

The NT Times.

The NT Times.

The NT Times.

The NT Times.

The NT Times.
At the Passover, the Jews placed the roasted lamb on the table in memory of the rite, and other articles symbolic of the Passover were also placed beside it: such as a roasted egg, said to be in memory of the free-will offering; a sauce called ḥaraveth, said to resemble the mortar of Egypt; salt water, for the symbolic dipping (cf Mt 26:23); the bitter herbs and the marzûq. The ṣēther (program) is as follows: sanctification; washing of the hands; dividing and dropping the parsley; breaking and setting aside a piece of marzûq to be distributed and eaten at the end of the supper; reading of the mōgadāh shel pe'aḥ, a poetic narrative in answer to the Ephesian and Colossian questions asked by the youngest child in compliance with the Biblical 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 marzûq; eating together; the meal; partaking of the marzûq that had been set aside as ḥpektómen or dessert; grace after meat; Hallel; request that the service be accepted. Thereafter folk-songs are changed to 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 (Piqṭḥon x.1) 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 Egypt Passover, it is customary to recline or lean at this meal in token of Israel’s freedom. The prohibition against leaven is strictly observed. Thereafter, 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 the Passover was celebrated in the wilderness. 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 ṭṣur bugh, in token of their love for the ordained celebration and their loathsome to depart from it.

NATHAN ISAACS

PASTORAL, pasʻ⁰-tôr-əl, EPISTLES, THE:

I. GENERALITY

1. External Evidence

2. Genuineness Questioned

II. ALLEGED DIFFICULTIES AGAINST PAULINE AUTHORSHIP

1. Relative to Paul’s Experiences

2. Subject-Matter Post-Pauline

3. Incidents in Church Organization

4. The Christianity of the Epistles Not Paul’s

III. DATE AND ORDER

1. Date of the Epistles

2. Their Order

LITERATURE

The First and Second Epp. to Tim, and the Ep. to Tit form a distinct group among the letters written by Paul, and are now known as the pastoral Epp., because they were addressed to two Christian churches. When Timothy and Titus received these epp., 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 Epp. were written to guide them in the discharge of the duties devolving upon them as Christian pastors. Such is a general description of these epp. 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 epp. there is abundant external attestation. Allusions to them are found in the 1. External writings of Clement and Polycarp.

In the middle of the 2nd cent. the epp. were recognized as Pauline in authorship, and were frequently among the list of apostolic books.

"Marcion indeed rejected them, and Tatian is supposed to have rejected them to Timothy. But, as Jerome states in the preface to his Comm. on Tit, these heretics rejected the epp. 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 epp. which condemned asceticism. So far, then, as the early church can guarantee to us the authenticity of the writings ascribed to Paul, the Pastoral Epp. are guaranteed' (Marcus Dods, Intro to the NT, 167).

The external evidence is all in favor of the reception of these epp., which were known not only to Clement and Polycarp, but also to Irenæus, Tertullian, the author of the Ep. to the churches of Vienne and Lyons, and Theophilus of Antioch. The evidence of Polycarp, who died 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" (cf 1 Tim 6:10). It would be difficult to overlook testimony of this character.

The decision of certain critics to reject the Pastoral Epp. 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 Irenaeus and others as "Paul's" (A. S. Peake, A Critical Intro to the N.T. 190). This tradition is satisfactory. In recent times, however, the authenticity of these epp. has been called in question by certain scholars (Baur, Fleming, and many others). Baur asserted that they were written for the purpose of combating the Gnosticism of the time, and of defending the church from it by means of ecclesiastical organization, and that the date of their composition was the year 130.

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 Pastorals; (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 the whole, quite different from that in the accepted epp.; (4) the "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship—so writes Dr. A. C. McGiffert (A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 402)—is that "the character of the author 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. themselves point to Paul's

1. Relative ages are these:

(1) Data in 1 Tim.—In 1 Tim 1 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. in the penultimate written, 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 3d 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 independence toward Macedonia (2 Cor 2). Paul was a man of no others exactly the reverse of that described in 1 Tim 1 3. Timothy 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 Jerusalem (Acts 20 15; 21 17).

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 1 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 perverse 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 can be dated 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 Pastorals.

Those who deny the Pauline authorship of these epp. also deny that he was released from what, in this article, is termed 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 left the record unfinished. However, which he was unable, owing to some cause now unknown, to carry into execution. The purpose of the Acts, as Ramsay says (St. Paul the Traveller and the Rom Citizen, 25, 308), is to lead up to the release of Paul. And to show that the Christian faith was not a forbidden or illegal religion, but that the formal impeachment 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 be directed to the facts and to the conclusions stated in the art. PROFESSION (Q.V.), Mommers showing that the words, "My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole pratorian guard" (Phil 1 13), mean that at the time when Paul wrote the Ep. to the Phil, the case against him was already come before the supreme court of appeal in Rome, that 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 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 Colossae, he asks him to prepare him a lodging, for he trusts that through the prayers of the Colossians, he will be granted to him.

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 condemned for a time to imprisonment. 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 moral 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, 360).

It should also 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. In 1:37, the words are, "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 διάσωσις θῆκον] and having borne witness before the rulers, so was he released from prison, but not to these, but 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 Jerusalem, 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 carrying out his 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 otherwise than journey to Philippi, and himself also go there, as he had already promised when he wrote to the Philippian church (Philem. 21, 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 Colossae, where he had promised that he would "come shorty." (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); (b) that he was the writer of the epp. he 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 escaped but that he had good reason to believe 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 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 epp. 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, was again arrested and brought to Rome, and from this second imprisonment wrote the Second Ep. to Titus—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 (2 Tim. and Titus), and considerably later than those of the Pauline age.

(1) The first statement, that the epp. imply an ecclesiastical organization in advance of the time when Paul lived, is one which cannot be maintained in view of the facts disclosed in the epp. themselves. For directions are given to Timothy and to Titus in regard to the moral and other characteristics necessary in those who are to be ordained as bishops, elders, and deacons. In the 2d cent. the outstanding feature of ecclesiastical organization was the development of monarchical episcopacy, but the Pastoral Epp. show a presbyterial administration. The office held by Timothy in Ephesus and by Titus in Crete was, as the epp. themselves show, that of a temporary character, the directions which Paul gives to Timothy in regard to the ordaining of presbyters in every church are in agreement with similar notices found elsewhere in the NT, and do not coincide with the state of church organization as that existed in the 2d cent., the period when, objects to the genuineness of the epp. assert, they were composed.

"Everyone acquainted with ancient literature, particularly the literature of the ancient church, knows that a forger or fabulator of those times could not possibly have avoided anachronisms" (Zahn, Intro to the NT, II, 93). But the ecclesiastical arrangements in the Pastoral Epp. coincide in all points with the state of matters as it is found in the church in the time of the apostles, as that is described in the Acts and elsewhere in the NT.

It seems an error to suppose, as has often been done, that these epp. contain the germ of monarchical episcopacy; for the Christian church had already, from the day of Pentecost, existed as a society with special officers for the fundamental discipline and administration. The church in the Pastoral Epp. is a visible society, as it always was. Its organization therefore had come to be of the greatest importance, and epp. so in the matter of maintaining and handing down the truth of the church accordingly is described as "the pillar and stay of the truth" (1 Tim 3:15), that is, the immovable depository of the Divine revelation.

(2) The other statement, that the epp. show a doctrinal development out of harmony with the Pauline age is best viewed by an examination of what the epp. actually say.

In 1 Tim 6:20, Paul speaks of profane and vain babblings and oppositions of gnosis (RV "knowledge," AV "science") falsely so called. In Tit 3:9, he tells Titus to avoid foolish questions and genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law. These phrases have been held to be allusions to the tenets of Marcion, and to those of some of the gnostic sects. There are also other expressions such as fables and endless genealogies (1 Tim 1:3, 4; 6:3), words to no profit but the subverting of the hearer (2 Tim 2:14), foolish and unlearned questions which do gender strifes (2 Tim 2:23), questions and prolix words (1 Tim 6:4, 5), discussions which lead to nothing but law and profane babbling. Such are the expressions which Paul uses. These, taken with what is even more
clearly stated in the Ep. to the Col., certainly point to an incipient Gnosticism. But had the writer of the Pastoral Epp. been combating the Gnosticism of the 2d century, or of the name of Paul, to stigmatize the gnostic systems, he would certainly have used much stronger expressions to describe their character and influence.

It should be observed that the false teachers described in 2 Tim 3 6–9.13, as well as in other places in these epp., were persons who taught that the Mosaic Law was binding upon all Christians. They laid stress upon rabbinic myths, upon investigations and disputations about genealogies and specific legal requirements of the OT. What they taught was a form of piously sounding doctrine assuming to be Christian, but which was really rabbinism.

"For a pseudo-Paul in the post-apostolic age—when Church had become more and more a legal and undenominational institution in the gentile Christian Church—have invented a description of and vigorously to have opposed the Paul. I did not exist for any of his own age or culture, for a religious system who were without parallel in the earlier epp. of Paul, which are themselves a 'diplome 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 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 clearly as do the external evidence, that they must have been written at least before the year 100. But this must not be considered as having been written during the first 20 or 30 years after Paul's death, because of the character of the references to persons, facts and conditions in Paul's life, and to his final 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., I. 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 OT or NT, and in Tit there are 33. But, while the total of such words in both epp. is 165, the number, large though it appears, may be compared with the words used only once in the other epp., of Paul, of Rom, I Cor, 3 Cor. Gal 1, Phil 1, Col. Eph, 2 Thess. I Tim, 1, 2 Tim, 2 Pet. Out of 764 words of this description are 627 in number. So nothing can be made of it. The fact, therefore, that 100 of the 165 word, far outweighs the majority 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 the claim which was not refused in the case of any ordinary author.

The objection to the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, based upon the dissimilarity of diction in them and in Eph. Phil., etc., is, to exist when the theory is no longer persisted in, that the nucleus of the Pastoral Epp. was composed during the Roman impri:rr鹳, which, according to this theory, ended, not in the apostle's release, but in his execution. The fact that he was well known to be a devoted friend of the Roman government, and that on important matters which were troubling the church at this time, he made it essential that he should, to a large extent, use a different vocabulary.

The "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship is that "the Christianity of the Pastoral Epp. is not the Christ." (McGiffert, A History of Christianity, 402). "For the most part," Dr. McGiffert writes, "there is no trace whatever of the great fundamental truth of Paul's gospel death unto the flesh life in the Spirit." Now this is not so, for the passages which Dr. McGiffert himself gives in a footnote (2 Tim 1 9–11; 2 11 ff; Tit 3 4–7), as well as other references, do most certainly refer to this very respect of the Church. For example, "the visions in the Church" in 2 Tim 2 contains these words, "If we died with him [Christ], we shall also live with him." What is this but the great truth of 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 section, 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 and body" (p. 404). But Our 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 who 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 epigraph 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 closely bears upon the "doctrine, legal and moral 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., I. 118).

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 in 2 Tim. This was so, if any kind of author or commentator.

The objections to the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, based upon the dissimilarity of diction in them and in Eph. Phil., etc., is, to exist when the theory is no longer persisted in, that the nucleus of the Pastoral Epp. was composed during the Roman imprisonment, which, according to this theory, ended, not in the apostle's release, but in his execution. The fact that he was well known to be a devoted friend of the Roman government, and that on important matters which were troubling the church at this time, he made it essential that he should, to a large extent, use a different vocabulary.

The "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship is that "the Christianity of the Pastoral Epp. is not the Christ." (McGiffert, A History of Christianity, 402). "For the most part," Dr. McGiffert writes, "there is no trace whatever of the great fundamental truth of Paul's gospel death unto the flesh life in the Spirit." Now this is not so, for the passages which Dr. McGiffert himself gives in a footnote (2 Tim 1 9–11; 2 11 ff; Tit 3 4–7), as well as other references, do most certainly refer to this very respect of the Church. For example, "the visions in the Church" in 2 Tim 2 contains these words, "If we died with him [Christ], we shall also live with him." What is this but the great truth of 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 section, 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 and body" (p. 404). But Our 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 who 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 epigraph 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 closely bears upon the
do not suit the Apostolic age. These objections have been already referred to.

The real difficulty, as 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 sentence of Christian men and the lack of grip and of continuity in the thought." Dr. Peake well and truly remarks that this does not admit of detailed proof; lack of grip and lack of continuity of thought are not the characteristics of such passages as 1 Tim 1 9–17, a passage which has been held to have nothing in it 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 new for the Christian church as a whole, if they could thus let themselves be imposed upon by epp. which purported to be Paul's, but which were not written by him at all, but were the enlargement of a Pauline nucleus? Can it be believed that the church of the 20th cent., the church of the martyrs, was in such a state of mental decrepitude as to receive epp. which were spurious, so far as the greater portion of their contents is concerned? And can it be believed that this idea, so recently originated and so destitute of proof, is an adequate explanation of epp. which have been received as Pauline from the earliest times?

When placed side by side with sub-apostolic writings like the Didache, Clem. Rom., Polycarp and other fragments of early Church literature, it returns upon one with almost every sentence that the Pastors are astonishingly superior" (Moffatt, The Historical NT, 596). Godet, quoted by R. D. Shaw (The Pauline Epp., 441), writes, "When one has had enough of the numerous amplifications of Clement of Rome, of the ridiculous inanities of Barnabas, of the general oddities of Ignatius, of the well-meaning commonplace of Polycarp, of the intolerable verbiage of Hermas, and of the nameless pair of pseudo-apocryphal Didache, and has passed promptly, in the first decade of the 20th cent., reverts to our Pastoral Epp., one will measure the distance that separates the least striking products of the apostolic literature from what has been preserved to us as most eminent in the ancient patriarchic literature."

In the case of some modern critics, the interpolation hypothesis is "their first and last appeal, the easy solution of any difficulty that presents itself to their imaginations. Each writer feels free to give a kaleidoscope turn, and then records with blissful confidence what are called the latest results. . . . The whole method postulates that a writer must always preserve the same dull monotone or always confine himself to the same transcendental theme. He may get something at once; having had his vision and his dream, he must henceforth be like a star and dwell apart. . . . To be stereotyped is his only salvation. . . . On such principles there is not a writer of note, and there never has been a man in public life, or a student in the stream of a progressive science, large parts of whose sayings and doings could not be proved to be by some one else" (Shaw, The Pauline Epp., 48).

The Text and Order.—In regard to the date of these epp., external and internal evidence alike go to show that they belong to practically the same period. The dates of their The Epistles composition are separated from each other by not more than three or four years; and the dates of each and all of them must be close to the Neroic persecution (64 AD). If Paul was executed 67 AD (see Ramsay, St. Paul, 396), there is only a short interval of time between his execution and the writing of 67, that is, a period of some 5 or 6 years, during which his later travels took place, and when the Pastoral Epp. were written. "Between the three letters there is an affinity of language, a similarity of thought, and a likeness of errors combated, which prevents their referring any of them to a period much earlier than the others" (Zahn, Intro., II, 37).

The order in which they were written must have been 1 Tim, Tit, 2 Tim. It is universally acknowledged that 2 Tim is the very last of Paul's letters, and the internal evidence of the other two seems to point out 1 Tim as earlier than Tit.

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— which has been made now for several generations more positively than in the case of any other Pauline epp.—has no support from tradition. . . . Traces of their circulation in the church before Marcion's time are clearer than those which can be found for Rom and 2 Cor [Zahn, op. cit., II, 52]. The internal evidence shows that all three are from the hand of one and the same writer, a writer who makes many personal allusions of a nature which it would be impossible for a forger to invent. It is generally allowed that the personal passages in 2 Tim 1 15–18; 4 9–22 are genuine. But if this is so, then it is not possible to cut and carve the epp. into fragments of this kind. Objectives dating only a century back are all too feeble to overturn the consistent and coherent thought which for four centuries has been corroborated as this by their reception in the church, dating from the very earliest period. The Pastoral Epp. may be used with 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. McGilp, 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); O. J. Elliot, 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 Moffatt, The Historical NT Intro (in the Lit. cit., II, 42); 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, pas'ür-æ. PASTURE, pas'ür. See Sheep-Tending.

PATARA, pa'tär-a (τὰ Ἡλεῖα, τὰ Pátara): A coast city of ancient Lycia, from which, according to Acts 21 15, Paul said he was to sail. 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 autonomous coins were 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 Arsinóe in honor of his wife. The real trading center was called Patara, 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. Gedimian 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
Patmos, pattrhmos (ταυτομον, <παθομον, <μακροθυμια, makrothumia): "Patience" 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. It is called "wait patiently" for God, to endure uncomplainingly the various forms of sufferings, wrongs and evils that we meet with, and to bear patiently injustices which we cannot remedy and provocations we cannot remove.

The word "patience" does not occur in the OT, but we have "patiently" in Ps 40 1 as the tr of hâdâd, "to wait," "to expect," which word frequently expresses the idea, esp. that of waiting on God; in Ps 37 7, 11, "patiently" (wait patiently) is the tr of hâdâd, one of the meanings of which is "to wait" or "to hope for" or "to expect" (cf Job 36 14); "patient" occurs (Eccl 7 8) as the tr of 'erekh râbâ, "long of spirit," and (Job 6 11) that I should be patient (ha'dîrakh nepheš). 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 (makrothumia); 29 8 (makrothumêth, RV "long patience") in Wsd 2 19, the Gr word is anezêkakia.

Patience is often hard to gain and to maintain, but, in Rom 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, patmos (Πάτμος, Πάτμος: It was a small island between the Greek mainland and the eastern coast of Asia Minor, and was the scene of St. John's exile. The Greek name is transliterated as Patmos in the New Testament. The island was a well-known destination for exiles of the Roman Empire, and was often used as a place of refuge for those who were persecuted for their faith.

Patmos was a small island located in the Aegean Sea, between the coast of Asia Minor and the Greek mainland. It was a common destination for exiles and was famous for its landscape and seclusion. The island was also known for its connection to the Apostle John, who is believed to have written the Book of Revelation while on Patmos.

The Book of Revelation is a key text in interpreting Patmos, as it provides insight into the island's historical and cultural significance. In the book, John writes about his vision of the end of the world and the establishment of God's kingdom, and Patmos is mentioned as a place where the final judgment will occur.

Patmos is also associated with the archangel Michael, who is said to have appeared to John on the island. The island is remembered as a place of spiritual renewal and is celebrated as a site of Christian pilgrimage.

Patmos is a place of both historical and spiritual significance, and its connection to the Apostle John and the Book of Revelation makes it an important location in the study of Western literature. The island's natural beauty and isolation have made it a popular destination for both tourists and scholars, and it continues to play a role in the ongoing dialogue between the past and the present.
PATTERNS, pattern (πατέρος, ἀβαθῆς, "model," μορφή, "a vision" or "view"): The OT words trv "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 the word "idea" or "suggestion" might possibly have indicated 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 for the temple. It is not the custom in Pal and Syria today to draw 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 draks (arm's lengths) wide and 15 draks long, made of sunshine 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 haik wo haik" ("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 the charges to his son Solomon [his conception] of the porch of the temple," etc (1 Ch 22:11). 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 his "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 trv in the NT: τός, τίπος, "type," occurs in Tit 2:7 and He 8:5. In the first instance RV reads "ensample," ὄρθος, ὑποτάσσει, "outline," has been similarly trv in 1 Tim 1:16, but "pattern" in 2 Tim 1:13. In He 9:24 AV ἀντικόμιον, ἀντίλυπνος, is rendered "like in pattern." ἵδεοςώμα, ἡπόδειγμα, AV "pattern," is trv in AV "copy" (He 8:5), "copies" (He 9:23). At the time of the trv of AV the word "pattern" meant either the thing to be copied or the copy. JAMES A. PATCH

PAUL, pāl. See PAUL.

PAUL, pāl, THE APOSTLE:

I. SOURCES
1. The Acts
2. The Thirteen Epistles
   (1) Pauline Authorship
   (2) Lightfoot's Grouping
   (a) First Group (1 and 2 Thess)
   (b) Second Group (1 and 2 Cor, Gal, Rom)
   (c) Third Group (Phil, Philem, Col, Eph)
   (d) Fourth Group (1 Tim, Tit, 2 Tim)
   (3) Paul's Conception of His Epistles
III. CONCLUSION OF PAUL'S CAREER
1. Scheme
   (1) Crucial Points
       (a) The Death of Jesus
       (b) The Church of Damascus
       (c) The Death of Herod Agrippa I
       (d) The First Mission Tour
       (e) The First Visit to Corinth
       (f) Paul at Troas according to Acts 20:6
       (g) Festus Succeding Felix
II. MODERN THEORIES ABOUT PAUL
1. Criticism Not Infallible
2. The Submission Theory
3. Protest against Baer's View
4. Successors to Baer
5. Appeal to Comparative Religion
6. The Eschatological Interpretation

EDWARD MACK

PATROCLUS, pa-tro'klus (Πατρόκλος, Πατροκλός): The father of the Syrian general Nicanor (2 Mace 8:9).

PATROBAS, pa-trō'bas (Πατρόβας, Πατρόβας): The name of a member of the Christian community at Rome to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16:14). The name is an abbreviation of "Patrobas." There was a wealthy freedman of Nero of the same name who was put to death by Galba (Tac. Hist. 1:49; 1:90). Patrobas of St. Paul may have been a dependent of his.
V. House of St. Paul

2. Final Address (Acts 20:1-38)
3. First Missionary Journey (Acts 13-14)
5. Third Missionary Journey (Acts 17-20)
6. The Emmaus Road (Acts 10:34-42)

VI. GOSPEL LITERATURE

1. Sources.

a. Pauline authorship.

b. The Thirteen Epistles.


a. First Group: 1 and 2 Thess. from Corinth, 52-53 AD.

b. Second Group: 1, 2, and 3 Cor. from Gal, 55-55 AD.

3. Hellenism.


5. Personal Characteristics.

6. Final Address.

7. Conversion.

8. Preparation.


10. Conclusion.

11. Last Imprisonment and Death

12. Literature.

1. The Acts that the view of Sir W. M. Ramsay in general is accepted as to the trustworthiness of Luke, whose authorship of the Acts is accepted and proved by Harnack (Op. Cit. 1908; The Acts of the Apostles, tr by Wilkinson, 1909; Neue Untersuch. zur Ap., 1911; The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, tr by Wilkinson, 1911). The proof need not be given here. The same batting appears in the "we" sections and the rest of the book. Even Moffatt (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 311) admits the Lukan authorship though dating it in 100 AD instead of 60-62 AD, against Harnack. The Acts is written independently of the Epp. of Paul, whether early or late, and supplements in a wonderful way the incidental references in the epp., though not without lacunae and difficulties.

2. Pauline authorship. See the articles on each epp. for detailed criticism. It is here assumed that the Ep. to the He was not written by Paul, though Pauline in point of view.

3. The Thirteen Epistles. One cannot stop to prove every statement in an article like this, else a large article would be needed. Criticism is not an infallible science. One can turn easily from the Hatch-Van Manen art. on "Paul" in E B (1902) to the Maclan art. on "Paul the Apostle" in the I Vol (1909). Van Manens part of the one denies all the thirteen, while Maclans says: We shall not hesitate to make the thirteen epp. as genuine. It is certain that Paul wrote more epp., or letters, as Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 225) insists on calling all of Pauls epp. Certainly Philem is a mere letter, but it is difficult to say as much about Rom. Deissmann (St. Paul, 22) admits that portions of Rom are like an epistolary letter. At any rate, when Moffatt (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 64-82) carefully justifies the Pauline authorship of both 1 and 2 Thess, it is clear that the case against them cannot be very strong, esp. as Moffatt stands out against the genuineness of Eph. (op. cit., 333) and the Pastoral Epp. (p. 414).

Bartlel, who was once at a loss to know what to do with the Pastoral, on the theory that Paul was not released from the Roman imprisonment (Apostolic Age, 1899, 200), is now quite willing to face the new facts set forth by Lightfoot (Op. Cit. 146), even if it means the admission of a second Roman imprisonment, a view that Bartlel had opposed. He now makes for the "fresh approach" from the side of experience, by men who are in touch with the realities of human nature in all its aspects, from the study of the historical background of society in the early Roman empire, that has renovated the study of them and taken it out of the old rut of dry speculation, and has moved in the most part in modern times" (Epres, January, 1913, 29). Here Bartlel, again, now eloquently presents the view of common-sense criticism as seen by the practical missionary better than anyone else. The freshness of new approaches, the vitality and concentration of a professor's chair, though he passes to note as an exception Professor P. Gardin's The Religious Experience of St. Paul (1912), once more (Epres, January, 1913, 30): "In the recovery of a true point of view a vital element has been added, situated on the basis of a unique experience, but also of practical instinct, the outgrowth of sympathy with living men of other types of thinking. When the breeze has moved anew in the light of this idea, half their difficulties disappear." One cannot adopt this attempt to make the occasional emphasis on "letters" rather than "epistles," and his undue depreciation of Paul's intellectual caliber and culture as being mere Armo than Origen (Acts 12, 6), in order to see the force of this contention for proper understanding of the social environment of Paul. Against Van Manens "historical Paul" who wrote nothing, he pleads the "historic Paul" who possibly wrote all thirteen. There is really no trouble except with the letters to Timothy and Titus, and even there the difficulties are perhaps not quite so great as many of our specialists admit (St. Paul, Epistles). Deissmann demes sharply that Paul was an "obscurantist" who corrupted the gospel of Jesus, "the drops of doctrinal study of St. Paul, mostly in the tired brains of gifted amateurs" (p. 4). But A. Schweitzer boldly and boldly pleads the case for Paul against his Jesus. It is the "exclusively Jewish eschatological" which Paul and his interpreters, 1913, to conception that Christ's gospel that furnishes Schweitzer's silvered (The Quest of the Historical Jesus). Thus he will be able to explain the obliteration of the mission. Schweitzer has moved through Paul. To do that Schweitzer plows his way from Gregorii to Holtzmann and Farm, and all are afloat in the wilderness. He is positive that his eschatological discovery will rescue Paul and some of his epp. from the criticism and with an Menne, to whose arguments modern criticism has nothing solid to offer, and the myterion means for any of Schweitzer ought to be thankfully received (ib. 249).

(2) Lightfoot's Grouping of the Acts (cf. Hib. Essays, 224).—There is doubt as to the position of Gal. Some advocates of the South-Galatian theory make it the very earliest of Paul's Epp., even before the Jesus Conference in Acts 15. So Emmet, Comm. on Gal (1912), ix, who notes (Preface) that his comm. is the first to take this position. But the North-Galatian view still has the weight of authority in spite of Ramsey's powerful advocacy in his various books (see Hist. on Gal, 1911), by Lightfoot. Even Moffatt, Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 90 ff. Hence Lightfoot's grouping is still the best to use.

(a) First Group: 1 and 2 Thess. from Corinth, 52-53 AD. Harnack's view that 2 Thess is addressed to a Jewish Christian community in the form of a correction and while 1 Thess is addressed to a gentile church is accepted by Lake (Earlier Epp. of St. Paul, 1911, 83 ff), but Frame (ICC, 1912, 54) sees no need for this hypothesis. Milligan is clear that 1 Thess precedes 2 Thess (Comm., 1908, xxxix) and is the earliest of Paul's Epp. (p. xxxvi). The accent on eschatology is in accord with the position of the early disciples in the opening chapters of Acts. They belong to Paul's stay in Corinth recorded in Acts 18.

(b) Second Group: 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Rom, 55-55 AD. This is the great doctrinal group, the four chief epp. of Baur. They turn about the Judaizing controversy which furnishes the occasion for the expansion of the doctrine of justification by faith in opposition to the legalistic conception of Judaizing Christians from Jesus (Acts 15:1-3; Gal 2:1-10). The dates of these epp. are not perfectly clear. 1 Cor was written shortly before the close of Paul's 3 years' stay at Ephesus (Acts 20:16-11; 1 Cor 9:19, Acts 20:1, 2) a few months later while he was in Macedonia (2:13; 7:5:18; 16:24). Rom was written from Corinth (16:23; Acts 20:21) and sent by Phoebe of Cenchreae (Rom 16:1). The integrity of Rom is challenged by some who deny that it has moved from the part of the 16 belongs to the ep. (13:348).
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 bit of a false addition.’ Von Soden (Hist of Early Christian Lit., 78) easily justifies the presence of Rom 16 in the Ep. to the Rom: ‘These greetings, moreover, were certainly intended by St. Paul to create bonds of friendship between the Roman Christians and the Rom community, and to show throughout 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 arises 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 1–8, but Hausrath 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, Strong, Reuss, Weiss, Soden, Thiersch, Sabatier, and others. Weiss (Christian History, 1915, 121) accepts the partition-theory of 2 Cor heartily: ‘It may be shown with the highest degree of probability that this letter has come down to us in 2 Cor 10–13, and Paul by At. and Th. has restored the theory that the change in tone is a climax to the disobeient element of the church is still maintained with force and justice by Klopper, Zahn, Bachmann, Denney, Bernard, A. Robertson, Weiss, Menzies. The determination of Gal 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 cold 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 succeed Felix (Acts 24 27). It was once thought to be 60 AD beyond any doubt, but there are many doubts and uncertainties. See “Chronology,” III, 2, (2), below. At any rate these four epp. 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 epp. were written from Caesarea (Schults, Thiersch, Meyer, Haurratz, Sabatier, Reuss, Weiss, Haupt, Spitta, McPherson, Hicks). But the arguments are more specious than convincing. See Hort, Rom and Eph, 101–109. There is a growing opinion that Philim. Col and Eph were written from Ephesus during a public imprisonment in Paul’s stay of 3 years there. So Deissmann (Light from the New East, 299; St. Paul, 107; St. Lisco (Vindola Sanctorum, 1906); M. Albertz (Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1910, 551 ff.); B. W. Bacon (Journal of Bib. Lit., 1910, 181 ff.). The strongest argument for this position is that Paul apparently did not know personally the receipt of Eph 11. But this objection need not apply if the so-called Epheisan Ep. was a circular letter and if Paul did not visit Colossae and Laodicea before his last letters at Ephesus. The theory is more attractive at first than on reflection. It throws this group before Rome—a difficult view to concede.

But even so, the order of these epp. is by no means clear that Col, Phil, Rom, and Eph were sent together. Tyndicus was the bearer of Col (4 7f) and Eph (6 21f). Onesimus bore Philem (vs 10 13) and was also the companion of Tyndicus to Colossae (Col 4 9). So these three epp. are from Rome, and it is 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 1 21f) and is expecting to be set free (1 25), but he has the same expectation of freedom when he writes Philem (ver 22). The reference at Eph 1 1 (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 Moffatt trouble with the Ep. to the Laodiceans (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 Marcion seems to have done. But the notion that Phil. is the last of 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 the absence of Luke (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 Moffatt trouble with the Ep. to the Laodiceans (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 Marcion seems to have done. But the notion that Phil. is the last of 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 the absence of Luke (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 Moffatt trouble with the Ep. to the Laodiceans (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 Marcion seems to have done. But the notion that Phil. is the last of 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 the absence of Luke (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 Moffatt trouble with the Ep. to the Laodiceans (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 Marcion seems to have done. But the notion that Phil. is the last of one church (hence without personalities) still holds the bulk of modern opinion.

In addition to this, it is also possible that Paul had been in Rome. But he seems to have been there only briefly, and it is not clear what he accomplished. Some scholars argue that he was there to visit the Roman Christians, while others believe that he was there to prepare for his first imprisonment. However, the evidence for these two positions is not conclusive, and it is likely that Paul’s visit to Rome was a complex event with multiple purposes.

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 cold and contemplative, but both on the same general theme.

(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, though he doubts the authorship of the epp. as well, has suggested that they may 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 fealty” in this group that binds them together and separates them from Paul. Thus tersely he puts the case against the Pauline authorship.

Moffatt argues for the sub-Pauline environment and sub-Pauline atmosphere of the epp. He places the epp. within an early ecclesiasticism (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 410 ff.). He thrusts aside the personal details and argues that the epp. give merely the tendency of early Christianity (Ueber Aufgabe und Methode der Sagen. NT Theologie, 1915, 557). 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 something to say to the internal evidence which immediately demands our attention” (Knowing, Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, 3d ed, 1911, 129). Moffatt (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 414) holds that the Pastoral Epp. came from one pen, but the personality and motives are not the same. Many critics who reject the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epp. admit the personal details in 2 Tim 1 14–18; 4 9–22 are not on a par with those in The Acts of Paul and Thekla in the 2d cent. Many critics who reject the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epp. admit the personal details in 2 Tim, but it is just in such matters that Moffatt places the evidence. To admit these fragments is logically to admit the whole (Chs 1–11). As Moffatt sees (Intro, 414), however much he seeks to avoid the “pseudo-Pauline” name, he overdoes the thing. The Epistle against Simon Magus (Acts 8 9–24) is, Moffatt argues, “a Christian form of tarsusier,” and “a further effort to maintain the rigid opposition of the Magi and their devotional establishment, that prince who had sought to claim apostolic sanction for the expanding institutions and Doctrines of the early church” (ib. 415). The objection against these epp. is not new; it has been vigorously overdone. As a matter of fact, each of the other four groups of epp. has the same thing to say to it, and naturally so. Style is a function of the subject matter, and is as much a mark of the man, hence Mann, style changes with one’s youth. It would have been remarkable if all four
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 Epistles to Philippi and Colossae juxtaposed present personal and ecclesiastical matters in a more or less reminiscence of vehemence than we meet with in the earlier epistles, but this situation is what one would reasonably expect. The "ecclesiastical organization" argument, as indicated by a maturing fact, "the organization in the Pastoral Epistles is not apparent, advanced beyond that of the church of the Philippian Christians in 16 AD" (Ramsay, *Expos. VII, viii, 17). The "gnosis" met by these epistles (1 Tim 6:20; Tit 1:14) developed types similar to the Ignatian Epistles of the 2nd cent. Indeed, Barist ("Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles," *Expos., January, 1913, 20) pointedly sees in these variations a Christian and "Christian Ecclesiology and Ramsay's "Historical Commentary on Titus," *Expos. VII, viii, 1) "one feels the subject has been lifted to a new level of reality and that much criticism between Bauer and Juliuscher is out of date and irrelevant." It is now shown that the Pastoral Epistles are not directed against Gnosticism of advanced type, but even of a more Jewish type (Tit 1:14) than that in Col. Ramsay (1 Tim 6:20, 1:263) sweeps this stock criticism aside as "from the wrong point of view." It fails to the ground, Lightfoot ("Note on the Heresy Committed in the Pastoral Epistles," *Bib. Essays, 415) had insisted on the Jesuit character of the Gnostic attack here. As a matter of fact, the main objection to these epistles is that they do not fit the Pauline type which breaks abruptly with Paul in Rome. But it is a false premise to assume that the Pastoral Epistles in Acts 26:20 predicted that he would never see the Epiphanes again and that he was urgent about his letters. Even in his Gospel before 2 Tim 4:21 (The Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels), as late as 20, he may not have revisited Ephesus at all, but may have seen Timothy at Miletus also (1 Tim 1:3). Harnack frankly admits the acquisition and usefulness of Paul and thereby for the Pastoral Epistles. Blass (2d ed. of Apostolismus, 24) acknowledges the Pastoral Epistles as genuine. See further *Pastoral Epistles.*

(3) Paul's conception of his Epistles. — Assuming, therefore, the Pauline authorship of the thirteenth epw., it is the main character of the epistles, a contention which has 3dly emphasized. The epistles are the Church's and to are clearly intended. It is the Church's attempt to keep alive the distinctive character of a particular Christ and Christianity, his adaptation to varied situations. His grasp of world-problems and the eternal values of life. Paul wrote other epistles, as we know. In 1 Cor 15:10 on a clear point, and have now been known to us otherwise, earlier than 1 Cor. The use of "every epistle" in 2 Thess 3:17 naturally implies that Paul had written more than two epistles. It is not certain to what letter Paul refers in 2 Cor 4:2 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 one Paul (4:16) mentions an epistle addressed to the Church at Laodicea. This epistle is almost certainly that which we know as Eph. Indeed, at least two apocryphal epistles to the Laodiceans were written to supply this deficiency. As early as 2 Thess 2:2 forgery was at work to palm off, in Paul's name, "or by ep. as from us," to attack and pervert Paul's real views, whom Paul defends in the advanced epistle. This "inferior work" would be continued (Gregory, *Canon and Text of the NT*, 1907, 101), though, as Gregory argues, Paul's exposure here would have a tendency to put a stop to it and to put Christians on their guard to reject such apocryphal epistles as a mark of genuineness (2 Thess 3:17; 1 Cor 21:6; Gal 6:11; Col 4:18). This was all the more important since Paul evidently dictated his letters to amanuenses, as to Tertullus in the case of Rom 16:22. In the case of Philem (ver 19), Paul probably wrote the whole letter. We may be sure therefore that, if we had the other genuine letters of Paul, they would occupy the same general standpoint as the thirteenth now in our possession. The point to be noted, a matter of fact, "the organization in the Pastoral Epistles is not apparent, advanced beyond that of the church of the Philippian Christians in 16 AD" (Ramsay, *Expos. VII, viii, 17). The,epistles are directed against Gnosticism of advanced type, but even of a more Jewish type (Tit 1:14) than that in Col. Ramsay (1 Tim 6:20, 1:263) sweeps this stock criticism aside as "from the wrong point of view." It fails to the ground. Lightfoot ("Note on the Heresy Committed in the Pastoral Epistles," *Bib. Essays, 415) had insisted on the Jesuit character of the Gnostic attack here. As a matter of fact, the main objection to these epistles is that they do not fit the Pauline type which breaks abruptly with Paul in Rome. But it is a false premise to assume that the Pastoral Epistles in Acts 26:20 predicted that he would never see the Epiphanes again and that he was urgent about his letters. Even in his Gospel before 2 Tim 4:21 (The Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels), as late as 20, he may not have revisited Ephesus at all, but may have seen Timothy at Miletus also (1 Tim 1:3). Harnack frankly admits the acquisition and usefulness of Paul and thereby for the Pastoral Epistles. Blass (2d ed. of Apostolismus, 24) acknowledges the Pastoral Epistles as genuine. See further *Pastoral Epistles.*

Paul, the Apostle
take to limit Paul's Epp. to the local and temporary sphere given them by Deismann.

(4) Development in Paul's Epp.—For Paul's gospel theology see last. 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 the 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 500 Christians (1 Cor 15 4-9). The revelation of Christ to Paul and in Paul (I,paul, en emoi, 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 as the Messiah, the Lord 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. C. Crouse regards Luke as "careless" historian ("The Spirit's Instruct St. Paul in Acts," Cambridge Bib. Essays, 1909, 386), but he quite admits the central place of Paul's conversion, both in the Acts and the Epp. (ib; 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, 1, 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 fact reappears in each of the groups of the Epp. It is the necessary implication in the apostolic authority claimed in 1 Thess 4 4-6; 2 Thess 1 2; 3 14. We might have claimed authority as apostles of Christ (1 Thess 2)."

For the second group we need only refer to 1 Cor 9 1 f and 15 1-11, where Paul justifies his gospel by the fact of having seen the risen Jesus. His self-deprecatio in ver 9 is amply balanced by the claims also to Cor 13 and Gal 1 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 his life is the key to Paul's life and letters. "I press on," Phil 3 14. The dangers and difficulties were outlined in Eph 3 2-13: "How that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote before in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ." In the fourth group he still recalls how Christ took pity on him, the blasphemer, the persecutor, the chief of sinners, and put him into the ministry, "that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his longsuffering, for an ensample of them that should hereafter believe on him unto eternal life." (1 Tim 1 16). He kept up the fight to the end (2 Tim 4 6 f), for the Lord Jesus stood by him (4 17), as on the road to Damascus. So the personal note of experience links all the epp. together. They were all preaching and world-to-wield Christ. Paul at the very start perceived that men are redeemed by faith in Jesus as the Saviour from sin through 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" (1 24) and Paul 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 2 13 f), 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 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, we are 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, 1890, 19). The 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 gospel is not his. 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 13 f), 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. It is in his Lord's address to the Ephesians in all his epp., but he presses home the special phase of truth needed at the moment, always with proper balance and modification, though not in the form of a system of doctrine. In the first group he relieves the minds of the Thessalonian Christians from the misapprehension into which they had fallen concerning his position on the immediate coming of Christ. In the second group Paul vindicates the gospel of grace from the legalistic addition of Mithraism (as in Phil 3, where he quotes and deplores the saying of the Jews who sought to rob the Gentiles of their freedom by insisting that they become Jews as well as Christians. This ringing battle is echoed in Acts 15 and is the mightiest conflict of Paul's career. We hear echoes of it in Phil 3, but he had won his contention. In the third group the battle with error has shifted to the province of Asia, to the Lycus Valley, where a mystic mixture of Judaism (Essenism) and heathen mystery-religions and philosophies (incipient Gnosticism) was so rife in its appeal. This was the phase of the Gnosticism which combined with some aspects of Christianity. It is possible also that Mithraism was already a foe of Christianity. The central position and essential deity of Jesus Christ was challenged by these new cults and world-views, and Paul attacks them with marvelous skill in Col and Eph and works out in detail his teaching concerning the person of Christ.
with due emphasis on the soteriological aspects of Christ's work and on Christian life. Bruce (St. Paul's Contribution to Christianity) conceives that Paul gives us his entire conception of Christianity in the four great epp. of the second group, while B. Weiss (Bibl. 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 struggle lingers on with variations in Crete and even in Ephesus. The Jewish phase of the heresy is more decided (perhaps Pharisaiic), and recalls to some extent the Judaistic controversy in the second group. Paul's polemics against Judaism 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 justify 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 argue about anything for nothing. Three methods of presenting Paul's Epp. in Robertson, Chronological NT (1904), and Moffatt, Historical NT (1901).

II. 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

   just as liable to presupposition and 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 spectators" (ib). Deissmann (St. Paul, 4:1) 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 Paulunianity, the historic Paul, to the 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 "doctrinal ascerten" of the modern Paulunianism and 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." In this position, Zahn, Deissmann, see us to 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 Pastoralbriefe (1855, p. 79), in which he remarked that there were only four epp. of Paul (Gal and 2 Cor, which could be

   The 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 2d 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 Judaism which whenever convenient had resorted violently against this view, and became the exponent of gentle freedom. Christianity was divided into
two factions, Jewish Christians (Petrinists) and gentle 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 fetch 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-

   Zahn, 1911, 1915) contends that the perpetuation of the Baur standpoint in Moffatt's Intro to the Lit. of the NT is an anachronism: "We are no longer in the 19th cent. with its negations, but in the 20th cent. with its growing power of insight and the power of belief that springs therefrom. Van Manen (EB) calls the Baur view that of the "old

   guard" of liberal theology in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, and, to some extent, in Britain. But even in Germany the older conservative view of Paul has always had champions. The most con-

   sistent of the recent opponents of Baur's

   3. Protest views in Germany is Th. Zahn (cf his against Einh in des NT, 2 vols, 1887-99; Intro

   Baur's View to dech, 1893). Zahn's Baurianism is

   the true successor of Lightfoot as the chief

   antagonist of the Tübingen School is Dr. W.

   M. Ramsay, whose numerous volumes (Church in the Rom Empire, 1885; Churches and Bishops of Phrygia, 1885; St. Paul the True Paulinian 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, Pfleiderer, Harnack, and

   4. Successors.-Baur's two chief opponents, Lipsius and Soden, were

   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 but Eph and the Pastoral Epp. This process eliminated completely Baur's thesis and nearly to the time of Lightfoot. Ramsay and Zahn. Von Soden (Early Christian Lit., 324) still stands out against 2 Thess, but Harnack has de-

   serted him on that point. But the old narrow view of Baur is gone, and Von Soden is eloquent in his enthusiasm for the Pauline estate of faithfulness, and 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." In this position, Zahn, Deissmann, see us to 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 Pastoralbriefe (1855, p. 79), in which he remarked that there were only four epp. of Paul (Gal and 2 Cor, which could be

   The Tübingen
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great epp. and from the pseudo-Clementine literature of the 2d 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 Judaism which whenever convenient had resorted violently against this view, and became the exponent of gentle freedom. Christianity was divided into
two factions, Jewish Christians (Petrinists) and gentle 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 fetch 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-

   Zahn, 1911, 1915) contends that the perpetuation of the Baur standpoint in Moffatt's Intro to the Lit. of the NT is an anachronism: "We are no longer in the 19th cent. with its negations, but in the 20th cent. with its growing power of insight and the power of belief that springs therefrom. Van Manen (EB) calls the Baur view that of the "old

   guard" of liberal theology in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, and, to some extent, in Britain. But even in Germany the older conservative view of Paul has always had champions. The most con-

   sistent of the recent opponents of Baur's

   3. Protest views in Germany is Th. Zahn (cf his against Einh in des NT, 2 vols, 1887-99; Intro

   Baur's View to dech, 1893). Zahn's Baurianism is

   the true successor of Lightfoot as the chief

   antagonist of the Tübingen School is Dr. W.

   M. Ramsay, whose numerous volumes (Church in the Rom Empire, 1885; Churches and Bishops of Phrygia, 1885; St. Paul the True Paulinian 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, Pfleiderer, Harnack, and

   4. Successors.-Baur's two chief opponents, Lipsius and Soden, were

   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 but Eph and the Pastoral Epp. This process eliminated completely Baur's thesis and nearly to the time of Lightfoot. Ramsay and Zahn. Von Soden (Early Christian Lit., 324) still stands out against 2 Thess, but Harnack has de-

   serted him on that point. But the old narrow view of Baur is gone, and Von Soden is eloquent in his enthusiasm for the Pauline estate of faithfulness, and 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." In this position, Zahn, Deissmann, see us to the pre-Baur time. Deissmann would like to get past all the schools of criticism, back to Paul himself.
in Acts as authoritative. But these give glimpses of the historical Jesus quite as truly as the Pauline Epp., and should therefor be regarded by advocates of the mythical Jesus. So the pendulum swings back and forth. One school destroys 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. ("Jesus and Paul," Cambridge Bib. 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 T. J. G. Machens' "Jesus and Paul" in Bib. 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 Wenke (Beginnings of Christianity, i, 163) sees that Paul is not the creator of Christianity, but the "great exegete" (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, 1906). 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 und Jesus (1907); Kaltner, Jesus und 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 Zeitschr. für die neutest. Spr. and Zeitschr. für die kathol. Theologie, 1912-13 (now in book form) by H. A. A. Kennedy on "St. Paul's Antithesis of the Religious," and Clemen on "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-Paulian myth of 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 of Paul's 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 made to Jesus (The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910). He calls the glories in the history to answer the interpretation absurdities of Steck, Loman, Van Manen and Drews by showing that the eschatological conceptions of Paul in his epp. are primitive, not late, and belong 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 we allow the "exclusively Jewish-eschatological" (p. ix) interpretation. There he slips, and his theory will go the way of all others. We are reaching the same point in 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. Myrrhe (Die Religion des Judentums in NT Zeitalter, 1903) seeks to find in the "late Jewish apocalyptic" "conceptions from the Bab and the Irano-Zarathushtrian religions" (Schweitzer, Paul and His Myth of God). 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, 1906). 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 und Jesus (1907); Kaltner, Jesus und 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 Zeitschr. für die neutest. Spr. and Zeitschr. für die kathol. Theologie, 1912-13 (now in book form) by H. A. A. Kennedy on "St. Paul's Antithesis of the Religious," and Clemen on "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-Paulian myth of 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 of Paul's 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 made to Jesus (The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910). He calls the glories in the history to answer the interpretation absurdities of Steck, Loman, Van Manen and Drews by showing that the eschatological conceptions of Paul in his epp. are primitive, not late, and belong 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 we allow the "exclusively Jewish-eschatological" (p. ix) interpretation. There he slips, and his theory will go the way of all others. We are reaching the same point in the Palestinian sect and the world-religion!" (Werne, Beginnings of Christianity, i, 159).

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.

1. Schemes to 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 (3:23), but he takes no such pains in the history of chronology. But we are left with a number of incidentallusions 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 Lipscomb 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>Harbach</th>
<th>McGiffert</th>
<th>Zahn</th>
<th>Ramsay</th>
<th>Lightfoot</th>
<th>Clemen</th>
<th>Findlay</th>
<th>Hoehn</th>
<th>Hoenick</th>
<th>Hawkes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>30</td>
<td>34-35</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>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second visit to Jerusalem</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference at Jerusalem</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53-57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third missionary tour</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest in Jerusalem</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest in Rome</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66-67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Paul</td>
<td>64-65</td>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64-67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us look at the dates given by ten of this list:
The 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). Thus he came before Paul's last visit and arrest in Jerusalem, and they do not embrace all 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 tour. This will take him back to Tarus 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 Epp.

(1) The death of Stephen.—Saul is "a young man" (Acts 7:58) when this event occurs. Like other Roman governors, the succession of his life was "due to the interregnum," i.e., the period of Aretas the Arabion, 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 exact date is "3 years after the death of Stephen" and "the year after the death of Stephen." The evidence shows that the city was not under the control of Aretas, but was attacked by a Bedouin chiefman who lay in wait for Paul before the city. That to me seems forced. Jos (Ant, XVIII, v, 3; vi, 3) at any rate is silent concerning the authority of Aretas over Damascus from 35-37 AD, but no coins or inscriptions show Rom rule over the city between 35 and 62 AD. Ramsay, however ("The Pauline Chronology," Pauline and Other Studies, 364), accepts the view of Marquardt (Römische Staatsalterth., I, 404 f.) that it was possible for Aretas to have had possession of Damascus before 37 AD. The flight from Damascus is the same year as the visit to Jerusalem, Paul's first after his conversion (Acts 9:26; Gal 1:18). If we knew the precise year of this event, we could subtract two or three years and reach the date of his conversion. Lightfoot in his Comm. on Gal gives 38 as the date of this first visit to Jerusalem, and 36 as the date of the conversion, taking "after 3 years" as a free way, but in his Bib. Essays, 221, he puts the visit 37 as the conversion in 34, and says "after 3 years must mean three whole years, or substantially so." Thus we miss a sure date again.

(2) The flight from Damascus.—Paul locates this humiliating experience (2 Cor 11:32 f.) when "the governor under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes, the Arabions, 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 exact date is "3 years after the death of Stephen" and "the year after the death of Stephen." The evidence shows that the city was not under the control of Aretas, but was attacked by a Bedouin chiefman who lay in wait for Paul before the city. That to me seems forced. Jos (Ant, XVIII, v, 3; vi, 3) at any rate is silent concerning the authority of Aretas over Damascus from 35-37 AD, but no coins or inscriptions show Rom rule over the city between 35 and 62 AD. Ramsay, however ("The Pauline Chronology," Pauline and Other Studies, 364), accepts the view of Marquardt (Römische Staatsalterth., I, 404 f.) that it was possible for Aretas to have had possession of Damascus before 37 AD. The flight from Damascus is the same year as the visit to Jerusalem, Paul's first after his conversion (Acts 9:26; Gal 1:18). If we knew the precise year of this event, we could subtract two or three years and reach the date of his conversion. Lightfoot in his Comm. on Gal gives 38 as the date of this first visit to Jerusalem, and 36 as the date of the conversion, taking "after 3 years" as a free way, but in his Bib. Essays, 221, he puts the visit 37 as the conversion in 34, and says "after 3 years must mean three whole years, or substantially so." Thus we miss a sure date again.

(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 Galilee (Ant, XIX, 2271). He received this dignity soon after Claudius began to reign in 41 AD, so that makes the date 44 AD. He died after thePassover in that year (44), for Peter was imprisoned by him during that feast and ultimately Luke sandwiches the narrative about Herod Agrippina between the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem (Acts 11:29 f.) 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 (12:1 f.) and Aretas (XIX, 217) we note that Peter "went to another place" (12:17). But the apostles are back again in Jerusalem in 15:4 f. Lightfoot (Bib. Essays, 216) therefore places the visit "at the end of 44, or in 45." Once more we have a fact that may fix the end date of 45. We add this to 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 11:29 f., but Lightfoot (op. cit., 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 apostles when he met them in Jerusalem. There is no record that he ever saw Agrippa the first time. 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 f., except that it was after the first missionary tour of Acts 13 and 14.

(4) The first missionary tour.—Sergius Paulus is proconsul of Cyprus when Barnabas and Saul visit the island (Acts 13:7). The proconsul Paulus is mentioned in a 2d book, in a manner which suggests that of Solus (Hogarth, in CIL, VI, 31, 545, but, as no mention of his being proconsul is here made, it is probably earlier than that time. The Soloi inscription bears the date 55 AD, but Sergius was proconsul of Cilicia only between 51 and 52. Hence he may have been proconsul 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 Galio becomes proconsul of Achaea (Acts 18:12). Paul has been apparently in Corinth a year and six months when Galio 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 Galio 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 Gallo") has shown beyond reasonable doubt that Galio, the brother of Seneca, became proconsul of Achaea about July, 51 AD (or possibly 52). On a stone found at Delphi, Galio is mentioned as proconsul of Achaea according to the inscription, but 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 the winter. The reference (Acts 20 23) to the date of Paul’s arrival at Corinth is 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 Epp. cannot be later than this date. Before the close of 52 AD, and after the 21st of May, Paul made the tours of Corinth, Athens, and Ephesus, and then Paulinism. This is the beginning of the 21 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 Gallo.

(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, 259 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 Philippippi 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. But insufficiency of 55 AD to the writer, reaches the same conclusion. The conclusion is logical if Luke is exact in his use of this day in his passage. Yet Lightfoot insists on 58 AD, and Ramsay has the opportunity on this point. See Pauline and Other Studies, 627 f.

(7) Festus succeeding Felix.—When was Felix recalled? He was appointed procurator in 52 AD (Schrader, 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 the ministry of Felix. But Felix’s “many years” has been explained by Erbes in his Todestag Paulus und Petri, and is 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, art. “Paul” in new Sch-Heiz Enc: Schrader, 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, 59-60, Acts 20 11) and the year of the Pauline Epp., Paul’s death would come within a month or thereabouts of his arrival (March). The year 59 is thus a probable one for Paul’s arrival. See also, Deissmann, op. cit., 467 f. We have seen that Gallo came to Corinth in the summer of 51 AD (or 52), and Paul had been there a year and a half (Acts 18 11), leaving ample time in either case for the journey to Corinth to attend the assembly of the Christians. Hence the Pauline Epp. of Paul’s second visit to 51 AD, which is the beginning of the 21st missionary tour (Acts 16 1-6) as it was understood. The Corinthian conference was probably the same year, and the first missionary tour would come in the two or (three) preceding years 47 and 48 (48-49). The stay at Antioch (Acts 14 25) may have been of some length. So we come back to the end of 44 or beginning of 45 for the visit to Jerusalem in Acts 13 29 f. Before that comes the year in Antioch with Barnabas (11 26), the years that Paul spent in Arabia (Gal 1 17 f), Paul’s first appearance at the death of Stephen (Acts 7 58). These early dates are more conjectural, but even so the facts seem to indicate Paul’s 3 visits to the capital city of the empire. The year of his birth would then be between 1 and 5 AD, probably nearer 1. If so, and if his death was in 67 or 68 AD, his age is well indicated. He was “Paul the Aged” (Philem ver 9) when he wrote to Philemon in 62 AD. Rome in 66 AD.

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 geotic speculation and the rabbinic argument, has heavily encouraged 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 truth of the Gospels. That is a serious charge against the man who claimed to be 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). D. Moir (Paul and Paulinism, 1910, 70) minimizes the effect of Paulinism: “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.” “Paulinism 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 “Paul was the great power of the apostolic age.” Hence “the history of the Church in the beginnings of Christianity, sees St. Paul as first after Jesus.” Feine (Jesus Christus und Paulus, 1902, 298) claims that Paul grasped the essence of the Gospel and preached it “auf das Tiefste.” I own myself a victim to “the peculiar Paulinism” to use Ramsay’s phrase (Pauline and Other Studies,
27. In seeking to study the "shaping influences" in Paul's career (Alexander, The Ethics of St. Paul, 1910, 27), we shall be in error if we seek to explain everything that was important and influential in his life. He is what he is because of original endowments, the world of his day, and his experience of Christ Jesus. He had both essential and accidental factors in his environment, as described in Religion and Theology, 1910, 469 f. Let us note the chief factors in his religious development.

Geography plays an important part in any life. John the Baptist spent his boyhood in the hill country of Judaea in a small town called Enon. The city of Tarsus Jesus spent His boyhood in the town of Nazareth and then the wilderness of Tarsus Jesus grew up in a great city and spent his life in the great cities of the Roman empire. He makes little use of the beauty of nature, but he has a keen knowledge of men (of Robertson, Epochs in the Life of Paul, 12). Paul was proud of his great city (Acts 21 39). He was not merely a "citizen" of that city but a distinguished citizen. This fact shows that Paul's family had not just migrated from Judaea to Tarsus a few years before his birth, but had been planted in Tarsus as part of a colony with full municipal rights (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 101). He has the citizenship of Cilicia, then a part of the province of Syria, but it had the title of metropolis and was a free city, urbs libera (Pliny, NH, v. 27). To the ancient Or the city was his "fatherland" (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 228). Tarsus was situated on the river Cydnus, and in a wide plain with the hill country behind and the snow-covered Taurus Mountains in the distance. It was subject to malaria. Ramsay (ib, 117 f) from Gen 16 4 f holds that the early inhabitants were Greeks mingled with Orientals. East and West flowed together here. It was a Rom town also with a Jewish colony (ib, 169 f), constituting a city tribe to which Paul's family belonged. So then Tarsus was a typical city of the Gr-Rom civilization.

The religions of the times all met there in this great mart of culture also. Strabo (xiv, 673) says that Tarsus surpassed all the universities, such as Alexandria and Athens, in the study of philosophy and educational literature in general. "The city itself is in this, that the men of learning here are all native." Accordingly, he and others have made up a list of the distinguished men who resided at Tarsus in the late autumn of Gr learning: philosophers—of the Academy, of the Epicurean and Stoic schools—poets, grammarians, physicians. At Tarsus, one might say, "you breathed the atmosphere of learning" (Lightfoot, Bib. Essays, 205). But Ramsay (Cities of St. Paul, 311 f) cautions us not to misunderstand Strabo. It was not even one of the three great universities of the world in point of equipment, fame, students from abroad, or general standing. It was not on a par with Athens and Alexandria, excepting when the citizen rich in what constitutes the true excellence and strength of a university, intense enthusiasm and desire for knowledge among the students and great ability and experience among some at least of the teachers" (ib, 233). Strabo was very fond of Athenian culture. Now students from all over Europe come to Tarsus, but they went from Tarsus elsewhere. But Philostratus represents Apollonus of Tyana as disgusted with the university and the town, and St. Chrysostom describes Tarsus as an oriental and non-Hellenic town.

Ramsay speaks of Tarsus in the reign of Augustus as "the one example known in history of a state ruled by a university, working through a university, and its principal." "It is characteristic of the general tendency of university life in a prosperous and peaceful empire, that the rule of the Tarsian University was marked by a strong reaction toward oligarchy and a curtailment of democracy; that also belongs to the oriental spirit, which was so strong in the city. But 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 important and interesting in 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 by citizenship cause he had bound him" (22 29).

Likewise the magistrates at Philippi feared what the people might do when they heard Paul say, "fear not what man shall do to you" (Acts 16 39), and promptly released Paul and Silas and "asked them to go away from the city." "The Roman his citizenship was his passport in distant lands, his talisman in seasons of difficulties and danger. It made his appeal to the laws of municipal and the injustice of local magistrates" (Lightfoot, Bib. Essays, 203). As 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, 10). He would naturally have a kindly feeling for the Rom 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 Eucholog of Virgil (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 49). Paul would seize upon the Rom 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). The word "Paulinism" (under the heading, "Paulinism in the Rom Empire" (Cities of St. Paul, 70 f) "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 his 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). "It is necessary to know something of the empire (ib, 66) does say: "His perspective was not imperialistic," but he shows thereby a curious inability to understand Paul. The vision of Paul saw that the regeneration of the empire could come only through Christianity. Ramsay strikingly shows how the emperor dreaded the spiritual upheaval in Paulinism and fought it steadily till the time of Constantine, when "an official Christianity was victorious, but Pauline Christianity had perished, and Paul was now a mere saint, no longer 'father, or 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 gathered round the Protestants of the Reformation."
Suffer Ramsay 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 perished or became essentially part of its course Christian after the Pauline form." Paul would show the Rom genius for organizing the churches established by him. Many of his churches would be in Rom colonies (Antioch in Phidias, Phillipi, 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 conversion with Rom law, not merely in knowing how to take advantage of his rights 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 ff the actual revolt. Rom law is referred to by which "heirship is now deduced from sonship, whereas in Gal sonship is deduced from heirship; for at Rome a son must be an heir, but an heir need not be a son (cf He 9 15 ff which presupposes Rom law and the right of primogeniture)" (Meyers in 1-vol 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 as Gal 4 shows. See Ramsay, Gal, 337-93; 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 Greek, would have "nomen cognomen," not determined by his nomen; there is no reason to think he was an 'Ephesius' (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler, 31). It is probable, though not certain, that Paul spoke Latin (see Souter, Epis, April, 1911). As a Rom 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 "pax 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 (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 79). We do not know all the factors which attended his development or constituted his education. He was master of all the education and the opportunities of his time. He turned to his profit and to the advancement of his great purpose the resources of civilization (Ramsay, 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 Schramm 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 (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler, 31). Certainly the Gr traits of adaptability, curiosity, alertness, the love of investigation were marked features of his character, and Tarsus afforded wide opportunity for the acquiring of these qualities (The Ethics of St. Paul, 39). He learned to speak the vernacular koine like a native 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 artificial rules of the rhetoricians of the day (Dissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 230 f.). Blass (Die Rhythm en der asiatischen und römischen Kunstprosa, 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 distribut and other common rhetorical devices, though he was very far from being tinged with Atticism or Asinianism. It is certain that Paul did not attend any of the schools of rhetoric and did not write in the manner in Meyer's Krit. exkomm. commends that Paul's methods and expressions conform more nearly to the cynic and Stoic distribut than to the rabbinical dialectic; cf also Wendland and Kern, Philo u. d. jüdisch-röm. Rhetorik, 1911, Hocks, "Paul 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 resuscitate as the home of Athenian writers of antitype. Even so, there is no reason to say that he made his few quotations from hear-say and read no Gr books (cf Zahn, Intro to the NT, 52). Certainly he knew the Gr OT and the Jewish apocryphal and apocryphal literature. To admit that Paul 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 Ramsay with "overrating the influence of the gentile environment on Paul's development" (Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 8). Ramsay 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 Traveler, 34). A resuscitate as the home of Athenian authors. It was a stronghold of Stoic theology. "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
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 the non-Christian world. He does not appear to have learned any Aramaic or Hebrew, and he is not known to have studied the Old Testament. There is no real difficulty on the score of time. The world was saturated with Greek ideas, and Paul could not escape them. He could not escape it unless he was innocent of all culture. Ramsay sees in Paul a blend of truth and reality "wholly inconceivable in a more narrow Hebrew, and wholly inexplicable without an education in Greek philosophy." ("St. Paul and Hellenism," Cities of St. Paul, 34). Paul exhibited a freedom and universalism that he had thought of as the unique function of the Christ of God. It is not that the ancient world was at all decayed as some think. For the discussion between Garvie and Ramsay see Expos, April and December, 1911. Pfeiderer (Urchristentum, Vorwort, 174-78) finds a "double root" of Paulinism, a Christianized Hellenism and a Christianized Pharisaism. Harnack is more nearly correct in saying that "notwithstanding Paul's Greek culture, his conception of Christianity is, in its deepest ground, independent of Hellenism." The Hellenistic influence on Paul was relative and subordinate (Wendland, Die Weltanschauung der ersten Christen in der Zeit des Jüdischen Christenthums und Christentums, 3te Aufl, 1912, 245), but it was real, as Köhler shows (Zum Verständniss des Apostels Paulus, 9). He had a "Gr inheritance" beyond a doubt, and it was not all unconscious or superficial, as some claim. See the discussion of the "Hellenistic" character of Christianity by C. L. Lightfoot in his St. Paul's Age and Message (C. I. T. 17).

It is true that in Athens the Stoics and Epicureans ridiculed Paul as a "pick up of learning's erumbe"—Browning's rendering (An Epistle of σπορομάχου, σερμολογίου). Paul shows a fine scorn of the sophists and verbal pedantries of the ancient 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, 260) 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 διά τού σώματος, τα διά τού σώματος, in 2 Cor 6:10, and uses a Stoic and cynic word in 2 Cor 9:8, αὐθάραξεν, αυθαρείαν. 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 the same common problems of life than that Seneca had seen Paul's Epp. 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 shows that some of the "Hellenistic" in 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 I confess my sympathy with the notion and find all the Pauline epp., 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, 53) 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," which had been calligraphied. He does not agree that here Deissmann understands Paul. He makes "the world of St. Paul" on too narrow a scale.

Was Paul influenced by Mishnaism? 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 sec. 3, 4, above). His arguments are conclusive on the whole as he claims the wild notions of W. B. Smith, "Der vorchristliche Jesus; J. M. Robertson, Pagan Christ; A. Drews, Die Christus-Myth; and Lubiniski, Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur. A magic papyrus about 300 AD has 'I adjure thee in the name of the Hebrew Jesus' (Il, 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 (Der Ursprung der islamischen-Judischen Quellen, 1912, 336) has the same objection. It appears to me that in the 1st cent. AD "one cannot speak of non-Jewish influences on Christology." One may dismiss at once the notion that Paul "defied" Jesus into a god and made him Christ under the influence of pagans (Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, 170, p. 31). 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 (Pitrōma, "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 doctrines went so widely abroad. 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 (Pitrōma, "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 doctrines went so widely abroad. 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 (Pitrōma, "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 doctrines went so widely abroad. 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.

Appeal is made to the magical use of the name of Jesus by the strolling Jewish exorcists in Ephesus (Acts 18 15 ff). Kiesvogt Lake (Barler Epp. 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. the "Christian baptism and the Lord's supper" (Epp. 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
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 the magic arts of the Mysteries. Indeed the two things may have been to some extent combined in some places. A parallelism is long been drawn between "dwelling in the things which he hath seen," or (m) "taking him to ... occultations," etc. (cf. Westcott, Ramsay, etc.) suspected an early error in the text, but the same word, ἐμπνεύσωμαι, embatē̂sō, has been found by Sir W. M. Ramsay as a result of investigations by Dr. miracle, by the Jewish Imperial Museum, in the sanctuary of Apollo at Claros, a town on the Ionian coast. Some of the initiates here record the finding of a way that being initiated, having been initiated, they entered" (embatē̂sō). The word is thus understood to have been initiated initiators into the life of the initiate (cf. Independent, 1913, 376). Clearly, then, Paul used the word in this sense in Col 2:18.

For further discussion see Jacoby and W. M. Ramsay, Mysteriorenligionen; Glover, Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire; Reitzenstein, Die hellen. Mysteriorenligionen; Friedlander, Rom Life and Manners under the Early Empire; III: Thorburn, Jesus Christ, Historical or Mythical.

M. Brückner (Der sterbende und aufstehende Gotttheit in den orientalischen Religionen und ihr Verhältnis zum 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 cults." 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 Midther? There we may leave the matter.

Paul was Gr and Rom, but not "pan-Bab," though he warned only all the winds of doctrine that blew about him, as we see.


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 glorying 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). 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 22:3ff; 26:4ff; Phil 3:4-6). "His religious patriotism flickered up within his Christianity" (Moffatt, Paul and Paulinism, 60). Had he been a Roman citizen, he could not do more. His Gentile culture and his rich endowments of mind, he would probably not have 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 in 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 Paul (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 (HDII) tersely says: "The Jew in him was the foundation of everything that he did." But it was this type of Judaism in spite of his persecution of the Christians. He belonged to the Judaism of the Dispersion. As a Roman 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 privileges the Israelites, as his true. But the type of Judaism, 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 Judaism ahead of his fellows (Gal 1:14). His ancestry was pure, Hebrew of the Hebrews (Phil 3:5), 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), as in the true of a mother's 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 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 Jerus to study at the school of Gamaliel. This Paul considered himself a Pharisee as distinct from the Sadducean scepticism (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 relations 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 Pharisism should be understood as the spiritual, not the legal. So Jesus played an important part in the training of Saul (Acts 22:3), as Paul recognized. He was known in Jerus as a student. He knew Aram. as well as Gr (and Lat.), and could speak in it as so to attract the attention of a Jewish audience (Acts 22:2). 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. Gr culture is common for pupils to go farther than their teachers, but 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 Pharisaism. An effort has recently been made to restore Pharisaism to its former dignity. Herford (Pharisaism, Its Aim and Method, 1912) undertakes to show that the Gospels have slandered Pharisaism, that it was the one hope of the ancient world, etc. He has a chapter on "Pharisaism and Paul," in which he claims that Paul has not attacked the real Pharisaism, but has aimed his blows at an unreal creation of his own brain (p. 222). But, if Paul did not understand Pharisaism, he did not understand anything. He knew not merely the OT but the Hebraic. He 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 method of approach, and so do most modern students of St. Paul. Paul knew Wisd, also, a book from the Jewish-Alexandrian theology with a tinge of Greek philosophy (see Goodrick, Book of Wisd, 398–403; cf. also Jowett's essay on "St. Paul and Philo" in his Epp. of St. Paul). Paul also knew to use allegory (Gal 4:24) in accord with the method of Philo. So he knew how to use the Stoic diatribe, the rabbinical 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 rabbinical schools remains with him (Köhler, Zum Verständnis, etc., 7). Here, then, is a man with a wonderfully rounded culture. 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 about 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 Greek training (Alexander, Ethics of St. Paul, 58). "We must allow something to remain in us as a sense of the children of the past, but some men have much more the spirit of creation than others. Paul is not mere "eclectic patchwork" (Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, 218). Even if Paul was acquainted with Philo, he may have had a tough constitution to have endured such hardship to a good age. He had one infirmity in particular that came upon him at Tarsus (2 Cor 12:1–9) in connection with the visions and revelations of the Lord and grace, but the point was not only his nervousness (Gal 4:14). He felt the frailty of his body as an earthen vessel (2 Cor 4:7) and as a tabernacle in which he groaned (6:4). But the effect of all this weakness was to give him a fresh sense of dependence on Christ and a new influx of Divine power (2 Cor 11:30; 12:9). But even if Paul was unprepossessing in appearance and weakened by illness, whether ophthamia, which is so common in the East (Gal 4:15), or malaria, or recurrent headache, or epilepsy, he must have had a tough constitution to have endured such hardship to a good age.

He had one infirmity in particular that came upon him at Tarsus (2 Cor 12:1–9) in connection with the visions and revelations of the Lord and grace, but the point was not only his nervousness (Gal 4:14). He felt the frailty of his body as an earthen vessel (2 Cor 4:7) and as a tabernacle in which he groaned (6:4). But the effect of all this weakness was to give him a fresh sense of dependence on Christ and a new influx of Divine power (2 Cor 11:30; 12:9). But even if Paul was unprepossessing in appearance and weakened by illness, whether ophthamia, which is so common in the East (Gal 4:15), or malaria, or recurrent headache, or epilepsy, he must have had a tough constitution to have endured such hardship to a good age. He had one infirmity in particular that came upon him at Tarsus (2 Cor 12:1–9) in connection with the visions and revelations of the Lord and grace, but the point was not only his nervousness (Gal 4:14). He felt the frailty of his body as an earthen vessel (2 Cor 4:7) and as a tabernacle in which he groaned (6:4). But the effect of all this weakness was to give him a fresh sense of dependence on Christ and a new influx of Divine power (2 Cor 11:30; 12:9). But even if Paul was unprepossessing in appearance and weakened by illness, whether ophthamia, which is so common in the East (Gal 4:15), or malaria, or recurrent headache, or epilepsy, he must have had a tough constitution to have endured such hardship to a good age. He had one infirmity in particular that came upon him at Tarsus (2 Cor 12:1–9) in connection with the visions and revelations of the Lord and grace, but the point was not only his nervousness (Gal 4:14). He felt the frailty of his body as an earthen vessel (2 Cor 4:7) and as a tabernacle in which he groaned (6:4). But the effect of all this weakness was to give him a fresh sense of dependence on Christ and a new influx of Divine power (2 Cor 11:30; 12:9). But even if Paul was unprepossessing in appearance and weakened by illness, whether ophthamia, which is so common in the East (Gal 4:15), or malaria, or recurrent headache, or epilepsy, he must have had a tough constitution to have endured such hardship to a good age.
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, that had driven him there. There is doubt be... 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 ff) calls special attention to the look of Paul. He "fascinated his eyes on" the man (Acts 16: 10; 19: 14). He argues that Paul had a peculiar, trating, 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 to preserve a likeness of the intensest 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).

1. *His natural endowments.* In respect to his moral nature he 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 ff) notes his silling body and his tremendous powers for work, his lack of self-confidence and his periods of depression and of intoxication with victory, his tenderness and his sternness; he was ardently loved and curiously 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 suddenness, of subtlety, of stamina, of endurance, 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, HBD; 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 mounting and the winding of the Sanhedrin (23: 6). The one was a mere matter of prudence; the other was a justifiable skill 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" (Hevan, *St. Paul in the Light of To-day*, 192). But it is through his epp. he loves his converts like a mother or a lover (Findlay, HBD) rather than a pastor. We fed the burning emo-tibilities of Paul. One, 1 Cor. 10: 16, 17; Gal. 5: 19-23; Phil. 2: 1 Tim in particular. He had the spiritual temper-ament of genius; yet he felt in the world, and his personality was his momentary husky, his rhapsody. He has elasticity and rebound of spirit, and comes up with the joy of victory in Christ out of the seemingly worst situations. His temper was great, but it is to serve Christ his Lord. He is a man of faith and a man of prayer. For him prayer is not the burden for friendship and binds men (Acts 10: 9, 11; 18: 18) to the hands of steel—men like Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Luke, Titus (Speer, *The Man Paul*, 1906, 111 ff). He is not afraid to oppose his friends when it is necessary for the sake of truth, as with Peter (Gal 2: 11 ff) and with Barnabas (Acts 15: 38 ff). While his nature was like that of the other apostles out of the clay whereof ordinary men are fashioned, you may say he was a man of infinite pains with his education" (Fairbairn, *Studies in Religion and Theology*, 471). If ever a man, full-blooded and and-eyed, wrenched the earth, it was Paul. It is impossible to answer the question whether Paul was married or not. He certainly was not married when he wrote the Epistles. But if he was a member of the Sanhedrin when he cast his vote against the disciples (Acts 26: 10), as his language naturally means, he was then married.

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 58), and soon drives the disciples out of Jerusalem.

2. (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: 1-5). 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 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. Preparatory. — It was sudden. It was without preparation. The event was the conversion of Saul. It happened. 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 sin's temporary defeat (7: 25). Of course, 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 said about 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 willfully 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 but a stranger on the whole is distinctly hostile to Christ, and the reason why he opposed his course was in the subconscious mind. There a volcano had gathered ready to burst out.

It is proper to ask whether Paul had known Jesus in the flesh. It is not easy to give a categorical reply. It is possible that Paul may have known that Paul had come to Jesus to study when Jesus as a boy of 12 visited the temple. He may have been a doctor. That could be true only in case Paul was born 6 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 present to work. There is no express statement to this effect in the letters of Paul, when he shows undoubted knowledge of various events in the life of Christ (Wynne, Preliminary Records of Jesus of Nazareth, 1857). It is almost certain that the events (Acts 9 and 21, the First-hand account of the conversion of Saul is given in Acts 22). Paul refers to the Risen Jesus. The passage in 2 Cor 10-16 is argued both ways: Wherefore we answer no man at the flesh; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him spiritually (v. 2). It may be the viewpoint of Christ and so of all men. Weiss pleads (ib. p. 40) at any rate, that we have no warrant for saying that "Paul had not seen Jesus in person." It may be left in abeyance as not vitally important. He certainly had not understood Jesus, if he knew Him.

(2) Experience. —Space does not permit a discussion of this great event of Paul’s conversion at all commensurate with its significance. A literature of its own has grown up round it. It has been keenly discussed 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 Life of the Apostle Paul, 1942; Magie, 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 into a trance, that he was blinded by a flash of lightning, that he imagined that he saw Jesus as a result of his highly wrought nervous state, that he deliberately renounced Judaism because of the growing conviction that the disciples were right. But none of these explanations explains. Mere 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. We must listen to 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 sense of the supernatural and did not see Jesus with his eyes. Deane (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 15:1), 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 his own existence. The account is given 3 t in Acts (chs 9, 25, 28) in substantial agreement, with a few varying details. In ch 9 the historical narrative occurs, in ch 22 Paul’s defense 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 the same sense, with the accusative. Finlay (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 gained the light of Christ’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 seion of Judaism who had renounced power, place, pride for the lowly Nazarene? He was not the man to go back to his old surroundings 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” (9:19). Ananias vouched for him by his vision (9:15), and Saul went boldly into the synagogues and proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God” (9:20). This was a public committal and a proclamation of his new creed. There was tremendous pith and point in this statement from Saul, who was so amazed (Acts 9:21). This is the core of Paul’s message as we see it in his later ministry (Acts 13:1, 17:3). 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 full 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 doctrines. The epoch that he takes no account of this personal phase of Paul’s career, but he allows room for it between Acts 9:21 and 22. It is Paul who tells of his retirement to Arabia (Gal 1:171) 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 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 indeed after that until his death. 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 he had been to each and to the very last. The undoubted devotions 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" (Köhler, Ztschr. f. ev. Dogm. 31, 17, 1908). Pfleiderer (Influence of the Apostle Paul on 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 became the savior of the world. 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 genuine a relationship than mere 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, i, 135). It caused the immediate unfolding of the missionary 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." But he does it with that 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 as completely absorbed his interest and almost it absorbed itself" (Deissmann, Life of Paul, 162). 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 to "become acquainted with him") though he may have gone for other, perhaps, less noble, causes. 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, then, expected, then the doors of work opened. But for 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 had heard 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). But Saul was more a man 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 (or hence unto the Gentiles") (Acts 9:12-21). One martyr like Stephen is enough. So the brethren took him down to Caesarea (Acts 9:30). It was an ominous beginning for a ministry with so clear a call. Where can he go now?

They "sent him forth to Tarsus" (Acts 9:30). Who would welcome him there? At Jerusalem he apparently avoided Gamaliel and the Sanhedrin. He was with the Christians and preached to the Hellenistic Jews. The Jews regarded him as a turncoat, 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 spoke to himself as he wandered through Syria and Cilicia during 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 Gentile ministration upon the "wilderness" of Tarsus, 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 whether he only goes among Jews 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 persecutions 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 15:41), with the promise of this early ministry and apparently containing Gentiles also. A letter from the Jerusalem conference was addressed to "the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia" (Acts 15:23). 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 this task would have been if Saul had 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 whether one can close out one against the other. 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 36 AD would bring us to 42 AD. Paul had spent a year in Antioch before going up to Jerusalem.
4. Opportunity

Findlay (HDB) thinks that Paul had the visions before he received the call to come to Antioch. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 41) received 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 arrest and return to Jerusalem. 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 Jerus during this period with James the brother of the Lord Jesus as chief elder. A narrow Pharisaic element in the church would be put to some such test of the church in its attitude toward the Gentiles.

This is clear in the treatment of Peter, when he returned to Jerus after the experience at Caesarea with Cornelius (Acts 11 1-18). There was acquiescence, but not without a notice of the church in its attitude toward the Gentiles. Now to see how they held the key of the Lord’s doing. They have shown 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 to be a member of the Pharisaic party in the church at Jerus (11 2), for he was glad (11 23 f.) of the work in Antioch. Probably mindful of the discipline attempted on Simon Peter, he refrained from going back at once to Jerus. 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 Jerus. The prophecy by Agabus of a famine gave Barnabas and Saul a good excuse for a missionary journey, and Saul was a ready man according to his ability”—from the Church for the relief of the poverty in the Jerus 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 Jerus 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.

5. The First Great Mission Campaign: individual in Cilicia. Now the Spirit specifically directs the separation of Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13 and 14, 1, 29 f. and 48 AD 13 2). They were to go together, and they had the sympathy and prayers of a great church. The endorsement was probably not “ordination” in the technical sense, but a farewell service and blessing. The missionaries went forth on the world-campaign (13 3). No such unanimous endorsement could have been obtained in Jerus to this great enterprise. It was momentous in its possibilities for Christianity.

The whole Gentile church at Antioch probably was moved to the same degree. The view of the church in the period Acts 11 19-22 was not to do an isolated work in Antioch, but to evangelize the whole island till Paphos is reached. There they met a man of great prominence and intelligence, Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul, who had been under the spell of a sorcerer named Bar-Nice (Acts 13 6 f.) 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, who was probably a Judaizer (1 Cor 10 13, 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 forefront 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 Jerus (his home), not to Antioch (13 13). Paul and Barnabas push on to the territories of Paphos and Iconium. So thinks that Paul had malaria down at Perga and hence desired to get up higher land. That is possible. The places mentioned in the rest of the tour are Antioch in Pisidia (13 14), and Iconium (13 15). Lystra (14 8), and Derbe (14 20), cities of Lycaonia.
At Iconium. Mercury left to Paul and Barnabas. Paul, however, does not mention that name here only the popular designations. The work is wonderfully successful. In these cities, on one of the great Roman roads east and west, Paul is reaching the centers of provincial life as will be his custom. At Antioch Paul is invited to repeat his sermon on the next Sabbath (Acts 13:42), and Luke records at length the report of this discourse which has the characteristic notes of Paul's gospel as we see it in his epistles. Paul may have kept notes of the discourse. There were devout Gentiles at these services. These were the first to be won, and thus a wider circle of Gentiles could be reached. Paul and Barnabas were too successful at Antioch in Pisidia. The jealous Jews opposed, and Paul and Barnabas dramatically turned to the Gentiles (Acts 13:45 ff). But the Jews reached the city magistrate through the influential women, and Paul and Barnabas were ordered to leave (Acts 13:50 f). Similar success brings like results in Iconium. At Lystra, before the hostile Jews even Paul and Barnabas was driven out, because of the healing of the impotent man, they 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 14:13-18. It was success such as this that 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 start from there with a Christus and a ten Chrs (a Chrs 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?

The early date of Gal, addressed to these churches of Pisidia and Lycocna before the Conference in Jerusalem does not allow time for a second conference there (Gal 1:6; 3:1) in South Galatia. Gal 2, 49 AD Besides, there is less likelihood of a reference to this previous conference on the same subject is made in Acts 15, since Peter does refer to his experience at Caesarea (Gal 15:11) and since James in Acts 21:25 specifically ("we wrote") mentions the letter of Acts 15 in which full liberty was granted to the Gentiles. Once more, the attack on the position of Paul and Barnabas (Gal 1:14-17) and the requirement that Gentiles be circumcised and hence the sharp disension and tense feeling. The occasion for the sudden outbreak at Antioch on the part of the self-appointed (Acts 15:24) regulators of Paul and Barnabas lay in the reports that came to Jerusalem about the results of this campaign on a large scale among the Gentiles. There was peril to the supremacy of the Jewish element. They had assumed at first, as even Peter did who was not a Judaizer (Acts 10), that the Gentiles who became disciples would also become Jews. The decree prohibiting idolatry they had had thus to face the conduct of Peter at Caesarea (Acts 11:1 f) 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 Barnabas, but they had not agreed to a campaign to Hellenize Christianity. The matter had to stop. So the Judaizers came up to Antioch and laid down the law to Paul and Barnabas. They did not wait for them to come to them. The council met not only in Antioch (Acts 11:30), but 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 stubbornly themselves, and destroy the liberty of the Gentiles 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, and Barnabas as well. If they go 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 15:3) 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: Acts 15:3-4. In so far as the matter is concerned by the Judaizing element. There seems to have come an adjournment to prepare for the conflict, since in ver 6 Luke says again that "the apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider this matter." After the adjournment we may place the private conference of Paul and Barnabas with Peter, John and James and other teachers (Gal 2:10-11). In this private conference some of the timid brethren wished to persuade Paul to have the Gentiles put on a yoke of bondage, a yoke that Paul had brought down from Antioch (a live specimen), offered as a sacrifice to the Judaizers ("false brethren") and circumcised. But Paul stood his ground for the truth of the gospel and was supported by Peter, John and James. They agreed all around for Paul and Barnabas to go on with their work to the Gentiles, and Peter, John and James would push the work among the Jews (a division in sphere of work, like home and foreign missions, not a denominational cleavage). Here, then, for the first time, Paul has had an opportunity to talk the matter over with the apostolic teachers, and they agree. The Judaizers will have no support from the apostles. The battle was really won in their private conference. The meeting was successful as all goes smoothly enough. Ample opportunity for free discussion is offered. Then Peter shows how God had used him to preach to the Romans, and how the Jews themselves had to believe on Christ in order to be saved. He opposed putting a yoke on the Gentiles that the Jews could not bear. There was a pause, and then Barnabas and Paul (note the order here: courtesy to Barnabas) spoke. The last of the conference, the brother of the Lord Jesus, and a stedfast Jew, spoke. He cited Am 9:11 to show that God had long ago promised a blessing to the Gentiles. He suggests liberty to the Gentiles with the prohibition of pollution of idols, of fornication, things strangled, and blood. His ideas are embodied in a unanimous decree which strongly commends "our beloved Barnabas and Paul," and disclaims responsibility for the visit of the Judaizers to Antioch. The Western text omits "things strangled" from the decree. If this is correct, the decree prohibits idolatry and human sacrifices (Wilson, Origin and Aim of the Acts of the Apostles, 1912, 55). At any rate, the decision is a tremendous victory for Paul and Barnabas. If the other reading is correct, Jewish feelings about things strangled and blood are respected. The decision was received with great joy in Antioch (Acts 15:30-35).
Some time later Peter appears at Antioch in the fullest fellowship with Paul and Barnabas in their work, and in free intercourse with the Gentiles, as he had timidly 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 complaint was the anxiety they felt about 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 that they 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 Judaisers had renewed the threat, and the Church would keep it, and harry 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 (15 36), but Barnabas insisted on taking along Second Mark, which Paul was not willing Mission to do because of his failure to stick to the work at Perga. So they agreed. Acts 15 36

By this view Paul had not meant to stop in Galatia proper and did so only because of an attack of illness (Gal 4 13). It is possible that Luke may have come to his rescue here. At any rate, he finally pushes on opposite Myia and Bithynia, in the extreme north and was forbidden by the holy Spirit from going into Bithynia. So they came down to Troas (Acts 16 7) where Luke (“we,” 16 10) appears on the scene and the Macedonian call comes to Paul. Thus Paul is led out of Asia into Europe and carries the gospel far beyond the city of Galatia at Derbe and Lystra. The matter has many “ins” and “outs” and cannot be argued on the basis of a solution of the problem. Ramsey makes the narrative in ver 6 resumepart and takes us back to the stand-point of ver 1 when Paul writes to Thessalonica for a forecast was in ver 1, or at most before ver 4, which already seems to have been written. The speech of Iconium and Antioch in Pisidia: “and as they went on their way through the cities.” Besides, “the Phrygio-Galatian region” lay between Lystra and Asia, and, according to Ramsey, after the exorcism in Lystra, he went to Iconium. This is certainly very artificial and unlike the usual procedure. According to the other view, Paul had already visited the cities in Lycia and Pamphylia on a former visit. He wished to go on west and to go into Asia, probably to Ephesus, but was forbidden by the holy Spirit and as a result turned northward through Phrygia and the regions of Galatia, using both terms in the ethnographic sense. As Acts 16:19 shows, Paul came to Galatia at Derbe and Lystra. The matter has many “ins” and “outs” and cannot be argued in a solution of the problem. The present interpretation is in harmony with the narrative in Acts. See also GALATIA; GALATIANS, EPITHE.
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 17:17). Curiosity leads them to invite him 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 18:1-1), and Paul preached in the street (Acts 18:2). Curiosity leads them to invite him again and the coming of Timothy and Silas from Thessalonica (18:5) with supplies from Philippoi, as they had done while in Thessalonica (Phil 4:15f). This very success led to opposition, and Paul has to preach in the church of Titus (Titus 1:14). But the very people he goes on till Gallo comes and a renewed effort is made to have it stopped, but Gallo declines to interfere and thus practically makes Christianity a religion legal, since he treats it as a variety of Judaism. While there the apostle finds Timothy and Silas, Paul writes the two letters 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 connections 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 Christianity. 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 at Jerusalem" at Jerusalem (Acts 21:17), "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 Judaeizers had organized opposition there against him in the absence of the apostles, and it was so unpleasant that he did not stay. He suggests also that he departed there at Jerusalem (Acts 18:22), "and left them after his letter of commendation from the church for their episcopacy (2 Cor 3:1) to Corinth and Galatia, who were preaching "another Jesus" of nationalism and narrowness, whom Paul did not recognize (Gal 1:14). Both Denney and Findlay follow Næumer, 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 before Paul's departure with Silas, Paulus over Mark, and as probably contributing to that breach at the beginning of the second tour. It is not necessary to suppose that the Judaeizers 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 churches" (Acts 18:23). In order, according to the 6th, 14th, and 16th verse, through 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 (Acts 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 knowledge, and the people of Ephesus. There is no evidence that he was rebaptized as was true of the 12 disciples of John (Robertson, John the Baptist, 290-303). The boldness of Paul in Ephesus led in 3 months to his departure from the synagogue. In the schoolhouse of Tyranus, where he preached 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 Laodicea in the Lycaean Valley (cf. Acts 14). Paul has a successful litigation with the strange 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 (the tradesmen, 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 Panteost, 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 12:12). He may also have written another letter and sent it by Titus (2 Cor 2:3). The sudden departure from Ephesus by the Ephesians to Tarsus ahead of time, but he could not wait for Titus. He was 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 ff) 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 had left in Ephesus (Acts 19 21). Timothy and Titus had been sent on ahead to Macedonia from Ephesus (Acts 19 22). Titus is personally green with Paul to the Corinthians in a letter (2 Cor) which Paul now forwards, possibly by Titus. The latter part of the ep. (chs 10-13) deals with the stubborn minority who still resist the authority of Paul as a direct charismatic representative of Christ, as opposed to the apostolic position. The first three chapters as a separate ep. see the earlier part of this art. Paul seems to wait a while before going on to Corinth. He wishes the opposition to have time to repent. During this period he probably went round about to Illyricum (Rom 15 19). He spent three months in Greece (Acts 20 2), probably the winter of 56 and 57.

We have placed Gal in the early part of this stay in Corinth, though it could have been written while at Ephesus. As a corollary to the Acts, the writer here, and they both treat the same general theme of justification by faith in Christ. James, February, 127-45, brought at last to the conclusion that Gal belongs to the date of Acts 15 1 f. He bases this conclusion chiefly on the absence of Gal's independence. This apostle, claimed in Gal 1 and 2, he holds, he would not have been content with the independence in 15, which "is a sacrifice of complete independence." This is a curious interpretation, for in Gal 2:1-10 Paul himself tells of his apostleship on terms of equality by Peter, John and James, and of his going to Jerus by "revelation," which was just as much "a sacrifice of complete independence" as we find in Acts 15. Besides, in 2 Cor 11 5 and 12 11 Paul expressly asserts his equality (with Paul) with the church at Jerus. Paul, in 1 to 15, 10 he claims in so many words to have wrought more than any apostle, for the particular mission he had there with the contributions from that region reported the havoc wrought there by the Judaisers. Gal is a tremendous plea for the spiritual nature of Christianity as opposed to Jewish ceremonialism.

Paul had long had it in mind to go to Rome. It was his plan to do so while at Ephesus (Acts 19 21) after he had gone to Jerus with the great collection from the churches of Asia, Galatia, Asiah, and Macedonia. He hoped that this collection would have a mollifying effect on the Jewish saints as that from Antioch had (Acts 11 29 f). He had changed some details in his plans, but not the purpose to go to Jerus and then to Rome (cf Phil 1 21). This lasted and important letter of all to the Romans, in which he gives a fuller statement of his gospel, because they had not heard him preach, save his various personal friends who had gone there from the east (ch 16). But already the shadow of Jesus is on his heart, and he asks their prayers in his behalf, as he faces his enemies in Jerus (Rom 15 30-32). He hopes also to go on to Spain (15 24), so as to carry the gospel to the farther west also. The statesmanship of Paul comes out now in great clearness. He has in his heart always anxiety for the churches that consumes him (2 Cor 11 28 f). He was careful to have a committee of the churches go with him to report the collection (2 Cor 8 19 f). Paul had planned to sail direct for Syria, but a plot on his life in Corinth led him to go by land via Macedonia with his companions (Acts 20 2-4). He tarried at Philippi while the rest went on to Troas. At Philippi Paul is joined again by Luke, who stays with him till Rome is reached. They celebrate the Pentecost (at Philippi) in Philippi (Acts 20 8). We cannot follow the details in Acts at Troas, the voyage through the beautiful Archipelago, to Miletus. There Paul took advantage of the stop to send for the elders of Ephesus to whom he gave a wonderful address (Acts 20 17-38). They change ships at Patura for Phoenicia and pass to the right of Cyprus with its memories of Barnabas and Sergius Paulus and stop at Tyre, where Paul is warned not to go on to Jerus. The hostility of the Jews to Paul is not in the least common everywhere. There is grave peril of a schism in Christianity over the question of gentile liberty, once settled in Jerus, but unsettled by the Judaisers. At Caesarea Paul is greeted by Philip the evangelist and his four daughters (prophetesses). At Caesarea Paul is warned in dramatic fashion by Agabus (of Acts 11 28) not to go on to Jerus (21 9 ff), but Paul is more determined than ever to go, even if he die (20 13). He had had three premonitions for long (20 22 ff), but he will finish his course, once he is confident of the providence of God. He finds a friend in Caesarea in Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple, who was to be the host of Paul in Jerus (21 16).

Paul had hoped to reach Jerus by Pentecost (Acts 20 16). He seems to have done so. Luke gives the story of Paul in Jerus, 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 Christians in Jerus was cordial (Acts 17 17). On the very next day Paul and his party made a formal call on James and all the elders in Jerus (Acts 19 30). The next day Paul came into the synagogue of the brethren (Acts 19 35). On the 25th of the second month he and the elders of the church of Jerus had a meeting with Paul and the Gentiles. He presented the alms (collection) in due form (24 17), though some critics have actually suggested that Paul used it to defray the expenses of the appeal to Caesar. Rumor's prophecy that he might be delivered "to the people of my father's heir by now to his portion of his father's estate is quite probable. But the brethren wish to help Paul set himself right before the rank and file of the church in Jerus, who have been imposed upon by the Judaisers who have misrepresented Paul's real position by saying that he urged the Jewish Christians to give up the Mosaic customs (21 21). The elders understand Paul and recall the decision of the conference at which freedom was guaranteed to the Gentiles, and they have no wish to disturb that (21 25). They only wish Paul to show that he does not object to the Jewish Christians keeping up the Mosaic regulations. They propose that Paul offer sacrifice publicly in the temple and pay the vows of four men, as a sign of his freedom. Paul does not hesitate to do that (21 26 f). He had kept the Jewish feasts (of 20 6) as Jesus had done, and the early disciples in Jerus. He was a Jew. He may have had a vow at Corinth (18 18). He saw no inconsistency in a Jew doing thus after becoming a Christian, provided he did not make it obligatory on Gentiles. The real efficacy of the sacrifices lay in the death of Jesus for sin. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 173) calls this act of Paul "clear evidence of his courage as a man or his faith in God." I cannot see it in that light. It is a matter of practical wisdom, not of principle. To have refused would have been to say that the charge was true, and it was not. So far as the record goes, this act of Paul accomplished its purpose in setting Paul in a right light before the church in Jerus. It took away this argument from the Judaisers. The trouble that now comes to Paul does not come from the Judaisers, but from the "Jews from Asia" (21 27). If it be objected that the Jesu Christians in Jerusalem did not seem to have been taken in by the story of Paul's years of imprisonment, it can be said that there was little to be done in a legal way, as the matter was before the Rom courts very soon. The attack on Paul in the temple was while he was doing honor to the temple, engaged in actual offering sacrifices.
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 way in which false charges, and the men who raised the hue and cry in the temple against Paul as the desecrator of the holy place and the Law and the people disappear, and are never heard of more (24 18 ff). 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 (Acts 7) in the Rom. capital restricted to 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 f), as they had done to Jesus. After the captain, astonished that “Paul the Egypt assassin” 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 he had previously spoken to the “Genosco” (21 7-20) of 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 Rom citizenship, to the amazement of the Jews who spoke in Aram. of the Visigoths (22 24 ff). 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 makes a sharp retort in anger to the high priest Ananias, for which he apologizes if he was so angry that he had not noticed, but he soon divides the Sanhedrin hopelessly on the subject of the resurrected Jesus, who they supposed to be in the temple itself. Thus, 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 stand on the steps of the temple of Antonia, to speak to the mob that clamored for his blood, he held their rapt attention by an address in Aram. in which he gave a defense of his whole career. All this he had previously spoken to the “Genosco” of which they raged more violently than ever. At this the captain has Paul tied with thongs, not understanding his Aram. speech, and is about to scourge him when Paul pleads his Rom citizenship, to the amazement of the Jews who spoke in Aram. of the Visigoths of which they raged more violently than ever. 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 makes a sharp retort in anger to the high priest Ananias, for which he apologizes if he was so angry that he had not noticed, but he soon divides the Sanhedrin hopelessly on the subject of the resurrected Jesus, who they supposed to be in the temple itself. Thus, 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 stand on the steps of the temple of Antonia, to speak to the mob that clamored for his blood, he held their rapt attention by an address in Aram. in which he gave a defense of his whole career. All this he had previously spoken to the “Genosco” of which they raged more violently than ever.}

### His Right to Roman Citizenship

Paul's right to Roman 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 a trap set by Felix to relieve his guests of ennui, 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 Felix also had admitted (25 13-36 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 notes in which 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. Phoenix, and Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 1886). 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. Thence they go to Rome by sea, and arrive at Anagnia, on the 16th of March (25 18). News of Paul's coming had gone on before (his ep. had come 3 years ago), and he had a hearty welcome. But he is now an imperial prisoner in the hands of Nero. He has more liberty in his own hired house than he had in the charges against him, as a 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 (25 18). Since Paul is a prisoner for 2 years more, probably because at this point he finishes the Book of Acts. But, as we have seen, during these years in Rome, Paul wrote Phil, Philem, Col., and Eph. He still has the churches on his heart. They send messengers to him, and he writes back to them. The incipient Gnosticism of the East has pressed upon the churches at Colossae and Laodicea, and a new peril confronts Christianity. The Judaizing controversy has died away with these years (of Phil 3 1 if for an echo of it), but the dignity and glory of Jesus are challenged. In the presence of the power of Rome Paul rises to a higher conception than that of the person of Christ and the glory of the church universal. In due time Paul's part is played, and he was disposed of to do his part. The Romans were proverbially dilatory. It is doubtful or his enemies ever appeared against him with formal charges. The genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles 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 Epistles seek to place them before 64 AD, so as to allow for Paul's death in that year from the Nero 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, therefore, 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 of Cilicia (Acts 9 28). 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 at 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 stopped at Troas and apparently expected to come back here, as he left his cloak and books with Carpus (2 Cor 2.14; 1 Tim 1.3). He was therefore in Macedonia (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 Rome (Acts 21.7, 10), but the apparently 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 (2 Tim 4.16). He is ready even for the 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 former charges against the Apostle (cf. 4.4.17). 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 (He 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 calls 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 Theophilus did not add this detail, as he himself suggests, to let Paul's words in 2 Tim 6-8 serve for his own epitaph. 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 Christianity must fully adopt, but he cannot 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, but he was also the wonder 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 only 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 that Christ reconciling the world through his gospel, topically, using all the epp. for each topic. A measure of historical development may still be observed. Only the chief notes in Paul's gospel can be mentioned here. Even so, one must not turn to his epp. for a complete system of doctrine. The epp. are "occasional letters, pièces de circonstance" (Findlay, HDB), and they do not profess, not even Rom, to give a full summary of Christian doctrine. They are vital documents that throb with life. There is no theological manual in them. Paul's gospel is adequately stated repeatedly. Paul's message is Christocentric. Jesus as Messiah he preached at once on his conversion (Acts 9 20.22). He knew already the current Jewish Messianism to which Jesus did not correspond. The acceptance of Jesus as he was (the facts about Him and teachings) revolutionized his Messianic conceptions, his view of God, and his view of man. "When he takes and uses the Messianic phraseology of his day, he fills it with a meaning new and rich" (Rosen- thron, Christus, p. 7). From the Pauline point of view Christ is 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 Christ is a new creature: 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 unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation" (2 Cor 5 16-19). Perhaps no single passage in Paul's Epp. 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 whom 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 if just before verse 18) with whom the believer has vital union ("in Christ") and who, as his Kiny, the only true object 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 hi 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 notion that sanctification is the final consummation of God's work in His people. But he is of the opinion that the denial of the human side of the doctrine of Christ is simply a 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. He becomes 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: 15 f). 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: 31). With Paul the agent and creation is Jesus (Col 1: 15 f), who is the head of the church universal (Col 1: 18; Eph 1: 22 f). In the work of Christ Paul gives the central place to the cross (1 Cor 1: 17 f; 2: 2; Col 2: 20; Eph 2: 17-20), its victory for God and humanity (Rom 1: 18-20), but the vicarious death of Christ makes redemption possible to all who believe (Rom 3: 21 f; 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 dissolve all problems of the present at once (2 Thess 1: 2), but was to be considered as always imminent (1 Thess 5: 2 ff). Meanwhile, death brings us to Christ, which is a glorious hope to Paul (2 Cor 5: 1-10; Phil 1: 21 ff; 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 foundation of all, as the model and criterion of all future spiritual 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 priests or idealists who allowed sentimentalism and emotionalism to take the place of righteousness. The notion of the righteousness demanded by God and given by God included both sanctification and justification. In the end, the sinner who for Christ's sake is created as righteous must be righteous. Thus the Gospel is Paul's regenerating work of the Spirit of God (2 Cor 3: 13). Paul sees God in the face of Christ (2 Cor 4: 6), and the vision of Christ brings God to all who see.

Literature.—Out of the vast Pauline lit. the following selections may be mentioned:


Paul, the Apostle

Theology

Pauline, pôÎIn,-in. THEOLOGY:

I. THE PREPARATION

1. The Pharisee

2. Saul and Sin

3. Primitive Christianity

II. THE CONVERSION

1. Christ

2. The Spirit

3. Saul

4. Salvation

5. Justification

III. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS

1. Abolition of the Law

2. Gentile Law

3. Redemption

4. Atonement

5. Moral Example

6. Function of the Law

IV. SPECIAL TOPICS

1. The Church

2. The Sacraments

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 opinion existed among Pharisaees. 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.

Saul the Pharisee believed that God was One, the Creator of all things. In His relation to His world He was transcendent, and governed it by means of His angels. Certain of these angelic governors had been unfaithful to their trust and had wrought evil, although God still permitted them to bear rule for a time (Col 2 15; cf. Ex 69-65). And evil had come into humanity through the transgression of the first man (Rom 6 12; cf. 2 Esd 7-118). To lead men away from this evil God gave His Law, which was a perfect revelation of duty (Rom 7 12), and this Law was illumined by the traditions of the Fathers, which the Pharisees felt to be an integral part of the Law itself. God was merciful and would pardon the offender against the Law, if he completely amended his ways. But imperfect reformation brought no certain hope of pardon. To a few specially favored individuals God had given the help of His Spirit, but this was not for the ordinary individual. The great majority of mankind (cf. 2 Esd 7 49-57), including all Gentiles, had no hope of salvation. In a very short time the course of the world would be closed. With God, from before the beginning of creation, there was the Son of his heavenly being, the Son of man of Dnl 7 13, and He was about to be made manifest. (That Saul held the transcendentall Messianic doctrine is not to be doubted.) As the world was irredeemably bad, this Messiah would soon appear, cause the dead to rise, hold the Last Judgment and bring from heaven the “Jesus that is above” (Gal 4 20), in which the righteous would spend a blessed eternity. See Pharisees; Messiah; Parousia.

Rom 7 7 shows the influence of the OT on Saul's personal beliefs. The OT promised pardon to the sinner who amended his ways, but the 2. Saul had an acute moral sense of Saul taught him and Sin that he could never expect perfectly to amend his ways. The 10th Commandment was the stumbling-block. Sins of deed and of word might perhaps be overcome, but sins of evil desires stayed with him, despite his full knowledge of the Law that branded them as sinful. Indeed, they seemed stimulated rather than suppressed by the Divine presence to corrupt him. With the best will in the world, Saul's efforts toward perfect righteousness failed continually and gave no promise of ever succeeding. He found himself thwarted by something that he came to realize was ingrained in his very nature and from which he could never free himself. Human nature as it is, the flesh (not “the material of the body”), contains a taint that makes perfect reformation impossible (7 18; cf. 8 3, etc.). Therefore, as the Law knows no pardon after the imperfectly amended, so for his future to be absolutely black. What he longed for was a promise of pardon despite continued sin, and that the Law precluded. (Any feeling that the temple sacrifices would bring forgiveness had long since been obsolete in educated Judaism.)

There is everywhere in Paul's epistles to the congregations no promise of forgiveness that was not unique at this period. Much has been written in recent years about the Jews' confidence in God's mercy, and abundant quotations are brought from the Psalms in support of this. But the surviving portions of the literature of the Jewish-Aramaic period of the Pauline period give a different impression. It is predominantly a literature of penitential prayers and confessions of sin, of peneaton, regarding the world of which God had so much to be ashamed. In 2 Esd, in particular, Saul's experience is closely paralleled, and in 2 Esd 7 (of course not AT) is one of the best known, ever written on Rom 7.

Saul must have come in contact with Christianity very soon after Pentecost, at the latest. Some personal acquaintance with Christ is 3. Primitive in no way impossible, irrespective of Christianity the meaning of 2 Cor 5 18. But no one in Jesus, least of all a man like Saul, could have failed to learn very early that there was a new “party” in Judaism. To his eyes this “party” would have about the following appearance: Here was a hand of God through His angels, Messiah, whom all expected, would be the Jesus who had recently been crucified. Him the disciples were preaching as risen, ascended and sitting on God's right hand. They claimed that He had sent on all His followers the coveted gift of the Spirit, and they produced miracles in proof of their claim. A closer investigation would show that the death of Jesus was being interpreted in terms of Isa 53, as a ransom for the nation. The inquirer would learn also that Jesus had given teaching that found constant and relentless fault with the Pharisees. Moreover, He had swept aside the tradition of the Fathers as worthless and had given the Law a drastic reinterpretation on the basis of eternal spiritual facts.

This inwardness must have appealed to Saul and he must have envied the joyous enthusiasm of the disciples. But to him Pharisaism was Divine, and he was in a spiritual condition that admitted of no compromises. Moreover, the Law (Gal 3 13; of Dt 21 20), cursed anyone who had been hanged on a tree, and the new party was claiming celestial Messiahsip for a man who had met this fate. The system aroused Saul's burning hatred; he appointed himself (perhaps stimulated by his moral desperation) to exterminate the new religion, and in pursuit of his mission he started for Damascus.
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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 have the Spirit without learning what it was, and in the inevitable discussions with the primitive church and was the truth for which Christ had died (Mk 14:62). 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 15:45, 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 sufficiently proved, and this 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 proof of the sufficiency of the resurrection, 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 29), 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 heaven must have been brought also (Rom 1:38; 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 before" (Col 1:18). It was 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 "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 wearies of expressing (Rom 8:10.23; Gal 4:6, etc.). The work of the Spirit in producing genuine faith needs no comment (see Holy Spirit; Sanctification), 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 fruitful use of the Spirit is joy, peace, etc. (Gal 5:22); the greatest miracles without love are more than useless (1 Cor 13:3); 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 in Unio Rom 8:9-11; cf 1 Cor 2:12; Gal Mystica 2:4; 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 6:11; 8:1; 16:7, etc). "We have become united with him" (Rom 6:5, συνιστωθεν, "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 once 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 death and corruption, and" (Col 1:13), the "real" still existing (Gal 5:17; Rom 8 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; 8:2:10; Gal 5:16, etc.). Indeed, it is possible to speak of the believer as entirely spiritual (Rom 6:11.22; 8:9, etc), as already in the kingdom (Col 1:13), as already existing in heavenly places (Eph 2:6), of course St. Paul had too keen an appreciation of the real to regard believers as utterly senseless (Phil 3:12, etc), and his pages abound in reproofs and exhortations. But the present existence of remnants of sin had no final terror, for the ultimate victory over sin was certain, if it was not complete until the last day when the power of God would reveal 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 bring to Adam what he termed the new man (Eph 3:5 45-49; cf Rom 5:12-21). If Cor 15:46 has any reference to the Pauline doctrine of the two Adams, it is a polemic against it. Such a polemic would not so unlikely.
mystery that God had revealed only in the last days (Col 1 26 f; 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 this world and so taken him away from the Law's control. In the Eph., 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 hath 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 11-13.20, 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 strongest moral effort becomes our duty (ver 13; cf 2 Cor 5 14 f).

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 8). But the Law had its role in the redemption plan. 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 nature, "to worship" (ver 15, 16), 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 uncheckable, its involving the whole man, 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 in- cipient as coming from God (Rom 3 25; 5 8; 8 22, 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 "mystic identification" is incorporated into the life of every believer.

Further developments of this doctrine about Christ's death find in it the complete destruction of whatever remained of the Law (Col 2 14), esp. as the barrier between Jew and Gentile (Eph 2 15 f.). The extenuation 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 fre- quently in the Pauline epistles (cf 2 Cor 1 5, 5; Phil 2 25; etc). While the idea Example 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
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, several “mysteries,” the “juridic,” and the “ethical.” But this distinction is largely only genetic and logical, and the lines tend to become indistinct in application. Consequently, it is frequently an impossible exegetical problem to determine which portion of the whole is 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 6. Function salvation, why was it given at all? How could the Law of the Old Testament be so prominent in any given passage (e.g. 2 Cor 15 4)?

There was a desire to transcend it, but there was no power to help toward fulfillment. So the Law gave knowledge of sin (Rom 3 20; Gal 5 17); but still Paul had the 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. Thus the Law gave knowledge of sin (Rom 3 20; Gal 5 17; cf. 1 Cor 15 56). Thus the Law became our παιδιστός “to bring us unto Christ” (Gal 3 24; see SCHOOLMASTER), and came in “besides” (Rom 4 15) of the Corinthian plan. Indeed, this could be shown from the Law itself, which proved that faith was the primary method of salvation (Rom 4; cf. Gal 3 17) and which actually prophesied its own repeal (Gal 4 21). With this 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 this element in common and are so united 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 part of the N.T. (Gal 4 26—8:18; cf. 1 Cor 7 17; Rom 16 16, etc.)—but the idea is present from the beginning. Indeed, the only terms in Judaism that were still applicable were those of the “nation” (Israel). Paul uses the latter term (Gal 6 16) and quite constantly employs it when referring at the same time to the Gentiles as the Holy Nation (e.g. cf. Eph 5 25 with Hos 2 19 f.). and time was needed in order to give ekklēsia (properly “calling”) the true content.

The church is composed of all who have professed faith and been united in the salvation of their Lord. But no matter how it is taken, it is evident that the church is not everywhere the same, or all have the same rights. The church is the body of Christ, which has been established in the whole world by Paul. The church is that which has come to Christ, have the same nature as the Lord Jesus Christ. The church is the body of Christ, the extension of His personality into the world (Eph 1 22-23; 2 20; 5 23). In the church we, with the Lord’s body, are subject to the same duty toward one another, but also the responsibility of carrying Christ’s message into the world (Phil 1 15, 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 death of Christ is something more than a subjective impression made on the mind by the fact of that death of Christ, and the death of Christ with the death accomplished in baptism in Rom 6 1-7 and Col 2 11 it is not explained, but by supposing there to be a more dramatic ceremony. That St. Paul was greatly influenced by the mystery-religion concepts has not been made out. But his readers certainly so were influenced and tended to conceive very mystical and spiritualistic the death of Christ (Rom 10 6; 15 29). And historic exegesis is bound to construe St. Paul’s language in the way in which he knew his readers would understand it, and a literal gentile 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 being represented to be obtained by some sort of participation in the Lord’s Supper. And in the Lord’s Supper this union is further strengthened, so that faith on the part of the believer is an indispensable prerequisite for the efficacy of the sacrament. St. Paul’s presentation of the Lord’s Supper is a complete and precise, if not exhaustive, presentation of the Christian faith.

See further under the headings: PRAYER; FASTING; PREDICATION; PROPITIATION, etc.

LITERATURE.—See under PAUL.

PAULUS, pól'ús, SERGIUS, síg'ús, Sêr'gios Paí'dòs, Sêr'gios Paúlòs): The Rom “proconsul” (RV) or “deputy” (AV) of Cyprus when Paul, along with Barnabas, visited that island on his first missionary journey (Acts 13 47). The official title of Sergius is more appropriately given to him, however, since he was originally an imperial province, 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 in the name of Zeus, approached 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 also the whole nation of Cyprus, with which Sergius listened to the teaching of Paul (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. KEHR

PAVEMENT, pāv'ment: In the OT, with the exception of 2 K 16 17, the Heb word is רֶפַע, repah (2 Ch 7 3; Est 1 6; Ezk 40 17, etc.). In Sir 20 18 and Bel ver 19 the word is סָדָן, sedan; in Jn 19 13, the name “The Paving” (לְהָרָעָת, lēhārātā, “paved with stone”) is given to a place outside the Praetorium on which Pilate sat to give judgment upon Jesus; and to the Arab (Arabic) equivalent is declared to be GABBATHA (v. q.). The identification of the place is uncertain.

PAVILION, pa-vil'yan: a covered place, booth, tent, in which a person may be set aside in a hid or secret (סִוק, sōkh, Ps 27 5; סִוקָה, sōkāh—the same word in Ps 31 20), or otherwise be withdrawn from view.
The term is used with reference to God (2 S 22 12; Ps 18 11); to kings drinking in privacy (1 K 20 12; 27). AV gives "pavilion" for AV "tabernacle" in Job 36 29; Isa 4 6; while in Nu 26 8 it substitutes this word, with m "alocve," for AV "tent" (קֹבֶד, and Jer 43 10, for "royal pavilion" (שַׁפְרָה) reads in m "glittering pavilion."

PAW, pō (פֶּו, kaph, lit. "palm," "yāh, lit. "hand"): The former (kaph) 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 37: "Jeh that delivered me out of the paw (יָדָּה) of the lion (לֵו) and out of the bear (בֹּר) he will deliver me out of the hand (יָדָּה) of this Philistine." The vb. "to paw" (פָּה, pāh) 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 ["the [wars]""] (Job 39 21). The word is usually tr 4 to "delive into," to "try into," to "explore."

H. L. E. LÜERING

PÈ, pÈ (פֶּ: The 17th letter of the Hebr alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as p.

PEACE, pēq (פֶׁ֖ו, shālôm; פֶּ֑: faith, trust, welfare); is a condition of freedom from disturbance, whether outwardly, as of a nation from war, or internally, as of the soul. The Hebr word is shālôm (both adj. and subst.), meaning, primarily, "southernness," "accommodating," but coming also to signify "prosperity," well-being in general, all good in relation to both man and God. In early times, to a people harassed by foes, peace was the primary blessing. In Ps 122 7, we have peace and prosperity, and in 36 7; 73 7, shālôm is tr 4 prosperity. In 2 S 11 7 AV, David asked of Uriah "how Joab did" (m "of the peace of Joabs"), and "how the people did [RV "fared," lit. "of the peace of the people"], and how the war prospered" (lit. "and of the peace [welfare] of the war.").

(1) Shālôm was the common friendly greeting, used in asking after the health of anyone; also in farewells (Gen 29 6, "Ja it well with him!" ["Is there peace to him?"]). 43 23, "Peace to you;" where Gal sketched the way of their welfare [of their peace];] Jps 6 23, "Jeh said unto him, Peace be unto thee;" 18 15 [AV "saluted him," ["He asked him of peace," RV "of his welfare;"] 19 20, etc]. See also GREETING. (2) Peace from enemies (implying prosperity) was the great desire of the nation and was the gift of God to the people if they walked in His ways (Lev 26 6; Nu 6 26, "Jeh lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace;" Ps 29 11; Isa 26 12, etc). To "die in peace" was greatly to be desired (Gen 27 32; 40 34, etc). (3) Inward peace was the portion of the righteous who trusted in God (Job 22 21, "Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace [שָׁלֹם; Ps 4 8; 85 8, "He will speak peace unto his people, and to his saints;" 119 365,; Prov 3 17, Isa 26 3, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace [Heb "peace, peace," whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee;" Mal 2 5]; also outward peace (Job 5 23 24; Prov 16 7, etc). (4) Peace was to be sought and followed by the righteous (Ps 34 14, "Seek peace, and pursue it;" 15 16, 18 19, "Love truth and peace"). (5) Peace should be a prominent feature of the Messianic times (Isa 2 4 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 shālôm (for which it is employed in the LXX; cf. Lk 19 42, RV "If thou hadst known . . . the things which belong unto peace"), we refer to it mostly through the coming of the Christ (Lk 21 1 7479; 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, "peace- ing . . . by Jesus Christ"). 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 exhorted His disciples, "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another" (Mk 9 50; Paul exorts, "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 (Col 1 3; 1 Cor 1 3; 2 Cor 13 10). (4) Christ is called "peace" as a greeting (Mt 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 21). (5) In the NT, the word is almost as often used as "peacemaker." (6) The peace and Christ, brought by the gospel, is the Messianic 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 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 בָּשָׂך, "to be still," "to be silent" (Gen 18 25; 20 17; of "peace bringer of God" [ cf. Ps 44 2]); לִשְׁחוֹר, "to hush," "to be silent" (2 K 3 3; Ps 39 2); מָשַׁק, and of other verbs, in Job 29 30 ("The nobles held their peace," AV). It is also "voic."

In the NT we have σιγᾶ, "to be silent," "to cease speaking." Of S 1: 26 49, "to be silent," "not to speak" (Lk 20 26; Acts 12 17; ἠπειροάσθη, "to be quiet." Lk 14 4; Acts 11 18). φωνῆδω, "to muzzle or gag" (Mk 1 25; Lk 4 38). In Arabic eirēnē is frequent, mostly in the sense of peace, welfare (Tob 13 14; Jth 3 1; Ecc 13 15; 1 Mace 5 54; 6 49; 2 Mace 16 4; eirēnē = "tranquility").

RV gives "peace" for "tongue." (Est 7 4; Job 6 24; Am 6 10; Hab 1 13); "at peace with me" for "perfect." (Isa 42 18, "made perfect," or "recompensed") ("security" instead of "peaceable," and "peace" (10 15; 11 21); "came in peace to the city," for "came to Shalem, for we have till the earth." (Gen 33 18); peace also instead of "for peace" (Isa 38 17; "when they are in peace," for "and that should have been for their welfare" (Ps 49 22).

W. L. WALKER

PEACEMAKER, pēmās-mē-ē: Occurs only in the pl. (Mt 5 9, "Blessed are the peacemakers [εἰρηνοτοιοι] 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 [εἰρηνοτοιοι] them that make peace" (εἰρηνοτοιοι). 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 actually producing that which is the will of the God of peace for men.

W. L. WALKER

PEACOCK, pe’kôk (םֶפָּה, tuklêyîm [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 proudly 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 bend between the wings in tiny feathers not over 6 in. in length, and extends backward. The quills hold a mass of purple, crimson, and gold feathers. The eye at the tip of each feather from one-half to 1 in. across, of a deep peculiar blue, surrounded at the lower part by two half-moon-shaped crescents of green. Whether the train lies naturally, or is spread in full glory, the whole shows encrusted with a marvel, the glancing shades of blue, gold, 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 advantage to contract the music at the pleasure 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 barely 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, 206. Alexander claimed that he brought them into Greece to contract the music at the pleasure 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.

PEDAHAL, ped’â-hel (πεδαχήλ, p’dehâ’hel, “whom God redeems”): A prince of Naphthali; one of the tribal chiefs who apportioned the land of Canaan (Nu 34 28; cf verse 17).

PEDAHZUR, ped’âzur (πεδάχυρ, p’dehâ’zur): Mentioned in Nu 1 10; 2 20; 7 54, 59; 10 23 as the father of Gamaliel, head of the tribe of Manasseh, at the time of the exodus. See Expos T, VIII, 555ff.

PEPDAH, ped’â-ya, ped’â’ya (πεπδα, p’dá’ya, “Jeh redeems”): (1) Father of Joel, who was ruler of Western Manasseh in David’s reign (1 Ch 27 20). Form πεπδάθ, p’dadhâ’th (see above).

PEDAHZUR, ped’â-za’ur (πεδαχυρ, p’dehâ’zur): (2) Pedahzur of Runah (2 K 23 36), father of Zezubah, Jehoakim’s mother.

PEDAHAI, ped’â’ya, ped’â’ya (πεπδα, p’dá’ya, “Jeh redeems”): (3) A son of Jecolah (1 Ch 3 18); in ver 19 the father of Zerubbabel. Pedahai’s brother, Shelahth, 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 are referred to under Shelahth and Salathiel respectively.

PEDAHAI, ped’â’ya, ped’â’ya (πεπδα, p’dá’ya, “Jeh redeems”): (4) Another who helped to repair the city wall (Neh 3 25), of the family of Pahoi (q.v.). Perhaps this is the man who stood by Ezra at the reading of the Law (Neh 8 4; 1 Esd 9 44, called “Phadeus”).

5 “Levite,” appointed one of the treasurers
over the “treasuries” of the Lord’s house (Neh 13: 13).

A Benjaminite, one of the rulers residing in Jerusalem under the “return” arrangements (Neh 11: 7).

PEDESTAL, ped’ē-s-tal (Τέμπες, kēn): In two places (1 K 7 29.31) RV gives this word for AV “base” (in Solomon’s “Sea”).

PEDIAS, ped’ē-as, pē-d’ē-as (Πεδίας, Pedias, A. Παδιέας, Pediais; AV by mistake Pelias): One of those who had taken “strange wives” (1 Esd 9 34) = “Bedethah” of Ezr 10 35.

PEDIGREE, ped’ē-grē (“Παρθενία, hēktyalēthē, “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 common phrase of Ch, Ezr and Neh, “to reckon by genealogy,” “to give genealogy,” etc (cf 1 Ch 7 5.9; Ezr 2 62 f; Neh 7 64). These last passages indicate the importance of the registered pedigree or genealogy 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.

WALTER R. BETTERRIDGE

PEEL, pēl, PILL, pil: “Fill” (Gen 30 37.38; Tob 11 13 [RV “scaled”]) and “peel” (Isa 18 2.7 [AV and RVm]; Ezk 29 18 [AV and RV]) are properly two different words, meaning “to remove the hair” (pine) and “to remove the skin” (pelle), but in Elizabethan Eng, the two were confused. In Isa 18 2.7, the former meaning is implied, as the Heb word here (חָרַד, mdrāt) 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 “peeled” (so RV) off portions of the bark of his rod, so as 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 AV “worn.”)

BRUNO SCOTT EASTON

PEEP, pēp (πεπάν, ‘sphaph: AV Isa 8 19; 10 14 [RV “chirp!”]): In 10 14, the word describes the sound made by a nesting bird; in 8 19, the changed (ventrilocust?) voice of neccromancers uttering sounds that purported to come from the feebly dead. The modern use of “peep” as “look” is found in Sir 21 23, as the tr of παρακάτωσθαι, parakatāpō: “A foolish man peepeth in from the door of another man’s house.”


1. Accession Pekah murdered his predecessor, Pekahiah, and seized the reins of power (ver 25). His usurpation of the throne is said to have taken place in the 53rd year of Jotham, 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.

2. Attitude Tiglath-pileser III was now ruler of Assyria (Assyria/Walam in the list of nations since 745 had proved himself a resistless conqueror. His lust for battle was not yet satisfied, and the turn of Philiest and Syria was about to come. In 753, a coalition, of which Pekah was a prominent member, was being formed to check his 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 who attended an anointing rite on the descending 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, Recalciatrant 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, who had joined on Jerusalem (2 K 15 15). 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, who was named 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 after 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 soverigns of the Northern Kingdom is, in all probability, a supplementation in Ch by further facts as to this campaign of the allies. The Chronicler states that “a great multitude of captives” were taken to Damascus and many more. These would be countrymen and women from the outlying districts of Judah, which were ravaged. Those taken to Samaria were, however, returned, unmurt, to Jericho by the advice of the prophet Oded (2 Ch 28 5–15).

The messengers sent from Jerusalem to Nineveh appear to have arrived when the army of Tiglath-pileser was already prepared to march.

5. Fall of Damascus: expeditious, they fell upon Damascus before the junction of the allies as and Eastern accomplished. Rezin was defeated in a decisive battle, and took refuge 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 Galeah beyond Ebron—already enrolled (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 Jizon (now ‘Aynān), Abel-beth-maacah (now ‘Akh,)
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Janoah (now Yârôn), Kadesh (now Kadoa) and Hazor (now Hadirch). These places and territories were not merely attacked and plundered. Their inhabitants were removed, with indelible loss and banishment, and put to death in Assyria, and given as Halah, Habor, 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 Galleries, 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 Hoshea, whom Tiglath-pileser claimed 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. Pekahiah'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. It is most probable that 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 period of gloomy future glory. It is not known when this Pekah was removed, but it is suggested that his fall was in the year 738, the time of the accession of Tiglath-pileser II. This date is in harmony with the fact that it was written before the fall of Samaria, and that of 10 9-11 that Damascus and Samaria had both fallen and Judah was expected to follow. This section of Isaiah may thus be included in the literature of the time of Pekah.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

PEKAHIAH, pê-kâ-êâ (פְּקָהֵיהָ, pîkahâh). "Jehah hath opened" [the eyes]. [2 K 15 23-26; Ëphsorîa, Ëphsicos, A. Ëfêsî.]

1. Accession as Phâxa'ea: 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; UZZIAH). Most date lower, after 738, when an Assyrian inscription makes Menahem pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser of 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 finally murdered— the 7th king of Israel who had met his death by violence (the others were Naahal, Elah, Tiben, 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 Arieah, 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 denunciations of the prophets of the Northern Kingdom (Am 5 21-27; Hos 8 1-6), the people and land of the calves remained, 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 CALDECOTT

PEKOD, pê-kôd (פְּקֹד, pîkôd). A name applied in Jer 50 21 and Ezk 23 23 to the Chaldaean. EVm in the former passage gives the meaning as "visitation."

PELALIAH, pê-lâ-lî-â (פֶלָלְיָה, plâ'îâh). (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 "Phalaias" in 1 Esd 9 48 (RV).

PELALIAH, pê-lâ-lî-â (פֶלָלְיָה, plîlâgh, "Jeh judges"). A priest, father of Jeroham, one of the "workers" in the Lord's house (Neh 11 12).

PELALIAH, pê-lâ-lî-â (פֶלָלְיָה, plîlâgh, "Jeh delivers") as a name recorded in the text is unknown.

(1) One who "sealed" the covenant (Neh 10 22).
(2) A descendant of Solomon, grandson of Zerubbabel (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 sounds, ending ".

PELEG, pê-le'g (פֶלֵג, pîlēgh, "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" (םָפִּיהָ) (Gen 10 25; cf. Lk 3 35; AV "Phalech"). This probably refers to the scattering of the world's population and the confounding of its language recorded in Gen 11 1-9. In Aram. plêgh and Arab. palaj mean "division"; in Heb pîlēgh means "watercourse." The name may equally be due to the occupation by this people of some well-watered (removed) district (e.g. in Babylonia), for these patronymes represent races, and the derivation in Gen 10 25 is a later editor's remark.

S. F. HUNTER
PELET, pel'ët (םלע, pelet, “deliverance”): (1) Son of Isaiah (1 Ch 2 47). (2) Son of Azmaveth, one of those who resorted to David at Ziklag while he was hiding from Saul (1 Ch 12 3).

PELETH, pel'ëth (םלע, pel eth, “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, pel'ë-thëts, pel'ë-thët's (םלע, פלטית): A company of David’s bodyguard, like the CHESETHITES (q.v.) (2 S 8 18; 15 18); probably a corrupt form of “Philistines.”

PELIAS, pel'i-ás: AV = RV “Pedias.”

PELICAN, pel'i-kan (בלוקן, ša'ath; Lat Pelecanus onocrotalus [LXX reads ἀλεκάν, pelékan, in Lev and Ps, but has 3 other readings, that are rather confusing, in the other places]). Any bird of the genus Pelecanus. The Heb št means “to vomit.” The name was applied to the bird because it swallowed large quantities of fish and then disgorged them to its nestlings. In the performance of this act it pressed the large beak, in the white species, tipped with red, against the crop and slightly lifted the wings. In ancient times, people, seeing this, believed that the bird was puncturing its breast and feeding its young with its blood. From this idea arose the custom of using a pelican with lifted wings in heraldry or as a symbol of Christ and of charity. (See Fictitious Creatures in Art, 182–86, London, Chapman and Hall, 1906.) Pal knew a white and a brownish-gray bird, both close to 6 ft. long and having over a 12 ft. sweep of wing. They lived around the Dead Sea, fished beside the Jordan and abounded in greatest numbers in the wildernesses of the Mediterranean shore. The brown pelicans were larger than the white. Each of them had a long beak, peculiar throat pouch and webbed feet. They built large nests, 5 and 6 ft. across, from dead twigs of bushes, and laid two or three eggs. The brown birds deposited a creamy-white egg with a rosy flush; the white, a white egg with a bluish tint. The young were naked at first, then covered with down, and remained in the nest until full feathered and able to fly. This compelled the parent birds to feed them for a long time, and they carried such quantities of fish to a nest that the young could not consume all of them and many were dropped on the ground. The tropical sun soon made the location unbearable to mortals. Perching pelicans were the ugliest birds imaginable, but when their immense brown or white bodies swept in a 12 ft. spread across the land and over sea, they made an impressive picture. They are included, with good reason, in the list of abominations (see Lev 11 18; Dt 14 17). They are next mentioned in 2 S 103 6: “I am like a pelican of the wilderness; I become as an owl of the waste places.”

Here David from the depths of affliction likened himself to a pelican as it appears when it perches in the wilderness. See Isa 34 11: “But the pelican and the porcupine shall possess it, and the owl and the raven shall dwell therein: and he will stretch over it the line of confusion, and the plummet of emptiness.” Here the bird is used to complete the picture of desolation that was to prevail after the destruction of Edom. The other reference concerns the destruction of Nibhol and is found in Zeph 2 14: “And the birds of prey shall lodge in the capitals thereof; their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds: for he hath laid bare the cedar-wood.”

GENE STRATTON-POINTER

PELISHTIM, pel'ish-tim, pel-ish'tim (פלשתים; 1914; p'lishtlm [RVM of Gen 10 14]). See PHILISTINES.

PELONITE, pel'o-nit, pel'o-nît, pë-li-'nit (פלונית; πλέοντι, a place-name): Two of David’s descendants are thus described: (1) “Helez the Pelonite” (1 Ch 11 27) (see PALTITE); and (2) “Ahijah the Pelonite” (1 Ch 11 36).

PEN, (贲, הָנָּה, heret; καλάμος, 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 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 Heb 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 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.

Figuratively “Written with a pen of iron,” i.e. indelibly (Jer 17 1), “My words are the pen of a ready writer” (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 contains the story of the Israelites in Egypt, their 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 greatest class 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 rapidly.

The current school during recent years, however, has been the school that has been called by the terms "higher" and "critical." 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 "higher-critical" school still has a majority, and controversy is beginning to find a new freshness 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 Astruc 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 "divine" (characteristic of two principal sects, and the Tetragrammaton, i.e., the Divine name YHVH represented by the "or the Lord") is a "God" to one and another. Despite occasional warning, this clue was followed in the main for 150 years. Eventually it was found that the whole current mass of critical development, but the most recent investigations have successfully proved that it is unreliable (see below, 3, [a]). Astruc was followed by Eichhorn (1790), who made a more thorough examination of Gen, indicating numerous differences of style, representation, etc.

Stede (1792) and Vater (1802-5) extended the method applied to Gen to the other books of the Pent. In 1819 Bingen distinguished two Elohist in Gen, but this view did not find followers for some time. The next step of importance was the assignment of the bulk of Dt to the 7th cent. BC. This was due to De Wette (1806). Hupfeld (1805) again distinguished a second portion of the book, and this has been adopted by the critics. Thus there are four main documents at least: D (the bulk of Dt), the Elohist (P) and E, and one document (c) that under the Tetragrammaton in Gen. From 1822 (Block) a series of writers maintained that the Book of Josiah was compounded from the same documents as the Pent (see Hexateuch).

Two other developments call for notice: (1) there has been a tendency to divide these documents further, regarding them as the work of schools rather than of individual writers; in this way, for instance, P is divided into different parts (P, etc.), and the notation of other writers J, Je, etc.; (2) a particular scheme of dating has found wide acceptance, and in the corresponding theories it was assumed that the principal Elohist (P) was the earliest document. A succession of writers of whose names we know, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen are the most prominent, have, however, maintained that this is not the first hypothesis that put the problem, and should therefore be regarded as an earlier or later. On this view the theory is in outline as follows: J and E (so called from their respective Divine appellations)—on the relative dates of which opinions differ—were composed probably during the early monarchical and actually combined to form a single document JE. In the 7th cent. D, the bulk of Dt, was composed. It was placed in the year of Josiah's reign. Later it was combined with JE into JED by a redactor (R). P or PC, the last of all (originally the Priestly Elohist, modified by the Hellenistic School) is an earlier date of uncertain which consists mainly of Leviticus and Numbers. The Code of the Law of Holiness (H or Pa). P itself is largely post-exilic. Ultimately it was joined with JED by a priestly redactor (Reu) last substantially our present Pent. As already stated, the theory is subject to many minor variations. Moreover, it is admitted that not all its portions are equally well supported, and W. Jns is regarded as less certain than the separation of J and E. Again, there are many variations, 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, and J. H. Rowen's OT Intro may be regarded as a typical modern presentation of their view; the latter esp. by Robertson 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 they should rather think (as in the case of the Ld) of two revisions of one document marked by the use of different Divine appellations. The critical P he treats as the work of a supplement, and the title it gives to a dependence existed before he considers 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 later irresponsible redactors, combining, altering, manipulating, enlarging at pleasure" (POT, 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 schools, and 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 and that the more uncertain portions of their theory, but rather on the main completed result. It might be said that the conflicting views on 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 essays 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, it is now evident that the current writers adopt a very 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 best founded." (Erdberlg, 11 s.). By general consent Eerdmans' 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 (Erbhega, 1910, 549-51). 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 theories of R. Driver, and though he gives the names of certain problems 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 Graf-Wellhausen theory, and suggesting a new pericope hypothesis. 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 1. Evidence adduced in its support. Why should for Critical the Current 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 provided us with a clue to the dissertation of that Book, this is based on Ex 8 8. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, by the name of Shaddai, but by my name YWHW I was not known to them. In numerous places unprofitably settled, represented, written, known, e.g. 4 20, where we read of men beginning to call on it in the days of Knoeh. The discrepancy here is very obvious. The God of Israel left Kadesbarnea in the 3d year and never 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-
haps 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 vbs. used are frequentative, denoting a regular process; 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 MT (25:26,30). 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 the passages that regard them as very few.

(4) Doubts.—Another portion of the critical argument is provided by doublets or duplicate narrations 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 unjust circuits compass in their day the midst of the camp at 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—13).” (a) Carpenter, Hexateuch, I, 30.

Thus the best strategy is to proceed from the argument and their supposed historical setting. By far the most important portions of this are examined in Sanctuary and Priestly (q.v.). These subjects form the two main pillars of the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and as such they are the art, 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 15:12 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 frequently a very effective one, since it depends so largely on an immense mass of details. It is said that each of the sources has certain characteristic phrasings which either occur nowhere else or only with very much less frequency. For instance in Gen 1, where ’Ribkim is used throughout, we find the word “create,” but this is not employed in 2 4b ff, where the Tetragrammaton 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 H; either he was acquainted with the portion or else he must have exercised considerable influence on those who composed them. Lastly the Chronicon 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 Pentateuch. Thus if 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 of the Heb would read “Behold thy father-in-law . . . is come.” As 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 must be borne in mind. 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 change to two or three letters which gave a narrative of the historical event. This is confirmed by the fact 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 transactions have taken place; e.g. the identification of Kadesh shows that it was B, of Horah. The evidence is not always clear, and even the report of the sea to the Red Sea would not bring the Israelites to Horah. Here there is no reason to doubt that the events narrated are historically true, but there is grave reason to doubt that they happened in the present order of the narrative. Further, Dt gives an account that is parallel to certain passages of Nu; and it confirms those passages, but places the events in a different order. Such difficulties may often be solved by simple transpositions, and when transpositions in the text of Nu are in agreement with the order of Dt they have a very different probability from guesses that enjoy no such sanction. Another department of textual criticism deals with the removal of glosses, i.e. notes that have crept into the text. Here the ancient VSS often help us, one or other omitting some words which may be proved from other sources to be a later addition. Thus in Ex 17:7 the Vulg did not know the expression, “and Meribah” (one word in Heb), and calls the place “Massah.” The fact that Dt habitually calls the place Massah (6:16; 9:22; 33:8) the true Meribah was Kadesh (Nu 20) and a glossator has here added this by mistake (see further [4] below). Thus we can say that a scientific textual criticism often comes close to the highest critical analysis by showing that the arguments rest on late corruptions and by explain-
ing the true origin of the difficulties on which the critics rely.

(2) *Astrae’s clue tested.*—Astrae’s clue must next be examined. The critical case breaks down with extraordinary frequency. No clean division can be effected here as in the MT. Gen makes P or E use the Tetragrammaton or ʾElōhīm. 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 the theory frequently forces the analyst to sunder verbs 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 ch 31, ver 3 goes to a redecorator, 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 higher 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 ʾElōhīm for the Tetragrammaton. Thus, in the version of the same Ishmael requires the word ʾElōhīm, as the name would otherwise have been Ishmayl, and one Heb MS, a recension of the LXX and the Old Lat do in fact preserve the reading ʾElōhīm. The full facts and arguments cannot be given here, but Professor Smith 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 *TSH*, 1. 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., 473–73, 563; *TMH*, 1, 85, 40–142, 190–197, 161, 164; *A. D. F. ʿAlāʾ and J. A. ʿAlāʾ, 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 Septuagint). 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. Sometimes they are closer to the original than the corresponding readings of the MT. Take the case of Ishmael’s age. We have seen (above, 2, [3]) that although in Gen 21 14 he is a boy who can be carried by his mother even after the weaning of Isaac, his father, according to 15 6, 16, was 80 years old at the time of his birth, and, according to ch 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 17 25 the MSS variants suggest that something similar is responsible for the difficulty of our Heb. Two MSS, apparently representing a recension, omit the words, “after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan” in 16 3, 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 not intended 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 deathbed for 37 years (Gen 2, 23). According to this Isaak 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 wills. It is not the least credible 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 29 and 36 40, the numbers used are 60 and 40, which is well known to have been employed by the ancient Hebrews, not as mathematical expressions, but simply to denote unknown or unspecified periods. See *Numm.*

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 38 Pesh reads “first” for “fifthik 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 conduces 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 Israelites spend 38 years at Kadesh immediately after receiving “Divine command 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, 20 114–21; 21 1–3; 15; 14; 16–18; 20 2–13.226; 21 46–9, then some
missing vs, bringing the Israelites to the head of the Gulf of Akabah and narrating the turn northward from Elath and Ezion-geber, then 20:22-23; 21:4-5, and some lost words telling of the arrival at this point in the wilderness of Zin. The saying "云云" of cloud that is missing in Laga'der's LX.X, and vs 365-37a 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 Punters, 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; 32:17, 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 some statement of the order of course in normal times when Moses was not absent from the camp. Ex 33:7 if provides such a statement. The only earlier place to which it can be assigned is after 13:22, but there it fits the context marvellously, for the statements as to the pillar of cloud in 33:9 f attach naturally to those in 13:21 f. With this change all the difficulties disappear.

Immediately after leaving Egypt Moses began the practice of carrying a tent outside the camp and trying to present before the court the cases of the people. "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 camp.

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, 134-46). 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 theIsraelites 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 in a kingdom (Nu 36:31) and the Canaanites as being "thee" in the land (12:6; 13:7), 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 the most probable; while in v414 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 is known by having a "book of the Wars of Jehu" (see Field, Hebrews of Bible, 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 appearances, 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 Rephidim-narrative (of Nu 35:14 P), there were 6 tales. In any case both J and E tell two stories each. It is impossible to convince the critics. We must assume 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 marna 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 interpretations, the context of the passage, the background and the state of the text. Reference must be made to the separate articles (esp. Sanctuary; Priests). 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 on other grounds, e.g. of all to those who in the eye 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. If "they are in the midst poor with the strangers ©" (ver 36) "it begins" (ver 39). 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 callednext. 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).

(6) The argument from style.—Just as this argument is too detailed to be set out in a work like the present, so the answer cannot be given with any degree of fulness. It may be said generally that the argument too frequently neglects differences of subject-matter, the varying number and kind of words (e.g. considerations of euphony and slight variations of meaning) which often provide far more natural reasons for the phenomena observed. Again, the VSS suggest that the Bib. text has been heavily glossed. Thus in many passages where the frequent recurrence of certain words and phrases...
supposed to attest the presence of P, versional evidence seems to show that the expressions in question have been introduced by glossators, and when they are removed the narrative remains unaffected in form, order and sense. I.e. the P-word. The effect of rising anger is given to the dialogue by the repetition of "But take too much upon thee," followed by the repetition of "Is it a small thing that" (v 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 Priestts, 50, how this may be explained. Lastly, Cm certainly knows the whole Pent, but as originally ministered. For 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 later literature. 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.
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In 2:14 we read of the Hiddekel (Tigris) as flowing E. of Assur, though there is an alternative reading "Assur on the E. coast" to correct, the passage must antedate the 13th cent. B.C., for Assur, the ancient capital, which was on the west bank of the Tigris, was abandoned at about that date for Kalkhon 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 5th or 6th cent. B.C. 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-takers in the age of ver 19, viz., tradition.

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 arts., e.g. Amraphel; 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 Babylonia 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 blood brother is one. The legal argument, which, as is known, is 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. 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.)

"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 preserves to be Mosaic. Perhaps this is not always fully realized. In critical editions of the text the rubrics are occasionally 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 to the rest and to the inheritance," i.e., "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 precisely for this reason it is required to keep it one month later (Nu 9:10 f.). 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 17, which makes it quite clear that no 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, or even all over the known universe? If so, it means a total prohibition of 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 such unions (Nu 31:18). And this chapter also contains a law of booty. 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 deportation that waits upon Moses? It is this: If heiresses 'be married to any of the sons of the other tribes of the children of Israel, then shall their inheritance be taken away from the inheritance of our fathers, and shall be added unto the inheritance of the tribe wherunto 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 important 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 Pent., 2, (a), (b), 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, and singers, as in Solomon's time. The code that ex hypothesi was forged to deal with this state of affairs has no acquaintance with them. The musical services of the temple are as much beyond its line of vision as the upkeep of the palace building, or the supervision, as that betrayed by the reference in 1 S 8:20 to the appointment by the high priest to positions
carrying pecuniary emolument is far beyond the primitive simplicity of P" (OP, 122).

(7) The legal evidence of P.—As this subject is technical and unfamiliar to many readers, legal reasoning may be confusing. Legal rules may be such as to enable the historical inquirer to say definitely that they belong to an early stage of society. Thus if we find that 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 everyday occurrence for men to die without leaving sons, and the question what is to happen to their land in such cases must from the nature of the case be raised and settled before very long. When therefore we 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 homicide. The earlier law had regarded all homicide as of equal value, for such a law, the human mind only reaches general principles through concrete cases, and other ancient legislations (e.g. the Icelandic) bear witness to the primitive character of the rules of Nu. Thus an expert like Darestes can say that those who are guilty are not extremely archaic (see further SBL 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 cannot therefore be revised." What are we to think, 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 discriminating against Ammon and Moab (23 3-4), in which no mention is made of a king up 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 17-18), who is also to Joel (3 19), Ob, and Isa (53 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 abrogates the principle of the identity of a king in the future (Dt 17 14 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 requirements that the king must be a native and not a foreigner (17 15), when the undisputed line of succession 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 makes it perfectly plain that in the time of Josiah these were fairly established in Canaan?" (Green, Moses and the Prophets, 63 ff).

This too may be supplemented by legal evidence (e.g. 22 26 testifies to the undeveloped intellectual condition of the people). OP, 130ff.

Wellhausen (Prophetengedicht, 392 n.) now regards their main elements as pre-Mosaic Canaanitish law.

(9) Later allusions.—These are of two kinds. Sometimes we find them clearly of a later period than the Mosaic code, and in other cases we find that they were in operation.

(a) By postulating redactors evidence can be banished from the Bible. 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 (cf. Lev 10 10 i.), and like P was to be taught to the people by the priests. Hosea 6 6 also knows of some priestly teaching, which, however, is moral and may therefore be Lev 19; and ch 8 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 certain that he knew a bulky written law which was not merely identical with Ex 21-23, and this passage cannot be met by Wellhausen who resorted to the device of translating it with the omission of the important 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 it really came into existence with D or P, but was an older law incorporated in these documents." That argument would apply, e.g. to the necessity for two witnesses in the case of Naboith. That is a law of D, but those who assert that the text reflects only assert that it is here merely incorporating older material. Again the allusions sometimes show something that differs in some way from the Pentateuch, and it is often impossible to prove that this was a development in the same sense, that it represents an earlier stage, and it frequently happens that the data are insufficient either to support or refute this view. "But fortunately there are in P certain institutions of which the critics definitely assert that they are late." Accordingly, references that prove the earlier existence of such institutions have a very different probative value. Thus it is alleged that before the exile there was but one national burnt offering and one national meal offering each day; whereas Nu 23 demands two. Now in 1 K 18 29.36, we find references to the offering of the evening oblation, but 2 K 3 20 speaks of "the time of offering the oblation" in connection with the morning. Therefore these two oblations were not concurrent in the days of the date assigned to P—who, on the critical theory, first introduced them. So 2 K 15 16 speaks of 'the morning burnt-offering, and the evening meal-offering . . . with the burnt-offering of all the people of the land, and their meal-offering.' This again gives us the two burnt offerings, though, on the hypothesis, they were unknown to preexilic custom. Similarly in other cases: Jer 32 shows us the land laws in actual operation; Ezekiel is familiar with the concept of a king in the future. Thus, though the critics allege that the date was first fixed in the Exile (OF, 132 ff).

(10) Other evidence.—We can call attention to certain other branches of evidence. There is the stylistic evidence 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, in the divergencies of the whole written law and narrative—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 question is: have any great frauds been 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 whom we know little or nothing about. It is not Mosaic. P is a make-up—nothing more. All its references to the wilderness, the camp, the Tent of Meeting, the approach of Canaan, etc., are so many touches 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. Were the Deuteronomic 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 fit turpissimus, says the old maxim; can we suppose that the denunciations of those who prophesy falsely in the name of the Lord proceeded from the pen of one who was himself forging in that name? Or can it be that the great majority of Biblical readers knew so little of truth when they read 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 monothetic ethical religions of the world today rooted in nothing better than folly and fraud?

(2) The historical improbability. A second fundamental consideration is the extraordinary historical improbability that these frauds could have been successfully perpetrated. The narrative in Dt does not give the impression that the king was regarded as an authentic work. King and people, priests and prophets must have been entirely deceived if the critical theory be true. It is surely possible that Huldah and Jeremiah were better judges than modern critics. Similarly in the case of P, if e.g. there had been no Levitical cities or no such laws as to tithes and firstlings as were here contemplated, but entirely different provisions on the subjects, how came the people to accept these forgeries so readily? (See further POT, 257 f., 291-97.) It is of course quite easy to carry this argument too far. It cannot be doubted that the exile had meant a considerable break in the historical continuity of the national development; but yet once the two views are understood the choice cannot be between the critical theory elaborated by Dr. literary forgeries were accepted as genuine ancient laws; on the conservative theory laws were accepted because they were in fact genuine, and interpreted as far as possible to meet the entirely different requirements of the period. This explains both the action of the people and the divergence between pre-exilic and post-exilic practice. The laws were the same but the interpretation was different.

(3) 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 PRIESTS, passim). It must now suffice to take just one instance to make the answer clear. We have seen (p. 10) that 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 certain services in the manner of ancient law. It seems 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 against 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, the testimony of the Christian church, with each fresh exponent, and that they start their case from textual corruption, develop through a confusion between an altar and a house, and end in misdating narratives and laws by 8 or 10 centuries! (see above 3 and 4; SANCTUARY, Priesthood). 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 penetrate to the innermost degree of certainty the joints 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 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 the impossible to estimate the date of the conjectures on which different minds may differ.

Secondly, we have, at least, the fact that 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 (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 SHEL H). This disregard. 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 learn to examine certain textual phenomena that throw light on our problem. It may be said that there is really there are occurrences that are due to textual corruption—that which is due to the ordinary processes of copying, perishing, annotating, etc., and that which is due to the conscious and deliberate attempts to produce, so far as possible, a correct standard text. This makes that which is due to the conscious effort of the Alexandrian critics on Homer. There is evidence that such revision could have been made by the Masoretes, and the important instance is to be found in the chronology of certain portions of Gen of which three different VSS survive. Massoretic, Samaritan, and Septuagint. Another instance of even greater consequence for the
matter 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 some merit may be mentioned. It appears that in the law of the kingdom (Dt 17) and some other parts of the Old Testament the scribes expect 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 unaccompanied with any law of the kingdom.

This is not the case with the other editions. At least the other recensions, the M and the Sept. While there are many minor readings (in cases of variation through accidental corruption) in the text of each, the impression is that the LXX text is in a more advanced state. It is probably safe to say that in general the Sam belongs to the same family as the M, while the LXX in the crucial matters represents a different textual tradition from the other two (see Expos, September 1911, 200-219). How is this to be explained? According to the worthless story preserved in the letter of Aristaeus the LXX was translated from M39 brought from Jews at a date long subsequent to the Sam slavus. The fact that the LXX preserves a recension so different from both Sam and MT (the exact copy of pre-Mosaic sources in Gen, and of the 5th cent. BC and its lineal descendants) suggests that this part of the story must be rejected. If so, the LXX may perhaps represent the text of the Pentateuch in Egypt and descend from a Hcb that separated from the MT before the Sam slavus. At all events this point must be ruled out in the fact that in Jer the LXX differs from MT more widely than in any other Bib book, and this is the least likely, for it is evident that the divergence goes back to the times of Jeremiah, his work having been preserved in the LXX and MT (with its allies) not under any threat of the Jews having an edition ofJer; they also had an edition of that law to which Jer refers, and it is probable 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—the 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 such a text as did that found in the Sam slavus, suggests that it was used at that time and is the original source of the story of the exile—The Egypt and the Bab. The narrative of the finding of the Book of the Law during the reign of Josiah (2 K 22), which probably refers to such a text as did that found in the Sam slavus, suggests that it was used at that time and is the original source of the story of the exile.

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 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 attests were made to repair this damage by rearrangement of the matter. 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 reduction, but in this branch nothing certain can be said. Within a period that is attested by the materials that survive, Ex 35-39 underwent one or more such reductions. Slighter reductions attested by Sam and LXX have affected the chronological order of the Books 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 is possible. Even the crudest attempt is difficult. Probably most readers are fully sensible to 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 discussion, 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 that it should be intelligible to 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) mnemononic, (2) oratorical, and (3) procedural.
   The first is familiar in other early legislations. It is lapidary, terse, and 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 if and occasional later passages, such as the judgment in the case of the wife of Shelomith's son (1 K 20:6-10). Also doubt these laws were memorized by the elders.

   Secondly, the legislation of Dt forms part of a speech and was intended for public reading. Accordingly, the laws here take on a distinctly oratorical style. Thirdly, the bulk of the rest of the legislation was intended to remain primarily in the custody of the priests who could certainly write down (Nu 6:23). This was taken into account, and the style is not terse or oratorical, but reasonably full. It was probably very closely approximated to what the laws were meant. There are minor varieties of style but these are the most important. (On the whole subject see esp. Ps, 170-221.)

   What holds good of the laws is also true with certain modifications of the various works. The style varies with the nature of the subject.

2. The Narrative
   In Nu 33 is intentionally composed in a style which undoubtedly possesses peculiar qualities with anything for an appropriate tune. The census lists, etc., appear to be written in a formal official manner, and something similar is true of the lists of the spies in Nu 13. There is no ground for surprise in this. In the ancient world as we have come to know it 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 of the deity. God and man.

   It is that certain 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 Lot, but in a case of God it is inapplicable, and the place of the jurat 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 the artist appeals to the ear in many subtle ways, and (2) in all such prose, emphasis and meaning are brought out by the order of the words.

   The figures of the old Gr rhetoricians play a considerable part. Thus if the figure of the circle, "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 Ex 16:27: "Would that we had died, yea, we had died with our "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 Ex 3:8, "Tongue of fire." In Nm 20:8: "Evil befalls a misguided and a fugitive wanderer." 9:6: "Sing, O daughter of Zion, for your King is come, and he is triumphantly exalted in glory." 1 Kings 19:15: "$r$ 318 men shall smite thee, and $r$ only escape." The first principle of the creative 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 is to consider what has been' done by R. Here, unfortunately, the modern inquirer is apt to neglect many important processes. It would be a truism, but for the fact that it is so often disregarded, to say that the whole process must 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 (v.14), whereas the text shows that the vast forces he actually faced were much larger (Gen 14:13). Sometimes the clue to the only instance in history of the methods of expression adopted cause trouble to the modern inquirer. There are many much-quoted passages where the expression is the same as that, times used 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 'spreading like a pestilence.' The rendering in vs. 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 8:14).

At this point two further idiocynracies of the Semitic genius must be noted—the habits of personification and the genealogical tendency; e.g. in Nu 20:12-21, Edom and Israel are described as vanquished by a deity in the same terms as that, in Ex 15:10-19. 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 author has been found who understands the literary character of Gen on this ground. It cannot be improved on. The easiest way, we think, to have here a literal report of what was said. This entirely ignores the practices of all literary artists. Such changes are to be expected in any presentation of what occurred; they convey a truer and more vivid and as it were natural face of 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 journeys seem designed to present 40 stations and must not be held to exclude camping at other stations not mentioned; 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's estate" (see NUMBER).

Still more important is it to endeavor to appreciate the habits of thought of those for whom the Pentateuch was first intended, and to seek the Thought of the Pentateuch in the light of such habits.

6. Habits of text in the light of such habits.

Thought.
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 therefore that the etymological meaning 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 23:20,1; Isa 30:27; see further EPC, 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, the national and it is therefore unnecessary to cite instances. 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 immest soul of a people, that book is the Pent. This will be considered in W. We see in its present form an event concerned 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 point animal and human, is at the same time national character. Alike in content 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 Pentateuch? The answer is entirely favorable.

8. How Far the Pentateuch is Trustworthy

(1) Contemporary information. —The Pentateuch is the first place the discussion as to the dating of the Pent (above, II, 4) has shown that we have in it documents that are in many cases certainly contemporaneous with the matters to which they relate and have been preserved in a form that is substantially original. Thus we have seen that the wording of Gen 10 19 cannot be later than the age of Abraham and that the legislation of the last four books is Mosaic. Now contemporaneity is the first essential of credibility.

(2) Character of our informants. —Given the fact (guaranteed by the contemporaneity of the sources) that our informants had the means of providing accurate information if they so desired, 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 narrators is essentially ethical. This appears of course most clearly in the application of Lev 19 11 to 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 Essau'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 manslayer 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 Pentateuch will go to the habit 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 unscientific 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 here 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 fact. This is no recent development; it is most convincingly attested by the Pent itself, which here, as elsewhere, sets down the standard of the spirit of the race. What is the highest guaranty of truth, a guaranty to 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, Ask thy father and he will tell thee; Thine elders, and they will tell thee" (Dt 31 2). "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 ask 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.

(4) 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 most fully believed the truth of his statements. 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 unquestioning 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 remarked, 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 the writers of De 4:32 (cf.). 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 to the history as that 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.

4) External corroboration.—All investigations of evidence depend 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 Biblical narrative has been subjected to the most rigorous cross-examination from every point of view for more than a century. Time after time definite assertions have been made that its falsehood has been definitely proved, and in each case the Pent has more than once interpreted the test triumphantly. The details 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 Egypt 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 11:5. 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 (see e.g. Jerusalem; Amarna). The latter 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 law 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 more to be praised in the Divine guidance that it rejected 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 as Reasoned History are given. A 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 is here more unsophisticated and the material 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 unity, lack of leadership, 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. It thus 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 statesmanship, 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 commands 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 philosophic history is an attempt to express it in terms of something to which it is incomparable.

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, Apane-tamba 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 amidst every walk of thought. The fundamental assumption is that a sacred or inspired lit is being once obtained to exist, all knowledge is contained in it. The Hindoos way of putting it is simply that the Scripture is true, but that everything which is true is contained in it. To be observed that such a theory, firmly held during the infancy of systematic thought, tends to work itself into fact. As the human mind advances, accumulating observation and accumulating reflection, nascent philosophy and nascent science are driven from sacred literature, while they are at the same time limited by the ruling ideas of its pious authors. But as the mass of this literature grows through time and is, by successive expositors, it gradually specializes itself, and subjects, which were at first mixed together, into the several conceptions, become separated from one another and isolated. In the history of law the most important of this already specialized division of science was that which we are inclined to de 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 as a portion of the first book, what a man must do. Thus the most ancient books of this class are called "Pentateuch," as the Hindu who would lead a perfect life. They contain much more ritual than law, a great deal more about the iniquity causing things that crop up crime, a great deal more about penances than about punishments" (pp. 10-18).

It is impossible not to solve the resemblance of the Pentateuch to many sentences such as that in the Pentateuch 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 of this book to do them" (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 idea of God must be quoted from the other; "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. The views here expressed dominate the legislation. Holiness—the correlative holiness to which the function befits because the the God holy—embraces much that is not germane to our subject, but it also covers the whole field of national and communal righteousness. The duty to God 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 interwoven in archaic legislation. There is a stage in human development when the idea of a personal God is a stage in the history of the Pentateuch belongs. No other legislation so takes up one department of man's life after another and impresses upon all the relations of God to his people. Perhaps nothing will so clearly bring out my meaning as a passage of some of the more fundamental differences between the Pentateuchal legislation and the old Indian law-books which often provide excellent parallels to it. Those to which I desire to draw particular attention are as follows: The Indian law-books have no idea of national (as distinct from individual) righteousness—a conception that entered the world with the Mosaic legislation and has perhaps not made very much progress therein since. There is no personal God; hence His personal interest in righteousness is lacking; hence, too, there can be no relationship between local and personal and while there is a supernatural element in the contemplated results of human actions, there is nothing that can be in the slightest degree compared with the personal Divine intervention that is so often promissed in the Pentateuchal system. If, at home, the Hammurian law class system, leads to distinctions that are always inequitable. The conception of loving one's neighbour and oneself are not lacking. There is no national system which may not become a scandal. The systematic provisions for poor relief are absent, and the legislation is generally on a lower ethical and moral level, while some of the penalties are distinguished by the most perverted and barbarous cruelty. All these points are embraced in the special relationship of the One God and the peculiar treasure with its resulting need for national and individual holiness" (Ps. 33:1).

These sentences indicate some of the most interesting of the distinguishing features of the Pentateuch: its national character, its catholic view of holiness of life, its attitude toward the Divine, and some at any rate of its most peculiar teachings. It is worth noting that Judaism, the oldest of the great religions which has influenced, attaches particular importance to one chapter, Lev 19. The keynote of that chapter is the command: 'Holy shall ye be, for holy am I the Lord your God'—to preserve the order and emphasis of the original words. This has been called the Jew's "imperative of respect". When this is rejected, that the use of the word "imitation" is here inaccurate. Now this book with this teaching has exercised a unique influence on the world's history, for it must be remembered that Judaism, Christianity and Islam spring ultimately from its teaching, 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 powerful way 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 Jew's character has also counted for much; so again have the moral and ethical doctrines, and the miraculous and unprecedented events of the nation. 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 lens which has to 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 efficacy? How are the 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 God 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 universal 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 Pent had not been the book of the people long before the Jews became the possessors of the book.

LITERATURE.—The current critical view is set forth in vast numbers of books. The following may be mentioned: "LOT:" Cornell's "Intro to the Canonical Books of the OT"; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's "Hexateuch" (a 2nd ed of the Intro without the text has been published as The Composition of the Hexateuch); the views of the ICC, Westminster Comm. and Century Bible. Slightly less thoroughgoing views are put forward in the Ger. Intros of König (1895), Baudissin (1910), Sellin (1910); and Gedén, "Outlines of Intro to the Hexateuch" (1909); Kittel, "Scientific Study of the OT" (1910); Erdtm. St. has entirely divergent critical views; "POT": TMH, I. and W. Moller, Are the Critics Right! and Wider der Gesandten der Quellenforschung der Gesandten der Quellenforschung, Early Religion of Israel; Van Hoonacker, Lieu du sable, and Sacredes Ususque as are the conservative and innovative and valuable. J. H. Raven, "OT Intro", gives a good presentation of the most conservative case. The views taken in this article are personal and an innovative and the Script. P. T. S., Tocchi, The Name of God, and in some matters, TMH, I.
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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 a revised copy from the Sam community in Nablus to which he 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 a standard text. 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, and when so exhibited still more rarely 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 inches deep, and 7 inches wide. The writing is in neat characters, 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 out, 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 inches long by 15 inches wide." Dr. Rosen's account on the authority of Kraus (Zeitschr. der deutschen vergl. 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 arabsche ornaments.

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 tshurit letters and in the holy tongue; after 20 years Ezra in the square ('ashurbith) character and the Aram. tongue. Israel chose for themselves the 'ashurbith character and the holy tongue; they left to the hekhayyoth ('uncultured') the 'tshurit character and the Aram. tongue—'the Carthaginians are the Aram.-yoth,'" said Rabbi Hasen. When Jewish hatred of
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 M S and the Siloam inscription. Another intermediate form, that found on the Assuan 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 word which he had left incomplete in the preceding one. In the M S in the papyri the words are not divided, but the scribal was not particular about the ends of lines. He wrote the letters of each line closely together so that the first letter or couple of letters of each line are placed directly under the first letter or letters of the preceding line—and 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 kisw 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 kisw are often enumerated on the margin; sometimes, in later MS in Arab. numerals. A parenthesis sometimes separates one of these kisw from the next.

4. The Tarikh

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 or an empty column. The space thus left is very 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 Nabûdûs roll this fact occurs in D and occupies three columns. In this it is said, "I Abunia, son of Pinhas [Pinheus], son of Eleazar, son of Akarun [Aarou] the priest, have written this holy book in the door of the tabernacle of the congregation in Mt. Gerizim in the 15th year of the rule of the children of Israel in the land of the Canans." 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.

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 Br-Gil Kaph letters are anaptyptic. The most singular peculiarity is that none of the gutturals is pronounced at all—peculiarly 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 Gen are subjoined according to the Sam pronunciation, as taken down by Petermann (Versuch einer hebr. Formenlehre, 161). From the reading of Akarun the third priest: Emtarabhi tarabxw Btwem it asabhum xwita wawet. Woaez qata-te uhe wawesh al jani . . . tum uwo Btwem a mek, efd an al. Emem wawet ci tep wawet ci ke wawet ci ke wawet ci ke Btwem b a or b wawesh ayqib Btwem leb a om uwa wawesh kara liha. Uyo aros uyo xfo bar yom ahad.

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 also there is no doubt. The Am Tab of the Nabûdûs sent from Caanaan 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 MS 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 Hamanians. The reason of this mode of writing being perpetuated in copying the Law may 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 dubious by the evidence of Mr. 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 Nablus MSS. roll necessitates a great adjustment of lines, as the quarters of the tarikh in the Nablus MSS. roll were placed 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 saw in the Nablus MSS. roll that 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 also for the vorting reading of the script. 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 preparation 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 Samaritan MSS. cannot fail to perceive its practical identity with the MT, closer study to MT: reveals numerous, if minor, differences. These differences were classified by Gesenius. Besides being illogical and unclassifiable, the classification was 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.

1. Relation to MT:—

Classifications of Differences:—

(1) 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 (a) 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 generally was followed by certain words or phrases, he might inadvertently conclude 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 acent; (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. Of these these may find in connection with the Sam Pent appear to be mistakes due to the resemblance of letters in the Sam Pent. Most of these are obvious blunders; thus in Gen 19 32, we have the meaningless tâbânnu instead of tâbânaa, "our father," from the likeness of 'âl, to to 'âl, a. In Gen 25 29 we have gâzêd instead of gâzêd, "to seethe," because of the likeness of yâl, to yâl, 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 the branch break thou, thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." This rendering does violence to the sense of both vs. and results in a tautology. In the Hiphil the first vb. râdâh ought to mean "to cause to wander," the second vb. râdâh means "to break," not "to shake off." The Sam has "When thou shalt be mighty, thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." The MT mistake may be due to the confounding of 'âl, a, with 'âl, t, and the transposition of q, d, and b. The vb. akîbâh, "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 Sam. In cases where there is only in letters in the square script may all be ascribed to variation in the MT. Cases involving the confusion of wâdâ and yâdâ 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 râbîth instead of râbîyoth (Nebirot) as usual; 36 5, where the Jewish scribe has yâdâ instead of yâdî (tâdî) as in the LXX and in the KJV. In writing râdîth instead of râdîth, 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 acent bâna, invariable in the Hebrew of Benjamin, bâna'im, is written Benjamin; also in Ex 11 11 pîthim instead of pîthim, but m and n are alike only in the script of the Siloam inscription. In Dt 12 21, the Sam has zîwâ, tsâkhekkâm, as the MT has in 12 11, whereas the MT has tîwâ, lâsîm. A study of the alphabets on p. 2514 will show the close resemblance between wâdâ and kîpîf 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 Hezekiah.

(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 words, so that the vowel is written plenum or the reverse, or, on the other hand, to the mistake of the gutturals. Of the former class are variations of the repetition or omission of a 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 pronunciation were not pronounced at all. Gen 27 36 shows and the interchanges of and . In Gen 49 7, and in Gen 23 18, in many Sam MSS, but the result is meaningless. This inability to pronounce the gutturals points to the fact considerably before the Arab domination. Possibly this avoidance of the gutturals because of the fashionable custom of the language of law was Lat., a language without gutturals. A parallel instance may be seen in Aquila, who does not transcribe any gutturals. These gutturals may be connected with the fact that in Assyrian kîpîf is practically the only guttural. The colonists
from Assyria might not unlikely be unable to pronounce the gutturals.

(6) Changes due to deficient attention: Another cause of variances from the MT is due to the translator's carelessness or his desire to represent the text accurately. This is manifested occasionally in the substitution of a word in the MT for one in the LXX. For example, in Gen 26:31 the Sam has "fr ethical, "to his friend," instead of the MT 'fr ethical, "to his brother," and in Ex 20:27 Sam has ‘YHWH instead of the MT. In such cases it is impossible to determine which represents the original text. We may remark that the assumption of Germaine that the majority of such Jewish writers as Kohl that the MT is always correct is due to mere prejudice. More important changes occur in the case of a word for a word in the MT, as in Gen 3:24, where Sam has 'YHWH instead of the MT 'Elohim, as in Gen 4:4, where Sam has 'YHWH instead of the MT 'Elohim, and Gen 7:1 where it has 'Elohim and the MT has 'Elohim. This is a case in which the text of the MT is more singular, in that in the 9th verse of the same chapter the MT has 'Elohim and the Sam 'YHWH. 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 to it in being directed. If the text, 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: Variations from the MT are frequently met with in reading 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'rah of the MT. The K'rah of the MT has in most cases and is more singular, in that in the 9th verse of the same chapter the MT has 'Elohim and the Sam 'YHWH. 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 to it in being directed. If the text, the Sam adds the clause "a little water from thy pitcher": if the Sam, then the MT has dropped it.

These variations are of unequal value as evidence of the relative date of the Sam recension of the Pent. The intention of the MT agree with this in which the text, the Sam adds the clause "a little water from thy pitcher": if the Sam, then the MT has dropped it.

(1) Statement of hypothesis.-The frequency with which the point in which the Sam Pent differs from the MT agree with this in which the text, the Sam adds the clause "a little water from thy pitcher": if the Sam, then the MT has dropped it.
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- disposed of the tradition.

(2) Review of these hypotheses.—The above unsatisfactory explanations result from deficient observation and unwarranted assumption. That there are many cases where the Sam variations from the MT are identical with those of the LXX is indubitable. It has, however, not been observed by those Jewish scholars that the cases in which the Sam alone or LXX alone, one or other, agrees with the MT against the other, are equally numerous. Indeed, there are a few cases in which all three differ. It ought to be observed that the cases in which the LXX differs from the MT are much more numerous than those in which the Sam differs from it. One has only to compare the Sam, LXX and MT of any half a dozen consecutive chapters in the Pent to prove this. Thus neither is dependent on the others. Further, there is the unwarranted assumption that the MT represents the primitive text of the Law. If the MT is compared with the Vulg, it is found that the LXX, despite the marked effect of the Greek upon it, and the Palestinian text, differs in very many cases from the MT. Theodotion is nearer, but still differs in not a few cases. Jerome is nearer still, though even the text behind the Vulgate is not identical with the MT. It follows that the MT is the result of a process which stopped somewhere about the end of the 5th cent. AD. The origin of the MT appears to have been somewhat the result of accident. A MS which had acquired a special sanctity as belonging to a famous rabbi or group of rabbis has been copied with fastidious accuracy, so that even its blunders are perpetuated. This supplies the K'thbbh. Corrections are made from other MSS, and these form the Kyre. If our hypothesis as to the age of the Nahal roll is correct, it is older than the MT by more than a millennium, and the MS from which the LXX was tr was nearly a couple of centuries older still. So far from its being a reasonable assumption that the LXX and Sam differ from the MT only by blunders due to carelessness or unskill, it is much more probable that the converse is at least as probable. The conclusion then to which we are led is that of Kennicott (State of Heb Text Diss., II, 164) that the Sam and LXX being independent, "each copy is incomparably superior to the MS which is used in our English version, and attentive study." It further ought to be observed that though Dr. Kohn points to certain cases where the difference between the MT and the LXX is due to confusion of letters only possible in Sam character, this does not prove the LXX to have been tr from a Sam MS, but that the MSS of the MT used by the LXX were written in that script. Kohn also exhibits the relation of the Sam to the Pesh. While the Pesh sometimes agrees with the Sam where it differs from the MT, it more frequently supports the MT against the Sam.

IV. Bearing on the Pentateuchal Question.—Jos (Ant, XI, viii, 2) makes Sanballat contemporary with Alexander the Great, and states that his son-in-law Manasseh came to Samaria and became the head of the household. The story is assumed by Jos, it is assumed by critics that he brought the completed Torah with him. This Manasseh is according to Jos the grandson of Eliashib the high priest, the contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah, and therefore mention of him with Artaxerxes I Longimanus and Nehemiah (13 28) mentions, without naming him, a grandson of Eliashib, who was son-in-law of Sanballat, whom he chased from him. It is clear that Jos had dropped a century out of his history, and that the migration of Manasseh is to be placed not c 335 BC, but c 435 BC. Ezra is reputed to be, if not the author of the PC in the Pent, at all events its introducer to the Samaritans, and to have edited the whole, so that it assumed the form in which we now have it. The claim of 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 enactments of Ezra, or would he have been the author of the introduction of 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 a further Sam roll was copied was written in some variety of angular script. We have seen, further, that the peculiarities suit those of the Sikhon inscription executed in the reign of Hezekiah, therefore approximately contemporary with the present 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 before the captivity, it would seem that this "Book of the Law" must have been read [Am 4 5 LXX Without, which would be the sense "sent the priest sent from Assyria taught as above the "manner of the God of the land," would contain all the portions—P, E, D, and P—of the Law. If so, it did not contain the Book of Josh; notwithstanding the honor they give to the writer of Cu- naam, 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 Jos. It is singular, if the Prophets were before the Law; for if so there should be archaism which are not found in the Prophets. From the way the Divine names are interchanged, as we saw, sometimes Elig7m 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 interchange occurs in the LXX. The result of investi- gation of the Sam Pent is to throw very considerable doubt on the possibility of identifying the versions 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 Aramaic and an Arabic. The Aramaic is called "Western Aram.;" in which the Jewish Tgs were written, was written, sometimes called "Adjicous" verse, some strange words, some of which may be due to the language of the Assyrians, but many are the result of blunders of the scribes ignorant of the language, and not to the original and is little given to paraphrase. Much the same may be said of the Arab. Tg. It is usually attributed to Abu Said of the 12th cent., but according to Dr. Cowley only revived by him from the Tg of Abulhassan of the 11th cent. There is evidence occasionally in the Fathers to a Samaritan which has been taken to mean a Gr version. No indubitable quotations from it survive—what seems to be so blemishes tr of the text of the Sara recension. There is in Arabic, a wordy chronicled called "The Book of Josh," it has been edited by Jaybanyi. 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. But it is a manifest forgery; the characters in which it is written is very late, is partly because of Josh, and partly from the older Sam Book of Joshua with famous additions. The Chronicle of Abulpharagia is a tolerable aggregate account of the history of the Samaritans after Alexander the Great to the 4th cent. AD.

LITERATURE.—The text in the Sam script is found in the papyri—Paris and London. Walton's text in the London Polyglot is transcribed in square characters by Dr. Layton, Oxford, 1704. Longeneck's text of recent times are Mills, Noahs and the Samaritans, London, 1864; Nutt, Dram from the Sam Text, London, 1874; Montgomery, The Samaritans, Philadelphia, 1907 this has a very full bibliography which includes articles in periodicals. For The Sam Pent and Modern Criticism, 1911, London. In Germany, Gesenius' 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 Christianity, are vivid and dramatic in the Acts of the Apostles. The old rendering of sumplesoirakshai (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 held on Passover, but on Thursday. 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 year occurred on Friday, Nisan 14 (18 28). But according to Mt, Mk and Lk, the Passover year occurred on Thursday, Nisan 14, and hence Pentecost fell on Saturday. The K AuthService explained the shabbath of Lev 23 15 as pointing to the Sabbath of the paschal week and therefore not the Pentecost. 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 Johannine 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 pentecostal 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 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 make explicit the 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 intelligents, 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 opinion of 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. This later doctrine has 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 the Twelve was elected 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 fitted them with 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 Tabor, § 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,” but is distinct from the “Semestre Ecclesiæ.”

3. Later Christian
Observance
As yet there was no trace of Christmas, Penitential period, closed the “Quadragesima,” or “Lent,” the entire period of which has been marked by self-denial and humiliation. On the contrary, the entire pentecostal period, the so-called “Quinquagesima,” was marked by joyfulness, daily communion, absence of 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 salvation was begun as 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, desquamated 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. DOKSER

PENUEL, pen‘-yôl, pen‘-yôl. See Peniel.

PENURY, pen‘-ûr-i (παριστη, pa-re‘tis, παριστημενον, pa-re‘tis-me-ne‘n). 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 (kurtépuma, kurtépêma) is in RV tr“want” (of the widow’s mites).

PEOPLE, pe‘-pul. In EV represents something over a dozen Heb and Gr words. Of these, in the OT, דֹּם, dom, is overwhelmingly the most common (some 2,000 t.), with נֶפֶשׁ, ne‘pes, and גּוֹי, go‘y, 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 above in the Preface to ERV) is the frequent use of the pl. “peoples” (strangely avoided in AV except Rev 10 11, 17 16), where the sing. esp. preponderates. 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, lâos, is the most common word, with ἕλεος, ἔλεος, used almost as often in AV. But in RV the latter word is almost always rendered as “thou art being pitied,” “people” being as often as in AV. But in RV the latter word is almost always rendered as “thou art being pitied,” “people” being as often as in AV.

PEOR, pe‘ôr (יוֹנָה, jo‘ôa, פּוֹר, Phôgor): (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 7). It is placed by Onom on the way between Livias and Heshbon, 7 25 miles from the latter. From here it is identified with Jebel el-Masahkjar, on which are the ruins of an old town, between Wady A‘yân Misa and Wady Heshbon.

(2) A town in the Judaean uplands added by LXX (Phôgor, Phôgor) to the list in Josh 18 9. It may be identical with Khirbet Phagâr to the S. of Bethlehem.

(3) Peor, in Nu 25 18; 31 16; Josh 22 17, is a Divine name standing for “Baal-peor.”

(4) In Gen 36 39, LXX reads Phôgor for “Pau” (MT), which in 1 Ch 1 50 appears as “Pai.”

PERAEA, pe‘-rē-a (περαε, he Peraios, Περαιας, Peraios, Περαιατας, Peraiatal, Peraiates): This is not a Scriptural name, but the term used by Jos to denote the district to which the rabbinic country, probably refers as “the land beyond Jordan.” This corresponds to the NT phrase περαν του Ιωδαναω (Mt 4 15; 19 1, etc.). The boundaries of the province are given by Jos (BJ, III, 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, vi, 3, 6), was capital of the Peraea. 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 Jedur—a reminiscence of the ancient name—not far from Ras-Sialt. The northern Gerasa held the land on the southern bank of the Yarmuk, the northern boundary of the Peraea would run, as Jos says, from Pella eastward. For the description of the country thus indicated see GILEAD, 2.

In the time of the Macedeans the province was mainly Gentile, and Judaism, if necessary to
remove to Judaea the scattered handful of Jews to secure their safety (1 Mac 5.45). Possibly under Hyrcanus Jewish influence began to 
2. History 
preval and before the death of An-
tripus (Ant, XVII, vii, 1). The tetrach 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, i, 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 Phædeus (BJ, IV, vii, 3-6). Under the Moslems it became part of 
the province of Damascus.

Perea, "the land beyond Jordan," ranked along with Judaea and Galilee as a province of the land of Israel. The people were under the same laws as regarded tithes, marriage and property.
Perea lay between two gentle provinces on the E., as Samaria between two Jewish provinces on the W. of the Jordan. The fords below Besidai and other favorable communications with Galilee and Judaea respectively. Perea 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, 52).

It seems probable that Jesus was baptized within the territory of Perea; and either He came from the turmoil of Jesus at the Feast of the Dedication (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 Perea that He was summoned by the sisters at Bethany (ver.3).
Perea furnished in Niger one of the bravest men who fought against the Romans (BJ, II, xx, 4; IV, vi, 1). From Bethzeb, a village of Perea, came Mary, whose story is one of the most appalling among the terrible tales of the siege of Jerus (BJ, VI, iii, 4). Jos mentions Perea for the last time, as its echo of the deeds of groans andoutingsthat accompanied the destruction of Jerusalem.
W. Ewing

PERAZIM, per'a-zim, pe-ráz-im, MOUNT (περαζῆ, bab-prá'tim); "Jehovah will rise up as in mount Perazim" (Isa 29 21). It is usually considered to be identical with BaaL-perazim (q.v.), where David obtained a victory over the Philis (2 S 5 20; 1 Ch 14 11).

PERDITION, per di'sh'un, apó-leia, ru'in or "loss," physical or eternal: The word "perdition" occurs in the Eng. Bible 8 t (Jn 17:12; Phil 1:29; 2 Thes 2:3; 1 Tim 6:9; He 10 39; 2 Pet 3 7; Rev 17 11.18). In each of these cases it denotes the final state of ruin and punishment which forms the opposite to salvation. The vb. apó-lei'ain, 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 apó-leia 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 LXX, in such an easy 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 18 12; Lk 15 10,11,32; Lk 15 11). "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 fate 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. Apó-leia being the oppo-
site of sotéria, and sotéria in its technical usage de-
noting the reclaiming from death unto life, apó-leia 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 5.11 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 Thes 2 3). This is the well-known Heb idiom by which a person typically embodying a certain trait or character or destiny 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 apó-leia. GEBHARDUS VOS

PERES, pe're. See MEHE.

PERESH, pe'реш (פֶּרֶשֶׁ, perek, "dung"): Son of Machir, grandson of Manasseh through his Aramite concubine (1 Ch 7 14.16).

PEREZ, pe'rez. See PHAREZ.

PEREZ, pe'rez. PHAREZ, fa'rez (פֶּרֶץ, perec, "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 "Parez" in AV Gen 36 12; Nu 26 20.21; Ruth 4 12.15; 1 Ch 2 4.5; 4 1. 9. 4. In AV and RV 1 Ch 27 3; Neh 11 4.6, he is "Perez." He is important for the fact that by way of Ruth and Boaz and so through Jesse and David his genealogy comes upward to the anthro-
pomorphic "Pharisee" occurs in Nu 26 20 AV. Perezites (Nu 26 20, AV "Pharizites"). The patronymic of the name Perez.

PEREZ-UZZA, pe-rez-uz'za. See UZZA.

PERFECT, pär'fekt, PERFECTION, pär-fek'-tion, shaman (שָׁם, šālāh, דֶּשֶׂ, dešē;طول, tomar; telóos, télos, τελείωσ, teileiōs): "Perfect" in the 1. In the OT the word "perfection, "finished," OT "whole," "complete," used (except in Dt 17 15, "perfect weight") of persons, e.g. a "perfect heart," i.e. wholly or completely devoted to Jehovah (1 K 2 6.11, etc.; 1 Ch 12 38; Is 38 3, etc.); tomar, "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.); tomar, with the same meaning, occurs only in Job, except twice in Pss Job 1 18; 2 3, etc.; Ps 37 37; 64 4); kalôs, "complete," and various other words are trd "perfect;"
Perfection is the tr of various words so tr once only: καθιστά (Lam 2 15): miktató, "completeness" (Ps 50 2); miktadh, "position" (Job 15 29, AV "neither shall he possess the position thereof upon the earth"). ARV "neither shall their possessions be extended on the earth" (Lk 14 31); it reverses this text and m: miktaká, "completeness," or "perfection" (Ps 119 96); miktah (twice), "end," "perfect." (Job 14 7). Qh. 01. do. 01. (perhaps find out the Almighty unto perfection? 28 3, searcheth out all perfection, AV, RV to the furthest bound; cf 260; RV the confines of light and darkness"). θέλουν, "perfect," "completeness" (Isa 47 9, AV "They shall call upon perfection, but shall not attain to it", Isa 2 10, "in their pkasure"), RV keys the meaning of the "the Urn and the Thummin" (Ex 28 30, etc) as "the Lights and the Perfections.

In the NT "perfect" is usually the tr of teleō, primarily, "having reached the end," "term," "limit," hence "complete," "full,") 2. In the "perfect" (Mt 5 48, Ye therefore NT shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt 19 21, "If thou wilt 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 "fully-grown" (Col 1 24, "perfect...in Christ Jesus; 4 7; Jas 3 2 m, etc). Other words are teleō, "to perfect...to end...complete" (Lk 13 32, "the third day I am...perfected," RV "end my course"); "as 17 23, "perfected into one"); 2 to one," 2 Cor 6 17, "perfect into one," RV "in the flesh"); etc, also epeklē, to bring through to an end" (2 Cor 1 7, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God"); Gal 3 3, "Are ye now made perfect by the law." AV RV "perfected in the flesh," m "Do ye now make an end in the flesh?" 3, "make perfect"); 4 6, "perfectly"); 4 11, "for perfection...to perfect" (Mt 21 16, "perfectly""); Acts 16 20, "saying...perfect") (Phil 1 3, "having had perfect understanding," RV "having traced...accurately") Acts 18 20 AV: "completely") ARV "a...flawed") (2 Tim 3 17, RV "complete"); περιφάρον, "to fill...to make full" (Rev 3 8, ARV "perfected...full...fulfilled...battalismos, "complete adjustment") (Eph 4 12, "for the perfecting of the saints").

Perfection is the tr of katartikē, "thorough adjustment," "fitness" (2 Cor 13 9, RV "perfected"); of teleōsis (He 7 11); of teleōtās (He 6 1), "RV full-grown"); it is thr "perfection" (Col 3 14); "perfection" in Lk 8 14 is the tr of telephoró, "to bear on to completion or perfection." In Apoc. "perfect," "perfection," etc, are for the most part the tr of words from this, "the completion" (Ecc 3 17), "so...sustained...full end"; 24 28; 50 11. RV has for the "upright" (2 S 22 24 16); for the "saints" (Ps 119 80, for "perfect" (Phil 3 5); for the "unmarried" (Ps 119 1, m "upright in way"); for the "righteous" (Ez 7 27, "perfect and so forth"); for "He maketh my way perfect" (2 S 22 33), "He guideth the perfect in his way," m "a...another reading...guideth my way in perfection...shall himself perfect...in...restore...for..." (He 12 2); "perfectly" is omitted in RV (Mt 14 36), "so your hope perfectly on...RV "hope to end" (1 Pet 1 19). Perfection is the Christian ideal and aim, but inasmuch as that which God has set before us is infinite—Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect (Mt 5 48)—absolute perfection 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 taken for wholly dedicated to God. Christian perfection must also have its seat in such a heart, but it implies the whole conduct and the whole man, conformed thereto as knowledge grows and opportunity arises, or might be found. There may be, of course, the relative perfection of 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 21).

W. L. WALKER

PERFORM, pér-form (He, paroimia, "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 sense (cf Rom 15 28; 2 Cor 8 11, Phil 1 6, where RV has respectively "accomplish," "complete," "perfect," but especially 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 on no particular principle. In the NT the word has been kept only in Mt 5 33 and Rom 12 17, but in the other verses RV has rendered the completion of the act, in the former case apologia, lit. "to give back," in the latter paroimia, "to make," "to do," being used.

Performance is found in AV Sir 19 20 (RV "doing"); 2 Mace 11 17 (inserted needlessly and omitted by RV); Lk 4 13, RV "fulfillment"); 2 Cor 8 11 (RV "completion").

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PERFUME, pér-fum, pér-fum, PERFUMER (περφύμ, πέρφυμ, καλαρτίσματα, κατάρτισμα, lit. "incense"). The ancients were fond of sweet perfumes of all kinds 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); couches and beds were sprinkled with savory scents (Ps 27 9); incense could be used in the last rites in honor of the dead (2 Ch 16 14; Lk 24 1; Jn 19 39). The writer in his collection a lump of prepared spices and resins taken from a tomb dating from the 1st or 2nd cent. AD, which was apparently fused and run 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" (περφυμοι, ἀποθήκη). 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 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-
Perga, Par'ga (Πέργα, Perga): An important city of the ancient province of Pamphylia, situated on the river Cestris, 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 missionary journey, and 2 years later, according to Acts 14 24-25, they may have reached there. Though the water of the river Cestris has now been diverted to the fields for irrigating purposes, in ancient times the stream was navigable, and from it a harbour 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 the city had 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 Leto, or the queen of Perga. It is highly probable that the coins 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. Very broad streets, lined with porticoes, divided 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 crossed at short intervals by bridges. Upon the higher ground was the aeroplos, 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 aeroplos is the platform of a large structure with fragments of several granite columns, probably representing the temple of the goddess Leto; others regard it as the ruin of an early church. At the base of the aeroplos 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, Par'ga-mos; or PERGAMUM, Par'ga-um (Perlamos, hē Pergamos, or Ἱλίας Ἡ Πέργαμον): Pergamos, to which the ancient writers also gave the neuter form of the name, was a city of Mysia of the ancient Roman province of Asia, in the Cæles valley, 3 miles from the river, and about 15 miles from the sea. The river navigable at Pergamos was navigable by large craft. Two of the tributaries of the Cæles were the Selinus and the Kteios. 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 people of the town were descendants of Gr colonists, and as early as 420 BC they struck coins of their own. Later the people of the town, deposited there 9,000 talents of gold. Upon his death, Philateus (283-263 BC) used this wealth to found the independent Gr dynasty of the Attalid kings. The first of this dynasty to bear the title of king was Attalus I (241-197 BC), a nephew of Philateus, 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) extended its fame and power, and the Romans built on it 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 baths, with colonnades, were the first used; hence the name "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 30 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, Aristonicus, however, attempted to use it 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 from which 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 present cent. AD. The magnificence of the city continued.

There were beautiful temples to the four great gods Zeus, Dionysus, Athena and Asklepios. To the temple of the latter, invalids from 2. Religions all parts of Asia flocked, and there, basking in the sunshine of 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 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 of the 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 1-3, 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 Seljukus 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 Bergama, 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 1886 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 frizies 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, pē-rī'dā (.Names, pērīdah, “recluse”): A family of “Solomon’s servants” (Neh 13:7). In Ex 2 25, a difference in the Hebrew spelling gives “Peruda” for the same person, who is also called “The Pharida” of 1 Esd 5 33.

PERIZZITE, per-i-zīt, peri-zi’t (NASB, Perizz, Peraizes): Signifies “a villager,” and so corresponds with the Egypt 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 1:4). We hear, accordingly, of “Canaanites and Perizzites” at Shechem (Gen 34:30), at Bezek in Judah (Jgs 1:4) and, according to the reading of LXX, at Gezer (Jsh 16:10). In Dt 3 3 and Is 6 18, where AV has “unwalled towns” and “country villages,” LXX has “Perizzites,” the lit. tr. of the Heb. “cities of the Perizite” or “villager” and “village of the Perizzite.” The same expression occurs in Est 9 19, where it is used of the Jews in Elam. In Jsh 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, per-jū’rī. See Crimes; Oath; Punishments.

PERPETUAL, pēr-pē’tū-əl, perpetually, pēr-pē’tū-əl-i, PERPETUITY, pēr-pē’tū-ə-tē (PERP), ‘dām, ‘dām, nāçōh, ‘tāBINDH, tābindh): Perpetual is usually the tr. of ‘dām, 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 29:9; 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 a perpetual possession” (Zeph 2:9, etc.; nāçōh, “preeminence,” “perpetuity,” “eternity” (often tr. “for ever,” Ps 9:6), is tr. “perpetual” (Ps 74:3; Jer 15:18); nāçōh (part.) (Jer 8:5); tābindh, “continuance,” generally rendered “continually,” but sometimes “perpetual” or “perpetually” (Ex 30:8; Lev 6:20).

Perpetually is the rendering of ‘adh, properly “progress,” “duration,” hence long or indefinite time, eternity (usually in RV rendered “for ever”), in Am 1:11, “His angel did fear perpetually”; and of kōl ha-yādim, “all the days” (K. J. 9:3; 2 Chr 7:16, “my heart shall be there perpetually”; of Mt 28:20, “pānūs tis heméras, lit. “all the days”).

Perpetuity is repeated in RV of Lev 25:33, “The land shall not be sold in perpetuity,” “The house . . . shall be made sure perpetually.”

Perpetual is frequent in Apoc, most often as the tr. of ἀβατόν and kindred words, e.g. Jth 13:20, “a perpetual praise”; Wind. 1:14, “perpetual glory,” RV “eternal”; Rev 11:33, “a perpetual blot,” RV “blame for ever.”

“Persecution” is a term coupled with “perpetual” in 2 Mac 6:8, as “perpetual name,” RV “everlasting...”; ἀνάμνησις, “ever-flowing death” occurs in Wind 11:6 (so RV); endechōs, “constant” (Rev 15:4, “perpetual reproach”).


W. L. WALKER

PERSECUTION, pēr-sēk’ē-shən (ἀναμνήσεως, diágnōmōs [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 Discipleship
5. A Means of Blessing
6. Various Forms
7. In the Cause of Jesus
8. Inspired 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
   (1) Testimonies of Tacitus
   (2) Reference in 1 Pet (3) Tertullian’s Persecution
14. Jewish Persecution
15. Testimony of Pliny, 112 AD
16. 2d and 3d Centuries
17. Best Emperors the Most Cruel Persecutors
18. Causes of Persecution
19. 300 Years of Roman Persecution
20. Persecution in the Army
21. Tertullian’s Apology
22. The Third Race
23. Hatred against Christians
24. The Decline of Persecution
25. Libel
26. The Edict of Milan
27. 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 more than 150 times, “persecution” 44 times, and “persecutor” 9 times.

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 inno-
cent 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 Law and the worship of God. During that time there were many patriots who were true martyrs, and those heroes of faith, the Macabees, were among those who “know their God . . . and do exploits” (Dtn 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
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 ‘sore enemies,’ because the 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 which they had them tried and condemned. 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 Epistles it is said, “Ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen, even as they [in Judea] did of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out, and sold us up to be numbered, 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” (Acts 9:2–4), and going 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 Agrippa (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, Paul and Silas were most cruelly persecuted (Acts 16:19–40); and, even before that time, Paul and Barnabas had suffered much at Iconium and at Lystra (Acts 14:29). On the whole, the Roman authorities were not actively hostile during the greater part of Paul’s lifetime. Gallio, for instance, the deputy of Achaia, declined to come into the charge brought by the Jews at Corinth against Paul (Acts 18:14; Acts 15:16). 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, at first, not a forbidden religion.—This legality of the Christian faith was illustrated and enforced by the fact that when Paul’s case was decided 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 is certain, however; never from a comparison of Phil with 2 Tim. There had been in the interval a complete change in the policy toward Christianity of the Rom. 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 Christians. But the Jewish friends were not likely to forget the prisoner of the same name when at Rome, was away from Rome, but steps were taken for his arrest. The apostle was brought back to the city in the autumn of the same year. From what he had to say at all, in view of the summary punishment of his brethren, witnesses to this, can only be accounted for by a certain show of legality in the persecution of the leader." (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 38). See Pastoral Ep. 1 Tim. 5 and 2 Tim. 4:11.

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 nothing less than a very early record of 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 Rom. deities, could make the people believe that he was innocent of causing the fire. He goes on to say that Neronic relatives, hence to relieve himself of this infamy he falsely accused the Christians of being guilty of the crime of setting the city on fire. This charge is the strangest assumption that persons commonly called Christians who were hated for their faith, but it is an instance of the saying, "in 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����es 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, though such thing as ye are partners of Christ's sufferings, so that at the last ye may rejoice, to the end that his glory may be revealed... As ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, comfort ye one another with these words." Then, to confirm this, he goes on to say that "if ye suffer for righteousness, blessed are ye; for the Spirit of glory and of God rests upon you." The whole of this may be referred to the persecution of Nero, as this was the last persecution before let them also that suffer according to the will of God commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator." (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 38).

(3) References in 2 Pet.—How absolutely apostate and suitable was this 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, which all things horrible and disgraceful flowed from all quarters in a common sink, and for many years 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 having the human race with the beasts and were treated to be killed by dogs, or nailed to crosses, and were burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his own gardens for the spectacle; and in his chariot he played the judge. Christians were indiscriminately mingling with the common people, dressed as charioteer, or else standing in his chariot. They were then laden with chains, and on the public tribunal were treated with inhumanity, even worse than guilty and deserving to be made examples by capital punishment, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but to be visious to the futility 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., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim., 2 Peter, the F
The abiding impression made by these times of persecution of the mind of John is also seen in the defense of the world found throughout his First Ep. (2 17; 5 19), and in the rejoicing over the fall of Babylon, the great persecution center. 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 Roman 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 beseeches the government to cease the worship of the Christians. He goes on to say that "many of both sexes are being called into danger, and will continue to be so. In fact the contumacy of the accusers, who did not confine their testimony to the cities only, but has spread to the villages and country districts, has reached such a degree that we cannot believe many professing Christians. That is to say, he had used persecuting measures, and had succeeded in forcing some of the accused to testify against the others in their stead. He tells the methods he had used. "The method I have observed to prove them is this: first; I have brought before me as Christians this. I asked them whether they were Christians. If they admitted it, I repeated the question a second time, and a third, and threatened them with punishment if they persisted. If they persisted, I ordered them to be punished, and to subscribe to a letter of allegiance, of the nature of which they confessed might be, that a contaminating and infamous obstinacy ought to be punished. There were others also, possessed with the same infatuation, whom, because they were Roman citizens, I ordered to be sent to Rome. But they could not be persuaded to accede to the state, which I had ordered to be brought in for this very purpose, along with the statutes 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 our hands, and I thought it proper to give them a chance in which to repent of their error. Those who were accused by a witness at first confessed themselves Christians, but afterward denied it. Some owned that they had been Christians formerly, but had now, some for several years, and a very few for only two or three years, given up the profession entirely. I judged it to be so much the more necessary to endeavor to extort the real truth by putting to the torture two female slaves who were accused deacons, yet I found in them nothing but an absurd and extravagant superstition."

To Pliny, who asked, "Then the Christians ought not to be searched for. If they are brought before you and convicted, they should be punished, but this should be done in such a way, that he who denies that he is a Christian, and when his statement is proved by his invoking our 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 worshiped the images of the emperor and of the idols, but multitudes of them had held fast the faith and maintained it.

Speaking generally, persecution of greater or less severity was the normal method employed by the Roman empire against the Christian church during the 2d and 3d centuries. It may be said to have come to an end only about the end of the 3d 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 badge of the Christian church, and the test of its purity. Both of these important ends, and others too, were secured by the severity of the means employed by the persecuting power of the Roman 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 regime was only that of 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 persecution religion of Christ is really a divisive factor in any kingdom in which civil government and pagan religion are indissolubly bound up together. The more that such a ruler could inflame the religious passions of his subjects 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 Septimius 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 Roman government, when these came into contact with the Christian faith. The essential principles of the Christian faith. The reasons for the persecution of the Christian church by the Roman empire were (1) political; (2) on account of the claim which the Christian faith makes, 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. Patriotism could never be united in the worship of the emperor, but Christians refused to take part in this worship on any terms, and so continually lived under the shadow of a great hatred, which always slumbered, and might break out at any time. Christianity made the Christian faith 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 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 paranosias of all sorts descended in the infant church their only rival. So while the new Hercules 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 be persecuted meant the great renunciation, the joining a despised and persecut, the swimming against the tide of popular prejudice, the coming under the ban of the State, the committing at any moment of imprisonment and death under its...
most fearful forms. For 200 years he that would follow Christ must bear the cost, and be prepared to pay the same with his liberty and life. For 200 years the more preponderant of Christianity was itself a crime, "Christianization with almost the one plea for which there was another, the want of an idea, an idea which was necessary as a 'title' on the back of the condemned. He who made it was allowed neither to present an apology, nor to seek a good议论. But the editor of a Christian text writes Tertullian, "asks but one thing, and that not by 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 of which that of Isis was an invincible savour," 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's Parnassus, the Cherub Hills in Britain. And went 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 considerable 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 be found everywhere, for Tertullian, in an oftentimes quoted verse of his Apologies, "We live beside you in the world, making use of the same laws, the same courts, the same inn, and all other places of trade. We sail with you, fight shoulder to shoulder, sell all the soil, and traffic with you; yet the very existence of Christian faith, and its profession, continued to bring the greatest risks. But the public will in their world, they remained a peculiar people, who must be prepared at any moment to meet the storm of hatred." (Apol. II. 15.) For this it returned that in this way or another, hatred on the part of the world inevitably fell to the lot of the footsteps of the Master: "All that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution" (2 Tim 3. 12).

"Every persecution of the Third Race," probably invented by the heathen, but willingly accepted by the Christians without demur, shows itself as what a bitter hatred the faith of Christ. "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 council of Carthage was (Apol. 9. 8.) "Quae greges tertiarii? 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 which 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 on 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, but over their souls and consciences. 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, a natural outcome. But still, in the beginning, fundamental tenet of primitive Christianity, that the Christian could not bow to human power, that this was his own old environment, ceased to hold his old connections with the state; in everything he became the bond-servant of Jesus Christ, who was in the world, not of the world, and fealty to the new empire and the Crucified Head. We engage to explain 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 death of persecution were over, these 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 69th 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.p. in recent excavations in Egypt. In the Expos T for January, 1909, Dr. George A. Plummer, in an example, and prints the Gr text of one of these recently discovered Egypt 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 those who, consent to superstitious sacrifices, the village of Alexander Island, from Aurelius Diogenes, the son of Satabus, of the village of Alexander Island, being about 72 years old, ap. 258, to the governor, of the last names, have made this request. (1st Hand). "Aurelius Syrus, as a participant, have certified Diogenes as sacrificing along with us." (1st Hand) "The first year of the Emperor Caesar Galus Mostoeus Pius Felix Augustus, Ephip. 3rd" (= June 25, 250 AD).

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 Christians did not, they definitely became 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 Roman 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, 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 obtained the victory. The noble Roman, like Quadratus and Tertullian and Origen and Cyprian and many, many more, like those who are the Christian faith in an external and formal manner only generally went back from their profession, the true Christian, as with the Romans, who 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 immortal even in this world. Of Christ's kingdom there shall be no end, and, while hands, yea, hammers break, God's altar stands. "Pagan Rome, Babylon, and Persia were called to the apostle John in the Apocalypse, tried hard to destroy the church of Christ: Babylon was drunk with the blood of the saints. God's temple is to exist for ever, and the blood of His children was shed like water. Why was it not more to have been terrible and extended far longer an experience of suffering? It was in order to convince the world that though the kings of the earth gather against the Lord and His Christ, yet all that they can do is vain. God is in the midst of His children; and shall help and protect them. The Christian church, as it suspended between heaven and earth, had no need of other help than that of the unsearchable judgments which at every moment held it up and kept it from falling. Never was the church more free, nor stronger in the power of preserving it more extensive in its growth, than in the days of persecution.

And what became of the great persecuting power, the tormentors, the cruel, the tyrannical, the cruel, the cru
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 4–6; 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 Dunelm

Persia, pūr’sha, žha (C) Fr, pāraš; Përš, Persis; in Assyri Paras, Paraša; in Achaemen Pers Parsa, modern Fars): In the Bible (2 Ch 36 20.22.23; Est 1 1.8; Est 1 3.14.18; 10 2; Ezk 27 10; 38 5; Dnl 8 20; 10 1; 11 2) the name denotes properly the modern province of Fars, not the whole Pers empire. The latter was by its people called Aryan, the present Irān (from the Skt. word dyaña, “noble’’); and even now the Persians never call their country anything but Irān, never “Persia.” The province of Persia lay to the E. of Elam (Susiana), and stretched from the Pers Gulf to the Great Salt Desert, having Carmania on the S.E. Its chief cities were Persopolis and Pasargadae. Along the Pers Gulf the land is low, hot and unhealthy, but it soon begins to rise as one travels inland. Most of the province consists of high and steep mountains and plateaus, with fertile valleys. The table-lands in which lie the modern city of Shirāz and the ruins of Persepolis and Pasargadae are well watered and productive. Nearer the desert, howev- ever, cultivation grows scanty for want of water. Persis was doubtless in early times included in Elam, and its population was then either Semitic or allied to the Accadians, who founded more than one state in the Bab plain. The Aryan Persians seem to have occupied the country in the 8th or 9th cent. BC.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

Persian, pūr’shan, zhān, LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE (ANCIENT):

I. LANGUAGE (Introdutory):

II. Dialects

III. MODERN DIALECT

IV. Glossary

V. Plant

VI. Literature

VII. Comparison

I. Language (Introdutory).—The Persiolanguage, 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 Irān (Aryānem), (1) that of the Persians proper, and (2) that of the Medes.

Dialects. The former is known to us from the inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings, the latter from the Avesta, and a few Median words preserved for us by Herodotus and other Gr writers.

II. Old Persian Inscriptions.—These fall between 550 and 350 BC, and contain about 1,000 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-Bab syllabary. 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 case of separate vowels. The syllabary, though much simpler than any other cuneiform system, does not quite attain therefore 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 Kurruh Khshayathiyu Hakhāmānisti, “I am Cyrus the King, the Achaemenian.” Darius I has left us long inscriptions, at Behistān (Besitūn), Mt. Alvand, Persepolis, Naqš-i Rustam, etc., and one at Suez, the latter mentioning his conquest of Egypt and the construction of the first (?) Suez canal:

Adam niyāskāyam imām yawpām kātanaḫi haca Pirāva nāma rauša luya Mūdrayati danaunaxi ubi daraya luya haca Parsa sità

(“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 Persepolis and many short ones of Artaxerxes I, Artaxerxes Mnāmôn, and Artaxerxes Oxhus. From them all taken together we learn much concerning the history and the religion of the Achaemenian period.
It is from Achaemenid or Old Pers, and not from the Medes or Avestics, 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 have been doubted can be understood through comparison with Armenian and even with the modern Pers, e.g. yavšva in the above inscription is the modern vulgar Pers šōb.

III. Medico-Dialect.—The Medico dialect is represented in literature by the Avesta or sacred books of the Zoroastrians (Pādrā). The word Avesta does not occur in the book itself and is of uncertain meaning and signification. It is probably the Aēstāhāb of Beh, Insc., IV, 64, and means either (1) an interview, meeting (Sk. avastāhā, "appearance before a judge"); Av. awa-ēstā, "to stand near"), or (2) a petition (Pahl. apaštān, "petition"); Arm. apāstān, "refuge," "asylum"), in either case deriving its name from Zoroaster's drawing near to Ahura Mazda in worship.

Yezdikhast.

This dialect represents a much greater decadence in grammar and vocabulary than does the Old Pers. Many of its consonants and most of its vowels are weakened; its verbs have almost entirely lost the augment; its declensional system shows extreme confusion. It stands to Old Pers grammatically somewhat as Eng. does to Oer. Its alphabet, consisting of 43 letters, is derived from the Byr (probably the Evangōli), and is written from right to left. As a specimen of the language of most of the Avesta we give the following extract (Yasna LXIV, 19611):

Dādī tāt, yē gām tashah apasa avenanda
Aminātād, hauvātād, Spandād Mānīna Mazda,
Tuxāth, uavštīyād, Manahā Vēhā, sīkēh.

("Give me, O thou who didst make the bull [earth], and the waters and the plants, immortality, health—O most Bountiful Spirit, Mazda—strength, might, through Vēhā Manahā, I say.")

There is a sub-dialect of Medico (Avestic) known as the Gāthā-dialect, from the fact that the Gāthās, or "Hymns," (e.g. Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV, XLI-L), and also the prayers (Yathā Aša Vairiyā, Aham Verē, Aham Yēhā, Aham Tashō, and originally Yēhā Hātām, and a few scattered passages elsewhere) are composed in it. This represents, speaking generally, an older form of the Avestic; it is probably the old language of Bactria or of Margiana. Gatha 1. 2. runs thus:

Yē sē, Mazda Ahūrā, pārīrajnā Vēhā Manahā,
Mātēyav dāvāi ašah (aivtatacasa hāypha manhā)
Aumātā Ashā hāc, vātīrapih darvīh hāṭhrāh,
(=mēy Vicubah Manahā, who taught you two through Vēhā Manahā, grant the benefits from Asha, [these] of both worlds [worlds] and of that which is of the spirit, through [which] [benefits] may [Asha] place in glory those who please him.)

The form of the Gāthās, like that of the other Avestic poems, is based on the number of syllables in a line, with due regard to the caesura. But the condition of the text is such that there is great difficulty in recovering the original reading with sufficient accuracy to enable us to lay down rules on the subject with any certainty.

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 ascribed to Zoroaster himself, the rest to his disciples. The 1. His Date, etc. is now becoming 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 poems of Zoroaster himself are represented 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 prince Vishtāspa (in Gr Hodašdēs) bears the same name as the father of Darius I, and was probably the same person. Vishtāspa's queen Hutaosa, who also protected and favored Zoroaster, bears the same name (in Gr Adasa) 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. 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 Frashoastra, 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 Rusa (Rapa, Rai), about 51 miles S. of the present Tehran, though some think his native place was Western Atropatene (Arzubeyān). Rejected by his own tribe, the Magi, he went to Vishštāspa's court in Bactria, the faith which he taught spread to the Pers court (very naturally, if Vishtāspa was identical with Darius' father) and thence throughout the country. Tradition (Yasht XIX, 2, etc) says that the Avesta was revealed to Zoroaster on Mt. Ushi-darena ("intellect-holding") in Sistan. 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) shows very well with recitation of the Gāthās and Yasna. Mention of controversies with Gautama, Buddha's disciples (Yasht 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 Vendīdād heretics (zādā) are mentioned who preferred the comm. (zād) to the Avesta to the Avesta itself, is a sign of late date. Names of certain persons found in the Avesta (e.g. Atare-pātā, a Dastur who lived under Hormoud I, 273 AD, and Rātastā Yaghehtī, whom the Dinkard identifies with the chief Mobed of Sapor II, 300-379 AD, Adērqār Mārsapand, 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 works in question 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 began, and continued with much zeal by Sardār Pāpākān, 229-40 AD. According to Geldner (Prolegomena, xlii) the final recension took place some considerable time after Yezygird III (overthrown 642 AD). In the times
PERSIAN RELIGION (ANCIENT):

1. 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 Indian Aryans, and in a less degree with the beliefs of the Aryans in general.

All the Aryan tribes in very ancient times showed great respect for the dead, though they carefully distinguished them from the gods (of Rig-Veda X, 96, 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 unacceptable 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 (barunsam, Skt. bhrks), and the flesh of victims was boiled, not eaten. Libations of 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 (Aryaman), Ashra (Ahuja), Apam Napat (Apam Napat), Tvashti (Tishtrya), Rama (Raman), Varuna (Vayu), Vatra (Vatra). So are many words of religious import, as Soma (Haoma), Mantra (Mithra), Hota (Zaotar). The Yama of India is the Yima of Persia, and the father of the one is Vivasvat and that of the other Vivahhat, which is the same word with dialectic change. The holy river of the Avesta, Ariavarta, the Unstained (Anahita), is represented by the Sarasvati, the Gangā (Ganges) and other sacred streams worshipped in India. Persia Ahr (or Fire) is a son of Ahura Mazda (Yasna LXIV, 46-53), as Agni (= Iignis) is of Tvaṣṭṛi in the Rig-Veda. Armaiti is Ahura Mazda’s daughter, as Sarayu in the Rig-
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Veda is the daughter of Tvashtri, the "Creator." The use of góméz (bois urino) for purification is common to both India and Persia. Though the soma-plant is not now the same as the háoma, 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 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 some higher may be found. Varuna, for instance, represents a lofty conception. In the closest connection with him stands Azura, who is a being of great eminence, and whose sons are the gods, e.g. the Ádityas.

Tvashtri 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 hubul form inscriptions alike, Ahura Mazda occupies much the same position as Varúna, Azura (the same word as Ahura), or Tvashtri in the Rig-Veda, or rather in the ancient belief of which traces are retained in the latter work. Hence, in 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 (Yendólit: 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 Tā'ālī), 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 Eruripides in Greece did later—that Principle "if the gods do aught shameful, they are not gods." Hence he perceived that the 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" (Ārō Mauiyū). So many of the popular deities were evil that Zoroaster used the word dātrā (the same as deu, deus, and Aram. dēš) to denote hitherto an evil spirit, just as Christianity turned the Gr. daimonios and daimión (words used in a good sense in classical authors) into "demons." Instead of this now degraded word dātē, he employed bāga (Old Pers.; Av. bagha, Vedic bhaga, "distribution," "patron," "lord") for the "God." But it must here be remembered that Zoroaster did not teach monotheism. Darius says that "Auramazda and the other gods that there are" brought him aid (Beh. Inser., IV, 60-63), and both he and Xerxes speak of Auramazda as "the greatest of the gods." So, even in the first Ghādz, Zoroaster himself invokes Asha, Vohu-Maō, Armaiti, Sauasha, and even Gōis-urvan ("the Soul of the Bull"), as well as Ahura Mazda.

(1) Darius and Xerxes.—Darius mentions the "clan-gods," but does not name any of them. He and Xerxes use 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 Creation) that Darius conquers his enemies. But both Artaxerxes Mūsēmān and Artaxerxes Ochus couple Mithra and Anāhita (Anahita) 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 Spéistas or "Bountiful Immortals." Mazda is the father of one of them, Spēitas Armaiti, who is also his spouse. He is prima inter pares among them, their chief, but no manus the only god. Monotheism is distinctly taught in later Zoroastrian works, for instance, in the Zardishth-Nāmāh, composed 1278 AD, but it is due to Christian and Islamic influence.

The modern Zoroastrian view, clearly stated in the Dasātri i Âsūndā and elsewhere, that all the good creatures of Omazd (Ahura Mazda) are entitled to adoration, undoubtedly of Worship rests upon the Avesta. There we find, in the first place, the Amesha Spéitas, who occupy in regard to Mazda the same position as do the Vedic Ádityas toward Varúna, though not one of the Ádityas is identical with any of the Amesha Spéitas.

The names of these are: (1) Ahura Mazda (otherwise called Spēitas Mainyu or "Bountiful Mind"); (2) Vohu Mano ("Good Mind"); (3) Asha Vahista ("Best Righteousness"); (4) Khshathra Vairya ("Excellence Enter"); (5) Spēita Armaiti ("Bounteous Piety"); (6) Haurvatât ("Health"); (7) Amešârât ("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 maenons. Khshathra is the guardian of metals. Vohu Mano guards sheep and cattle and introduces to Ahura Mazda the spirits of the just. In rank come the Yazatas ("Worshipful Ones"), of whom there are a large number. Three of them, Mithra, Rashnu and Saosha, preside at the judgment of the dead on the 4th day from death. Rashnu holds the scales in which man's deeds are weighed. Saosha guards the soul during the first three nights after death. Aryanman Isyya (the longed-for comrade) is the protector of mankind, the bestower of peace and happiness. On one occasion (Yend., Pars. XXI, 23-25) Ahura Mazda sends his messenger Nairyō Sāhha ("male instructor") to ask for food and water, and gives his help. The rāma, king of the earth, is the friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the "master of truth" (the Darius of his reign), and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), with the sun shining golden darts and driving fiery steeds, invades the Aaśya, the bosom friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the "master of truth" (the Darius of his reign), and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), with the sun shining golden darts and driving fiery steeds, invades the Aaśya, the bosom friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the "master of truth" (the Darius of his reign), and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), with the sun shining golden darts and driving fiery steeds, invades the Aaśya, the bosom friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the "master of truth" (the Darius of his reign), and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), with the sun shining golden darts and driving fiery steeds, invades the Aaśya, the bosom friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the "master of truth" (the Darius of his reign), and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), with the sun shining golden darts and driving fiery steeds,}
Ostā and Dānā ("Knowledge" and "Religion"), who are others of the Yazatas. All these are entitled to worshipship at the hands of the true adorer of Mazda (Mazda
ysa, opposed to Daēvas, or worshippers of the demons).

In opposition to the creatures of Ahura Mazda are those of Ahrō Maniゅ, 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 Amesha Spēta: Aka Mano ("Evil Mind") that of Vohu Mano, and so in order: Indra (or Andra, "deion of untruthfulness"), Sauvy ("Evil government"), Nābhaithya ("discontent"), Tāurai ("who poisons water") and Zāri ("poison"), being antagonistic to the other Bountiful Immortals. Aēsma-Daeva ("Demon of Wrath")—the Asmodeus of Tob S—is the special foe of Saosna, the genius of obedience. Apana, demon of drought, is the enemy of Tishtrya. Bûta (or Bûdi) teaches men to worship idols, and also causes death. Daēvyâsta (or of evil) is the demon of sloth. Yathātar or Astuvindhotā causes death by destroying the body. Other evil beings, Drujes, Patríaes, Jānines, Yatus, 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 Mainiゅus and his creatures cause destruction and death, Ater ("Fire"), also Aēzpān Naŋpat ("Offspring of the Waters"), is the vital principle and the source of chaos in the world. Anēha, Anēha is the female. As a river the latter flows from Mt. Hukairya, a peak in the Elburz Range (Yavas X, XIV), into the Caspian Sea (Yasna X), of which grows the tree Nāhpa ("well watered"), which bears the seeds of all plants. Anēha means "mixed," but it is applied to purity of conscience: to dole out any of the four "elements" was, for later Zoroastrians, a grievous sin. In it he put to any moral purity. Her association with Mitra is close, even in Herodotus' time, for he falls into the mistake of saying (1.151) that the Persians speak of Mitra-Mithra, as if he should have said Aōn-pâta (Anāhita). Though god of truth and righteousness Mitra is not associated with moral purity (chastity). On the contrary, he was said to fertilize the earth with his rays, as sun-god, and Anāhita as goddess of fruitfulness represented the female principle in conjunction with him. The vileness which led to the identification of Anāhita with the Bab Mīlīta 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-o'kin marriage (Av. Hāmb, Hāmbēkās), which permitted and encouraged marriages between brothers and sisters.

According to later Zoroastrian belief, the contest between Ormazd (Ahura Mazda) and Ahriman (Ahrō Maniゅü), after continuing for 6,000 years, is to be decided in favor between Ormazd and Ahriman (Bând, I). Both came into existence independently in limitless time (Av. Zrānā Arkaran; Vend., Parg. XIX, 13; Pahl. Damān 1 Akanabakhmān, Bând, I), which, personified in the Vendâd, 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" (Armaity), 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 impersonal of the Lie which the Avesta so firmly denounces and which Darius mentions as one of all the rebellions, which produced so much bloodshed in his time. No virtue was valued so highly as truth in ancient Iran, as Herodetus agrees with the Avesta in testifying.

Avestic morality encouanges the destruction of all hurtful beings, as being of Ahrō Maniゅü's creation, and the propagation of everything good thing. 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 Sasanides esp., this led to fearful and repeated persecutions of Christians throughout the empire.

The Sacred Thread (Av. Aīvyāsphakhā; Skt. Upavita, etc., now by the Parsees styled the Kushti) plays as important a part in Zoroas-

trianism as in Hindûsm. So do charms, nātha (Skt. mantra), con-
gregating in v. 6.7.6 and 13.9.2, are condemned by Ahrō Mainiゅü (in a later version, by Mithra). His spirit (Gēās Uraŋ) went to heaven and became the guardian of cattle.

Holiness does not enter into Zoroaster's conception of the Divine nature. This is a point to which attention has not yet been properly directed, though its importance can hardly be exaggerated. The epithet ṣpērā, often applied to Ahura Mazda and making him "Holy," is by the Zoroastrians themselves in Pahlavi rendered əsrānīk, i.e., "that causes increase." Its ṣ par or əspān=Skt. ṣā, "to swell," "to grow," "to increase." The opposite to this is the term ahrō (ahro, from ḍaŋ; cf. Ger. eng, "narrow") applied to the Evil Spirit, and denoting "narrowing," "decreasing," "destroying." Hence, as the Destroyer, he is styled pūrurukha, "full of death."
The first man was Gayā-maretan ("Mortal Life"); hence the phrase Haca Gaqatā Mardehāt ā Soosh-yanat, from Gayā-maretan (Gayomard, Kayomard) to Saoshyant (Yasna XXVII, 10; Yasht XIII, 145), means "from the beginning to the end of the world." From the Airyana Vaējā ("Aryan germ"), the first home of the Iranians, men were compelled to migrate because Ahrō Mainyōs so altered the climate that the winter became ten months long and the summer only two. Yima Khshathra ("Yima the Brilliant," Pers Jamsht, son of Vīvaihāt, though he twice refused Ahura Mazda's commission to guard his creatures, and though by three lies he lost the "Royal Light" (Hvarōn Kāwōm) which he originally possessed, was yet directed to prepare a very extensive inclosure (Vāra), in which he preserved "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 (Vendōlād 11; Yastī XIX). The Būstānī-Khōnī tale of a flood differs from this, preserving an independent narrative. Ahura Mazda's law was preached to men within Yima's inclosure.

The earth consists of seven divisions, called Karsara (cf. Yastī, 119). One of these, Hvārînatha, is inhabited by men; the others are separated from it by impassable abysses. Sun, moon, and stars revolve round Mt. Tēvrā, a peak in the Elburz mountains (Demēntiān). A later legend says that the Elburz Range surrounds the earth.

Each god and man possesses a fravashī, which has been compared to a guardian spirit and seems to differ from the soul (herōn). After

10. The Earth

11. Heaven

12. Interment

13. Worship

Zoroastrianism permits no idol-worship and no temples, fire-altars only being used. These were served by Atharvatans or fire-priests, who fed the fire with costly wood and poured into it libations of homa-juice, taking care to cover their mouths with a cloth (patti-đōna) to keep the sacred fire from being polluted by their breath. Sacrifices were often offered on the tops of the highest mountains under the open sky (Herod. 1.132; Xen. Cyrop. viii).

The Magi doubtless owed the monopoly of priestly functions to their being Zoroaster's own tribe. They are not mentioned as priests in the Pers canoneform inscriptions. Only once does the word "Magus" occur in the Avesta, and then in composition (Maguha-bish, a Magus-hater, Yasna 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 secession 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 Zoroaster's death, a prophet named Ukhshydration-cresta will arise from his seed to restore his religion. After another 1,000 years another, Ukhshydration-nemâin, will appear for the same purpose. The end of the world will come 1,000 years later. A third prophet, Saoshyant, will be born, and will usher in the Restoration (frashōh-herad) of the world to its primitive happiness and freedom from the evil creatures of Ahrō Mainyōs. This process will be completed in 1,000 years, during which various seers will perform in the other 6 Karsaarae 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 Būndīhāshkhīn (ch v) and the Patît (§ 2S) we have the word rīstākhzh (from Av. irahta, "departed," and hāx, "to rise"), which does mean "rising of the dead." But it can hardly be doubted that the doctrine is due to Hēb and Christian influence, esp. when we consider the late and uncertain date of the books in which the idea occurs. Israelites settled in Media in large numbers in or about 730-728 BC under Sargon (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 himself 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

Fire Altars.
Persians, pūr'shanz, -šzan (Persian), Pārs, also s Persia, Persis [q.v.]; adj. Pers, Pārs, Pāš, Persian, Persian (modern Fārs), including probably part of Elam.

The Avesta shows that the Medo-Persian community was divided into 3 classes (zāsāva): the Āthāvāna or fire-priests, the Rathēs or charioters, and the Vāsya-Rṣaks or cattle-rearers (of the three original Hindu castes, the Brāhmaṇs, the Kshatriyas and the Vaiṣayas). A 4th class, the artisans or Ḥūdāt, came later. But these were classes, not castes.

They were also divided into tribes, clans (Achaem. viṭī; Av. viś; cf. vicus) and families or households (Achaem. taumā; Av. vidana). Herodotus (1.125) mentions ten Pers tribes, and the chief being the Pasargadac, to which belonged the Achaemenian clan (σπαρτης, πρηθρέτες) which included the royal family. This dynasty traced its origin to Achaemenes (Hākūhmānšāh) according to Durrius and Herodotus. The following scheme will serve to show the descent of the line of Pers kings mentioned in the Bible and in secular history up to the time of the fall of the dynasty in 331 BC.

II. Civilization.—The Persians had indulged less in luxury than the Medes, until their conquest of Media and other lands under Cyrus.

1. Writing. The Persians, especially in the 5th century BC, were making progress towards a convenient alphabetical writing, which they used for business purposes. They did not adopt it for religious purposes, however, until the 4th century BC, when it was modified and became the Pahlavi alphabet. The Achaemenian script was probably still used for religious purposes until the 4th century BC.

2. Institutions and Customs. The Achaemenian kings probably borrowed from Babylon and further developed their system of royal posts (Est 8:14) or messengers.
(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, lyng is regarded as a great crime.

(3) Marriage.—The Persians practised polygamy, and marriages between those next of kin were approved of. Pride and garrulity are mentioned as distinctive of the Persians 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 priests or "kings" of Anshan, a district in Persia or Elam. Cyrus himself (WAf, V, plate 35) gives his genealogy up to and including Téspés, entitling all his ancestors whom he mentions, kings of Anshan. Phraorîta, king of the Medes, is said to have first subjugated 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 Persia (549 BC). His army mutinied and surrendered him to Cyrus, whom the Greeks held 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 of Babylon, nišîḫ, 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 Nabûnišîḫ's army and capturing the king, Cyrus sent his own forces under Gûryaš (Gubaru, Gauraruva) 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 Gûryaš vicereign of Chaldæa, and he appointed governors in Babylonia" (Cyrus' "Annalistic Tablet"). When Gûryaš died within the year, Cyrus' son Cambyses was made vicereign of the country, now become a province of the Persian empire. Cyrus restored the gods to their sanc-

tuaries, and this doubtless led to permission being given to the Jews to return to Jerus, 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 Pasargadæ, 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, Gaumâta, 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' Besîtin Inscription, col. iv. 80-86). Darius became king as the heir of Cambyses (521 BC). But in nearly every part of the empire, he was confronted by real or pretended descendants of the ancient kings of each country. After at least 3 years' struggle Darius' authority was firmly established everywhere. He then divided the empire into satrapies, or provinces (dahyâta), of which there were at first 23 (Beh. Inscription, col. i. 13-17), and ultimately at least 20 (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 restored and rendered: "I am a Persian; with Persia's (6) Darius' Suez I seized Egypt. I commanded to dig this canal from the river named the Nile [Prâva], which flows through Egypt, to this sea which comes from Persia. Then 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 attempts 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 Artaxerxes I illegitimate sons (we pass over Sogdianus' brief reign). Artaxerxes II, Mnémón, succeeded his father and left the throne to his son Artaxerxes III, Ochon. The latter was murdered with all his sons but the two youngest, Arses, by an Egyp eunuch Bagôs, probably in revenge for Artaxerxes' conduct in Egypt (333 BC). Arses was murdered by Bagôs 3 years later, when Darius III, Codomannus, the son of Sisygambis, daughter of Artaxerxes II, and her husband, a Pers noble, ascended the throne. Durins 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 ers empire of the Achaemenides, the whole of the lands composing it becoming part of the empire of Macedonia.

IV. First Mention in Inscriptions.—Persis (Par sia) first met mention in an inscription of Rammân on Nîrîr III (WAI, 1, plate 35, no. 1, l. 8), 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 Spiegel, Die altper sisten Rechtsnachrichten, Arrian, Tactydes, Polibus, Strabo, Curtius.

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALE

PERSIS, pûr'sis (Iaspís, Persis): The name of a female member of the Christian community at Rome, to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16.12). The name is for "the beloved, who waited much in the Lord." The name is not found in inscriptions of the imperial household, but it occurs as a name of a freedwoman (CIL, VI, 23, 959).

PERSON, pûr'sun, pûrs'h, PERSONALITY, pûrs'un-al'î-ti (πσων, nêphês, ἴθ, ἴς, ῶθαμ, ἴπιμ, προσωπον, προσώπον, προστάσιον, λύπο stasis): The most frequent word for "person" in the OT is nêphês, "son." (Gen 14, 21, "Give me the persons, and take the goods"); 36, 6, AV "all the persons"; Nu 5, 6, AV "that person," etc; "îth, "that person"; Arsat, "threesome and ten persons"); 11, 16, 18, "a comely person"; etc; "îbâm, "a man," "an animal," "a human being." (Nu 31, 28, "of the persons, and of the oxen"); Prov 6, 12, "a worthless person," etc); "îbôm, "a man," "a weak, mortal man," occurs twice (lgs 9, 4, AV "vain and light persons"); Zeph 3, 4); bâ'al, "owner," "lord," is once têb "person" (Prov 24, 8, AV "a mischievous person"); and mîthôm, "men," once (Ps 56, 4, AV "vain persons"); pûrnâm, "face," is frequently têb "person," and when it refers to 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 prosôpôn, "face," "countenance," stands in the same connexion (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, 22). In the NT, this word is used as a person (prosôpôn), also, as in the later Gr, the gift bestowed . . . by many persons," the only occurrence in the NT; in 2, 10 prosôpôn may stand for "presence," as RV "in the presence of Christ," but it might mean "as representing Christ." No H 1, 3, AV Hupostasis, "that which lies under," subst. 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 Hupostasis of the invisible God and Father. "Person" is also frequently supplied as the substantive implied in various adj., etc., e.g. profane, perjured, vile.

In the Apoc we have prosôpon têr "person" (Jth 7, 15, RV "face"); Ecclus 120, 5; 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, 11; "With him [God] is no respect of persons," Ecclus 36, 12.

RV has "soul" for "person" (Nu 5, 6), "face" (Jer 52, 25), "man" (Mt 27, 43); "reprobate" for "vile person" (Ps 15, 4); ARV, ERUV, "fool" (Isa 52, 5); AV "men of falsehood," ARV "vain persons." RV has an evil thing (Ps 10, 4), "back to thee in his own person" (aut. different text) for "again thou therefore receive him" (Philem ver. 2), "take away life for respect any person" (2, 8, 14, 14) with seven others for "the eight person" (2, 8); "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 acted, then to any assumed character, then to anyone having a particular 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-determination—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 (hupostasis) of the being, that which underlies all its manifestations; hence the rendering "the express image of his person" in He 1, 3 AV. Hupostasis was employed by the early Gr Fathers to express what the Latins Intended by persona; afterward prosôpon was introduced.

Recent psychological thought has introduced prominence 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 expressed in the personal consciousness and action. The real responsible personality, however, is something which is always being formed. The phenomenon of double personality is pathological, as truly the result of brain disease as insanity.

In the Bible man is throughout regarded as personal, although it were certain that the full importance of the individual as distinct from the nation was realized. The use of prosôpon for "person" indicates also a more external conception of personality than the modern. With the Hebrews the nêphês was the seat of the soul, e.g. "Thou wilt not leave my soul [nêphês] 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 sometimes are anthropomorphic so much as 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 transcend-ing, not only the whole of Nature, but all that is human, etc. "Moses could not look abroad" (Nu 23, 19; 1, 15, 29); "Canst thou by searching
find out God?’ (Job 11:7; Isa 40:28; cf Ecles 3:11, 8, 17 etc.) In the NT the personality of God is, on the warrant of Jesus Himself, conceived after the analogies of fatherhood, 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).
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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, which lies on-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 difficulty to be derived from them is not, in a case like this 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 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 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 its fundamental 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 drive 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, 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:—
(I) General drift of passage.—With Phil, then, with the most didactic of the NT writers, the apostle Paul, and especially with those passages in which he most fully intimates his conception of the person of his Lord, Phil 2 3-9. Even here, however, Paul is not formally expounding the doctrine of the Person of Christ; he is only alluding to certain facts concerning His person and action perfectly well known to his readers, in order that he may give point to an adduction of Christ’s example. If he is in exhorting his readers to unselfishness, such unselfishness as esteems others better than ourselves, and looks not only on our own things but also on those of others. Precisely this unselfishness, he declares, was exemplified by Our Lord. He did not look upon His own things but the things of others; that is to say, He did not stand upon His rights, but was willing to forego all that He might justly have claimed for Himself for the good of others. For, says Paul, though, as we all know, in His intrinsic nature He was nothing other than God, yet He did not, as we all know right well, look greedily on His condition of equality with God, but made no account of Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and, having found that condition as a man, humbled Himself, becoming obedient to death, even death of the cross. The statement is thrown into historical form; it tells the story of Christ’s life on earth. But it presents His life on earth as a life in all its elements alien to His intrinsic nature, and assumed only in the performance of an unselfish purpose. On earth He lived as a man, and subjected Himself to the common lot of men. But He was not by nature a man, nor was He in His own nature subject to the fortunes of human life. By nature He was God; and He would have naturally lived as became God—on an equality with God. He became man by a voluntary act, ‘taking no account of Himself,’ and, having become man, He voluntarily lived out His human life under the conditions which the fulness of His unselfish purpose imposed on Him.

(2) Our Lord’s intrinsic Deity.—The terms in which these great affirmations are made deserve the most careful attention. The language in which Our Lord’s intrinsic Deity is expressed, for example, is probably as strong as any that could be, Our Lord does not say simply, ‘He was God.’ He says, ‘He was in the form of God,’ employing a turn of speech which throws emphasis upon Our Lord’s possession of the specific quality of God. ‘Form’ is a term which expresses the sum of those char-
Actorizing 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 we call "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 expressed here, not instinctively, because, in adducing 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 were speaking of a merely former 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—"is forever," i.e., "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 always" 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 this the present case, where it is cast in a 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 "in's, Lk 16 14 23; 22 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 becomes what He is, and which is at the present time; although, had the mode of existence he describes was Our Lord's mode of existence before this action—so much as painting in 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 exanimation.—And here it is important to observe that the whole of the action adduced is thrown up thus against this background—not in 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 look 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 St. Paul says, and av 6-8, that He is described 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 characterizing 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 a fashion as a man," and that the mark of servanthood and obedience, the mark of servant-ship, 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 life on earth, 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 ERV: "counted it not a prize to be made gain by being originally," 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 store" 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 with which it is at once connected: "by becoming 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 Him of" something absolutely, 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 passages 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, as it were, of 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 solved. That 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 overwaving store by his state of being, for he might have "magnified himself" with the sufficient object of all the efforts. He was not self-regarding; he had regard for others. Thus he becomes our supreme example of self-abnegating conduct. See also kenosis.

Paul 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 them 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 this means that on his part he was not 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 the heightening of the phrase "the first man..." 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 brought out in 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 5 21). Though true man, therefore (1 Cor 15 21; Rom 5 21; Acts 17 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 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 on becoming a man he loses his 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 first man and the second man 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 one, he tells us that on becoming a man 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

Ephesians 1

The elements of Paul's conception of the person of Christ are brought before us in this suggestive passage with unwonted fulness. But they all receive endless illustration from his occasional allusions to them, Pauline Passages one or another, throughout his Epp. The leading motive of this passage, for example, reappears quite perfectly in 2 Cor 8, where we are referred to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who became for our sakes (emphatic) poor—He who was (again an imperfect participle, and therefore without suggestion of the cessation of the condition described) rich—that we might become (very emphatic) rich. 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 therefore led 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 them 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 this means that on his part he was not 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 the heightening of the phrase "the first man..." 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 brought out in 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 5 21). Though true man, therefore (1 Cor 15 21; Rom 5 21; Acts 17 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 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 on becoming a man he loses his 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 first man and the second man 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 one, he tells us that on becoming a man 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, and by His grace 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 2); that is to say, the very Deity of God, in all its completeness, has its permanent home in Our Lord, and that in a “bodily fashion,” that is, is in Him clothed with a body. He who looks upon Jesus Christ sees, no doubt, a body and a man; but as he sees the man clothed with the body, so he sees God Himself, in all the fulness of His Deity, clothed with the humanity. Jesus Christ is therefore God “manifested in the flesh” (1 Tim 3 16), and His appearance on earth is an “epiphany” (2 Tim 1 10), which is the “appearance of the image of the invisible God” (Col 1 15). Though truly man, He is nevertheless also our “great God” (Tit 2 13).

II. Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. —
The conception of the person of Christ which underlies and finds expression in the Ep. to the Hebrews is indistinguishable from that which governs all the allusions to Our Lord in the Epp. of Paul. To the author of this ep. Our Lord is above all else the Son of God in the most eminent sense of that word; and it is the Divine dignity and majesty belonging to Him from His very nature which forms the fundamental feature of the image of Christ which stands before his mind. And yet it is this author who, perhaps above all others of the NT writers, emphasizes the truth of the humanity of Christ, and dwells with most particularity upon the elements of His human nature and experience.

(1) Background of express Deity. —The great Christological passage which fills ch 2 of the Ep. to the Hebrews in its richness and fulness of detail, and its breadth of implication, that of Phil 2. It is thrown up against the background of the remarkable exposition of the Divine dignity of the Son which occupies chs. 1 and 3 of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There the Son had been declared to be “the effulgence of his (God's) glory, and the very image of his substance,” through whom the universe has been created and by the word of whose power all things are held in being; and His exaltation above the angels, by means of whom the Old Covenant had been inaugurated, is measured by the difference between the designations “ministering spirits” proper to the one, and the Son of God, nay, God itself (1 8,9), proper to the other. The purpose of the whole passage is to enhance in the thought of the Jewish readers of the ep. the value of the salvation wrought by this Divine Saviour; by removing from their minds the offence they were in danger of taking at His lowly life and shameful death on earth. This earthly humiliation finds its abundant justification, we are told, in the greatness of the end which it sought and attained. By it Our Lord has, with His strong feet, broken out a pathway along which, in Him, sinful man may at length climb up to the high destiny of which he was destined; He should have dominion over all creation. Jesus Christ stooped only to conquer, and He stooped to conquer not for Himself (for He was in His own person no less than God), but for us.

(2) Completeness of humanity. —The language in which the humiliation of the Son of God is in the first instance described is derived from the context. The establishment of His Divine majesty in ch 1 had taken the form of an exposition of His infinite exaltation above the highest and highest of exaltations. His humiliation is described here therefore as being "made a little lower than the angels" (2 9).

What is meant is simply that He became man; the phraseology is derived from Ps 8 AV, from which had just been cited the declaration that God had made man (despite his insignificance) "but a little lower than the angels," thus crowning him with glory and honor. The adoption of the language of the psalm to describe Our Lord's humiliation has the secondary effect, accordingly, of greatly enlarging the reader's actual appreciation of the humiliation 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," the, of 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; but His death was by nature and by will, (7 16 m). 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 to glory, to make the appointment of their 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;" and, in keeping with the argument of ver 17 that the ultimate object of His assimilation 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 human- ity and of His humanity is perhaps nowhere more strongly emphasized in this passage. He took part in the flesh and blood which is the common heritage of men, and after the same fashion that others have in it (2 14); and, having thus become a man among men, He shared with other men the trials, the sufferings, 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 real exaltations of ch. 1. The glory of this became truly a man, and lived a truly human life, subject to all the experiences natural to a 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 (i 3).

Indeed, we are expressly told that even in the days of the flesh, He continued still a Son (6 8), and that it was precisely in this that the wonder lay: that the Son of God became a man, lived, died, and was raised again, as an ordinary man, and that He was in every sense a real and true partaker of humanity, being born of a woman, and even in the form of that likeness, but without sin, to His Father (6 14). Indeed, we are expressly told that even in the days of the flesh, He continued still a Son (6 8), and that it was precisely in this that the wonder lay: that the Son of God became a man, lived, died, and was raised again, as an ordinary man, and that He was in every sense a real and true partaker of humanity, being born of a woman, and even in the form of that likeness, but without sin, to His Father (6 14).

Thus, we see that the glory of this Son God-man consisted in His being the eternal Son of God, expressively or visibly represented in the likeness of men, yet remaining essentially God, and retaining His divine attributes, but in such a way as to be without sin, to be formed a vessel to receive the image of His Father, and to be a living representation of Him in the likeness of men (6 14), and in such a way as to retain His original glory, and to be possessed of power to express it, to express it.

2. Prologue to the Gospel

(a) 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, "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 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 is immediately added that He is the Father's Son, the very Word of God who was made by him, and apart from him was not made one thing that hath been made' (1 3). Thus He is taken out of the category of creatures altogether. Accordingly, what is said of Him is not that He was the first of existences to come into being, but that 'in the beginning when things began to come into being, He already was.' It is express eternity of being that is asserted: "the imperfect sense of the original suggests in this relation, as far as human language can do so, the notion of absolute, supra-temporal existence" (Westcott). This, His eternal subsistence, was not, however, in isolation: "And the Word was with God." The language is pregnant. It is not merely existence with God that is asserted, as of two beings standing side by side, united in a local relation, or even in a common conception. What is suggested is an active relation of intercourse. The distinct personality of the Word is distinctly implied. From all eternity the Word has been with God as a fellow: He who in the very beginning already "was," "was" also in communion with God. Though He
was thus in some sense a second along with God, He was not merely not a separate being from God: “And the Word was God” (1 Jn 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.” This prevents immediate inductive 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 Jn 4:2). And the Word became flesh” (Jn 1:14), he says, “and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.” 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, declares John, an appellation of 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. 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 manifestation 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 has here, in the place of the more simply denotative term “man.” What he means is merely that the eternal God became man. But he elects to say this in the language which throws but few to view what it is to become man. The contrast between 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 Jn 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 incarnate 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 dimmed by His becoming flesh, that he gives us at once to understand that it was rather “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, 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, because, on its assumption by the Word, the Temple of God on earth (cf. 2:19) 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, or 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 as of the only begotten of the Father.” It was 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, would naturally have; men recognized and could not but recognize in Jesus Christ the unique Son of God. When this unique Son of God is further described as “full of grace and truth,” the elements of His manifested glory are not to be supposed to be exhausted by this description alone. Certain items of it only are brought out for particular mention. The visible glory of the incarnated Word was such a glory as the unique Son of God, sent forth from the Father, who was full of grace and truth, would naturally manifest.

That nothing at all less than the preservation 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 no man has ever had 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 a past thing, the fact being revealed in the present realization of the continuity of the Word with the Father—“in the bosom of the Father—that is to say, He continues in the most intimate and complete communion with the Father. The Word became flesh” (1 Jn 4:2) “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. 3. The Gospel. The Gospel is 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 your faith may be established on this sure foundation, that Jesus which is made man (1 30) was thoroughly known in His human origin (7 27), confessed Himself man (8 40), and died as a man dies.
(19 5), was, nevertheless, not only the Messiah, the Son of God, the fulfller of all the Divine promises of redemption, but also the very Son of God, that God only begotten, who, abiding in the bosom of the Father, is without beginning or end. For when he says, when the beginning of the Gospel onward, this purpose is pursued: Jesus is pictured as ever, while truly man, yet manifesting Himself as equally truly God, until the veil which covered the eyes of His followers was wholly lifted, and He is greeted as both Lord and God (20 28). But though it is the prime purpose of this Gospel to exhibit the Divinity of the man Jesus, no obscuration of His manhood is involved. It is the Deity of the man Jesus which is insisted on, but the true manhood of Jesus is as prominent in the representation as in any other portion of the NT. Nor is any effacement of the humiliation of His earthly life involved. For the Son of man to come from heaven was a descent (3 13), and the mission which He came to fulfil was a mission of contest and conflict, of suffering and death. He brought His glory with Him (1 14), but the glory that was His on earth (17 22) was not all the glory which He had had with the Father before the world was, no more, than after Christ was done, He should return (17 5). Here too the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another. In any event, John has no difficulty in presenting the life of Our Lord on earth as the life of a body, in the sense that He is on the ground that belongs to Him as God and on the humiliation which is brought to Him by the flesh. It is distinctly a duplex life which He ascribes to Christ, and it attributes to Him without embarrassment all the powers of setting the one hand to Deity and on the other to sinless (Jn 8 46; cf 14 30; 1 Jn 3 5) human nature. In a true sense his portrait of Our Lord is a dramatization of the God-man which he presents to our contemplation in his prologue.

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 thetical exposition 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, the prologue to Paul's own preaching; and 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 end up by sifting 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 temptation 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 description of Him, can we be even to their representations; while, on this 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. This is especially true in the case of 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 have taught us to regard as both Christ 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 material about his earthly experiences is transmuted into a mere set of cas contradictions. See also Gospels, THE SYNOPTIC.

VI. Teaching of Jesus.—The Gospel narratives not only present us, however, with dramatizations of the life of Jesus, according to their authors' conception of His composite 1. The Johanneine 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 Gospel, and had itself, as we have seen, been fashioned from the Gospel itself, compacted 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 than earthly origin and nature, He repeatedly asserts: "Ye are from beneath," he says to the crowd (8 19), "and I am not of this world!" (20 19) 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 thou seest me do in the body, that shall also do the Son of Man also (8 20)"; 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, when 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 one" (plurality of persons) "gece" (neuter singular, and accordingly singleness of being) of Himself from the very nature, the "he" of the sentence, is making Himself, the person then speaking to them, God (10 33; cf 6 18; 19 7). The continued sameness of the person who has been, from all eternity down to this hour, one with God, is therefore fully safeguarded. His earthly life is, however, distinctly represented as a humiliation. Though even on earth He is one with the Father, yet He "descended" to earth; He had come out from the Father and out of God; a glory had been left behind which was yet to be returned to, and His sojourn on earth was therefore to that extent an obscuration of His proper glory. There was a sense, then, in which, because He had "descended," He was no longer equal with the Father. It was in order to justify an assertion of equality with the Father, in power (10 25 29) that He was led to declare: "I and my Father are one" (10 30). But He can also declare "The Father is greater than I" (14 28). Obviously this means that there was a humbled, in a certain sense, He. It was to be returned to, and His sojourn on earth was therefore to that extent an obscuration of His proper glory. In it He was a "man": a man who hath told you the truth, which I have heard from God' (8 40), where the contrast with "God" throws the assertion of humanity into emphasis (cf 10 33). The truth of His human nature is, therefore, everywhere assumed and endlessly illustrated, rather than explicitly asserted. He possessed a human soul (12 27) and bodily parts (flesh and blood, 6 33ff; hands and side, 20 27); and was subject alike to physical affections (weariness, 4 6, and thirst, 19 28, suffering and death), and to all the common human emotions—not merely the love of compassion (13 34; 14 21; 15 8 13), but the love of simple affection which we pour out on "friends" (11 11; cf 11 15, 14), indignation (11 33 38) and joy (15 11; 17 13). He was in the participation produced by strong ex- citement (11 33; 12 27; 13 21), the sympathy with suffering which shows itself in tears (11 33), the thankfulness which fills the grateful heart (6 11 23; 11 41; 16 27). On the one hand, with the Father, He was without sin: "the prince of the world," He declared, "hath nothing in me" (14 30; cf 8 46). Clearly Our Lord, as reported by John, knew Himself to be true God and true man in one indivisible person, the common subject of the qualities which belong to each.

(1) His Deity.—(a) Mk 13 32: The same is true of His self-consciousness as revealed in His sayings recorded by the synoptists.

2. The Synoptic Jesus

2.1. The remarkable declaration recorded in Mk 13 32 (of Mt 24 36): 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, nor yet the Son, but the Father.' Here Jesus places Himself, in an ascending scale of being, above "the angels in heaven," that is to say, the highest of all creatures, significantly marked here as supramundane. Accordingly, He presents Himself elsewhere as the Lord of the angels, whose behests they obey (Weiss). He is of man so high sent forth His angels, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Mt 24 31; cf 13 49; 25 31; Mk 8 38). Thus the "angels of God" (Lk 12 8 9; 15 10) Christ designates as His angels, the "kingdom of God" (Mt 12 28; 19 24; 21 31 44; Mk and Lk offer it as His Father's). Mk 13 20; Lk 18 7; cf Rom 8 33; Col 3 12; Tit 1 1) as His elect. He is obviously speaking in Mk 13 22 outside 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 we mean by the term "the Son." 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 a Divine nature. This is the term "the Son" should mean. 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). Christ's statement is that He can and should feed the general hunger of man for "food of God which he purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20 28m); or John kelehi 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 "souls" 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 for 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 and therefore die. We know equally how to account for Paul's apparent contradictions. We know that Our 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 blood because He is also man. He can justly speak, therefore, when speaking of Jesus Christ as "the blood of God." When precisely the same phe- nomenon meets us in Our Lord's speech of Himself, we are more presumptuous to characterize the same state of things. When He speaks of "the Son" (who is God) as ignorant, we are designating Himself as "the Son" because of His higher nature, and yet has in mind the ignorance of His lower nature. He means that He is designated "the Son" 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, "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 Moses and Jesus as "the two lights of the same lamp" (2 Cor 4:6), and of the Son of Man as "a lamp that is not put under a bushel" (Lk 8:16). For in the first sentence, thus, Our Lord bears witness to His Divine nature, with its supremacy above all creatures, to His human nature with its Creation and, added to the unity of the subject possessed of these two natures.

(b) Other passages: Son of Man and Son of God: All these elements of His personality find several repeated assertions in other utterances of Our Lord recorded in 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" (Mt 1 41; 5 19; 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" (Lk 11 2, and other passages, Mk 3 31 ff.; 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 parabolic discrimination of Himself a Son of Man (Mk 14 62; Lk 17 20; Mt 20 19); even on His ascription to Himself of the purely Divine functions of the forgiveness of sins (Mk 2 5) and judgment of the world (Mt 25 31), or of the purely Divine powers of reading the heart (Mt 22 28); Lk 8 17) or of intercession (Mt 14 62); 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 name of the Son of God (Mk 1 1 11; Mt 3 17; Mk 14 62; Lk 1:32-33). 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 His Father (Mt 28 19; Lk 22 28-30), or interceding (Mk 14 62). The implication of Deity imbedded in the designation, Son of Man, is perhaps more plainly spoken out in the companion designation, Son of God, of 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 thus not lost: it is preserved in twined respects, the one by both Matthew (11 27 ff.) and Luke (10 22 ff.), and the other by Matthew (28 19).

(*) 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," He says, "knoweth the Son, save the Father." For 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 was so remote from the mind of man that he could 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 'always, even to the end of the world'—He appears in the presence of and on the face of His disciples in the form of the heavenly Son of Man. For there were three beings enumerated, 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 Je'h, and to name the name of the Son as the Son of God. The name of the Holy Ghost was, He says, "the Holy Ghost." 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 threecold 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, therefore, not without significance that He commanding them to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. This is what Jesus, as reported by the Synoptics, understood Himself to be. See Trinitry. (2) His Nature in the Old Testament: Jesus is to be 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 39), 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 in 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 you see 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 also, of His pity for the weary and hungry ones to whom He ministered (Mt 11:28-30). He expresses also His 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 11:19; Mt 7:11; Lk 3:34, 39; 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 pronounces Him an example of the highest personal achievement (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 conclude Him to be 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 expressions of each consistent. If, as God, 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 are thus, in the 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 (1:8,17; 21:13), 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 the characteristic thought of His movement, characteristic of Him, to the Epp. 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 consistently thought of as true man. Nevertheless, from the beginning to the end of the whole series of books, while first and last, but not the only, aspect of His two natures comes into repeated prominence, there is never a 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 indifferently from every part of the NT, and passage justly be cited to support and explain passage without reference to our partition 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 cursorily 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 them all. There can scarcely be imagined a better proof of the canon of inspiration than the 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 make harmless 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 battle-fields, 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 common life. 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 two natures. But the matter is not so pressing, 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 and were supplemented or at least at the expense of 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 the form of 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; and so the Father 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, undivided and undivisible, incapable of a separation, and of the property of each nature being preserved, and concouring 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 its form to all the allusions to Christ in the great mass of preaching and song which has accumulated during the centuries; and it has supplied the background of the conceptions of the untold multitudes who through the Christian ages have been worshippers of Christ.

NOTE.—In this art, the author has usually given his own translation of quotations from Scripture, and not that of any particular version.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD

PERSONALITY. See Person.

PERSUADE, πέρεσώ, PERSUASION, περσώ-ζην: (1) in the older Eng. "persuade" need not mean "convinces" (although it is this usual sense in the AV: Mt 27 20, etc), but may mean only "attempt to convince," "argue with." This is well brought out in Acts 26 28, where the Gr is lit. "in little thou 'persuaded' [πεπέθηκα, πεπέθητα] to make me Christ." (2) "He took πεθιείς 'convinced' (almost thou persuadest me ...), but this is impossible, and so the AV rendered πεθηκα by "thou wouldst fail." To keep something of the language of AV, "persuasion" was supplied after "little," but it should be italicized, for it is merely conjectural, as ARVm recognizes by giving "time" as an alternative for "persuasion." The text of the passage, however, is suspected. See ALSO.

Similarly in Acts 13 43, RV replaces "persuade" by "had some change," and had have been made also in 2 K 13 18 and Xs (3). (2) The "popular persuasions" of 1 Esd 5 73 are "efforts to persuade the people" (uncertain text, however). Acts 19 8 AV writes "persuading the things" (RV "as to the things") for "present the things persuasively." And in Gal 1 10 (ERV and AV, not in ARV) and 2 Cor 5 11, there is a half-ironic force in the word: St. Paul's enemies have accused him of using unworthy persuasion in making his conversions.

PERUSA, περουσα (περουσος, προυδαθ). See PERIDA.

PERVERSE, περασων: The group "perverse-ly, -ness," "act perversely" in AV represents nearly 20 Heb words, of which, however, most are derivatives of the stems πασιον, πασαον, πασαον, πασαον. RV has made many changes. In Job 36 8, RV "mischievous" is better for the taste of a thing, and in Isa 50 3 greater emphasis is gained by RV "wickedness." In Ezk 9 9, "wresting of judgment" is perhaps too concrete, and "perverseness" is kept in the m (inverted in AV). RVm "headlong" in Nu 22 23 is over-literal, and in 23 21 ARVm's "trouble" is a distinct improvement.

PESTILENCE, ρέστιλες (ρέστιλη, debyr; λαομε, loimods): Any sudden fatal epidemic is designated by this word, and in his Bib. use it generally indicates that these are Divine visitations, the word is most frequently used in the prophetic books, and it occurs 25 in Jer and Ezek, always associated with the sword and famine. In 4 other passages it is combined with noisome or evil beasts, or war. In Am 4 10 this judgment is compared with the plagues of Egypt, and in Hab 3 5 is a concomitant of the judgments of God from the Arabian mountain. There is the same judicial character associated with pestilence in Ex 5 3; 9 15; Lev 26 25, Nu 14 12; Dt 28 21; 2 S 24 1; 1 Ch 21 12; Ezk 14 19.21. In the dedication prayer of Solomon, a special value is bequeathed for such petitions as may be presented toward the temple (2 Ch 6 28). Such a deliverance is promised to those who put their trust in God (Ps 91 6). Here the pestilence is called noisome, a shortened form of "annoysome," used in the sense of "hateful" or that which causes trouble or distress. In modern Eng. it has acquired the sense of loathsome. "Noisome" is used by Tindale where AV and RV have "hateful" in 1 Tim 6 9.

The Lat word pestilentia is connected with pestis, "the plague," but pestilence is used of any visitation and is not the name of any special disease: debber is applied to diseases of cattle and is tr' "murrain."

In the NT pestilence is mentioned in Our Lord's eschatological discourse (Mt 24 7 AV; Lk 21 11) coupled with famine. The assonance of loimods and linds in these passages (linois is omitted in the RV passage for Mt) occurs in several classical passages, e.g. Heroiotus vii.171. The pestilence is said to walk in darkness (Ps 91 6) on account of its sudden onset out of obscurity unassociated with any apparent cause.

ALEX. MACALISTER

PESTLE, πεστα (πεστα, πεστα): A rounded implement of wood or stone used for pounding, bruising, or powdering grains in a mortar. Used only in Prov 22 27. See MORTAR.


LITERATURE. The data for this article are found chiefly in the four Gospels; in Acts, chs 1-16; in Gal 1 and 2; and in the two Epistles of Peter.

Simon (or Simeon) was the original name of Peter, the son of Jonas (or John), and brother of Andrew, a disciple of John the Baptist, as Peter also may have been. A fisherman by occupation, he was an inhabitant of Bethsaida on the Sea of Galilee, though subsequently he dwelt with his family at Capernaum (Mt 4 18; 8 14; 10 2; 16 17; 17 27; Mk 1 16.29.30.36; Lk 5 3.4. 5.8.10; 22 31; 24 34; Jn 1 40-44.)

His first appearance in Gospel history is in Jn 1 35-42, when Andrew, having discovered Jesus to be the Messiah, "first findeth his own brother Simon," and "brought him unto Jesus"; on which occasion it was that the latter, beholding him, said, "Thou shalt be called Cephas," an Aram. surname whose Gr synonym is Petros, or Peter, meaning "a rock" or "stone." At this time he also received the name Peter, the disciple of Jesus, although, in common with that of other names of the Twelve, this call was twice repeated. See Mt 4 19; Mk 1 17; Mk 5 3 for the second call, and Mt 10 2; Mk 3 14.16; Lk 6 13.14 for the third.

Some interpret the second as that when he was chosen to be a constant companion of Jesus, and the third when he was at length selected as an apostle.
The life-story of Peter falls into two parts: first, from his call to the ascension of Christ; secondly, from that event to the close of his earthly career. (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-in-law (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 Lord and his own inconstant desire to walk upon 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 scene in Mt 17 24.

The events beginning at the Passion are more easily recalled, because to 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 in his thought concerning the event (Jn 13 1-10); the first of his presumptuous boasting 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 51-34), twice repeated before the betrayal; in Gethsemane (Mt 26 31-50); 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 forsaking 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 66-58; 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 related by all the four Evangelists, together with the account of the resurrection, in the words of the angel (Mt 16 7); and on the same day he sees Jesus alive before any of the rest of the Twelve (Lk 24 34; 1 Cor 15 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 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 4, 8). He is in arrest and beaten (ch 6); after a time he is sent by the church at 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 house-top which influences him to preach the gospel to the gentle centurion at Caesarea, and explains this action to the other 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 the works of salvation, adding his testimony to that of Paul, are "the cup of salvation" 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 attempted to separate himself from the support of the Gentile church (Acts 15 36). The second council was held to settle this question and a dispute that arose concerning Gentiles with respect to circumcision, for which resembling 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 of age. 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 assumed that Peter went to Rome immediately 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 history, men have ever written more clearly or strongly." He has been styled the prince of the apostles, and, indeed, seems to have been their leader on every occasion. He is always named first in every list of them, and was their common spokesman. He was hopeful, bold, confident, courageous, frank, impulsive, energetic, vigorous, strong, and loving, and faithful to his Master notwithstanding his defection prior to the crucifixion. It is true that he was not always consistent, and because of his peculiar temperament he sometimes appeared forward and rash. Yet, as another says, "His virtues and faults had their common root in his enthusiastic disposition," and the latter were at length overruled by Divine grace into the most beautiful humility and meekness, as evinced in his two Epistles.
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 himself, and it is not yet conceded by his associates. 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 Ep. (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 and Gentile alike; on him follows Saul the Jew and 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 two Epistles 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 beneficiaries are exhorted to set their hearts and their minds. The living hope is expounded 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 of God (1 13–13).

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 heaven gifts, patience in suffering, fidelity in service, and humility in ministry. The power and majesty of the unseen powers of God are emphasized, the blessings of the NT are promised. The living hope is expounded 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 of God (1 13–13).

The genuineness of this First Ep. has never been doubted, except 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 addressed; as a matter of fact it is not known even whether the epistle consisted of one or two letters, or whether the epistle contained the NY book of Baruch. 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, rather because of its late admission to 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 Ep., 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 1 2–11, the ground of it in 1 12–21, 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 3–5), and whose desertion of the faith is expected. The threat 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 Jesus 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 23 5–8; Ezk 37 21–28), Peter was explaining by the prophecy of the NT to his readers. The living hope is expounded 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 of God (1 13–13).

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 heaven gifts, patience in suffering, fidelity in service, and humility in ministry. The power and majesty of the unseen powers of God are emphasized, the blessings of the NT are promised. The living hope is expounded 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 of God (1 13–13).

The genuineness of this First Ep. has never been doubted, except 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 addressed; as a matter of fact it is not known even whether the epistle consisted of one or two letters, or whether the epistle contained the NY book of Baruch. 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) 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 16 11 AV). Moreover, it is clear from Peter’s Second Ep. (1 1) that his conception of justification from the Divine as well as from the human side is identical with that of Paul, since he speaks of justifying faith as terminating on the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. As we understand it, this is not the righteousness which God demanded in the Law, but the righteousness which God gives (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 and yet the most 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, the Petrine 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 16; 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 holiness (1 13); to give patience in persecution (4 12 13); fidelity in service (5 1 4); steadfastness against temptation (5 6–10); and growth in grace (2 Pet 1 10 11). It is a further peculiarity that the apostle always throws the thought of the resurrection forward 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 (2 Pet 1 4 5); 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 Ep, 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 found to be the staple of the Christian’s’s daily discipline. 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 Ep 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 "in-genthe world (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 the heavens and the earth shall become" yet to be "when all 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 which spoken of by the OT prophets (Isa 2 22–22; 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, 1864; C. A. Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, 21–41, New York, 1885; Scofield, Reference Bible, where pertinent.


JAMES M. GRAY

PETER, APOCALYPSE OF, see APOCALYPHIC GOSPELS, II, 4; LITERATURE, SUB-APOTOLIC (Intro).

PETER, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO, see APOCALYPHIC GOSPELS; LITERATURE, SUB-APOTOLIC.


He occupied a distinguished place among the Lord’s disciples. In the four lists of the apostles found in the NT his name must occur (Mt 10 2–4; Mt 3 16–19; Lk 6 14–16; Acts 1 13). He is the chief figure in the first ten chapters of the Acts. It is Peter that preaches the Christian sermon (Acts 2), he opens the door of the gospel to the gentile world in the house of the madman, Cornelia, and has the exquisite delight of witnessing scenes closely akin to those of Pentecost at Jerus (Acts 10 44–47). It was given him to pronounce the pardon of sentences on the guilty pair, Ananias and Sapphira, and to rebuke in the power of the Spirit the presbyter Simon Magus (Acts 8 19–20). In these and the like instances Peter exhibited the authority with which Christ had invested him (Mt 16 19)—an authority bestowed upon all his disciples (20 22).—see Peter, Epp. of Second.
Peter, First Ep. of
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doubt and uncertainty have existed from the early ages to the present. The genuineness and authentic-
itish receive graduate, or a reversion.

1. Canonicy of 1 Peter.—The internal and external evidence 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 a contemporary of Polycarp, quotes it copiously, and the 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 (UE, III, xxiii, 3). He places it among those writings about which no question was ever raised, no doubt ever entertained by any portion of the catholic church." (Professor Lumby in Biblical 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 quotes are such as are found in the New Testament only; 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 epistles 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 body of Israel, that is, including among them the gentile nations (Jn 7 55). But we must not conclude from this that the Ep. is directed to Christian Jews alone. Gentile believers are by no means excluded, as 1 14; 18; 20; 2 10; 2 6; 4 8. Since anciently all races were included, the idea of churches of Asia Minor largely predominated at the time. The term "sojourners" represents a people away from home, strangers in a strange land; the word is the "pilgrims" in 2 11 and He 11 13. An appropriate name for these who confess that they have here no continuing city, but who seek one to come. While no doubt Peter had believing Israelites in mind when he wrote, for he never forgot that his ministry belonged primarily to the circumcision (Gal 2 7-8), he did not neglect the more numerous gentile converts, and to these he speaks as earnestly as to the others; and these also were "sojourners."

Three of the four provinces Peter mentions, viz. Pontus, Cappadocia, and Asia, had representatives at the memorable Pentecost in Jesus (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 neighbors. This would form a close 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, and our faithful brother, as I account him, I have written unto him, that so he may shew you the same things, and the like matters as are written in this epistle. But while I would not neglect the occurrence of these words that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the Epistle, I yet think it more likely that this "follower of Christ" was the writer or the secretary. Silvanus was Paul's companion in the ministry to the Thessalonians, and while we do not know of him as going with Paul to Jerusalem or to Rome, it is probable he returned from Corinth finally to Aisa Minor, and labored there with Peter and Paul. Peter met, where no one knows, though not a few think in Rome; as likely a guess perhaps in his Ep. in Col. At any rate, Silvanus, or the "sojourner" as Peter designates him in 2 Pet, was an acquaintance of the apostle. This seems to account more fitly for the phrase, "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 5 13 the Ep. was written in Babylon. But what is the place meant? Two cities having this name were in apostolic times.

Which? One was in Egypt, probably on or near the present site of Cairo, and we are told that it was the place in which the "Tend Babylonian" Epiphanius calls it "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 question. Babylon on the Euphrates was the place meanly and contemptuously 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 for the view that Peter wrote the Ep. at Babylon, and that the absence of tradition in its support is a very serious difficulty. A third view regards it as symbolic of Rome. Roman Catholics thus interpret it, and not a few Protestants so understand it. Tradition which does not rank very high in the 2d cent. appears to favor it, though much uncertainty and obscurity still surround the earliest ages of our era, in spite of the unwaried researches of modern scholars. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who lived in the first half of the 2d 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 quite totally out of harmony with the rest of the writing. Preeminently 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 by all readers. It is altogether him that this man, plain of speech almost to bluntness, should interject in the midst of his personal explanations and final salutations such a mystical epitaph 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 need was not dependent on the Apocalypse for this name of Babylon as Rome. Peter could not not use it, for he was alive more than a decade before that date. The Ep. was written about 64 AD, at the time when Nero was under the infamous Nero were raging, at which time also the apostle himself bore his witness and went to his heavenly home. Even as his Nazarenes had foretold before this time (John 12), while not unthinkable 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. First and foremost he desired that they "be strengthened in the grace which is in Christ Jesus." "Feed my lambs!"—"Tend my sheep."—"Feed 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 tends 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 inheritances they share, exalts to walk in the footsteps of the uncomplaining Christ (2:20–25); 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, "Honour 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 affections were generally local and sporadic. There were churches of large membership and wide influence which were unmolested (1 Cor 4:10–13); and while the Christian church was not 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 sort that 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 the very heart of persecution, the 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; kairopoiōth, maleficē, 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 "ugly calumniators," or "false accusers," or "false witnesses," 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 feasts, 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 their own. Their record spoke for admission 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 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 godly lives, by being so meek, docile, patient, meekfast, true, faithful to God, that you can credit the false accusations (2:1–5; 3:13–17; 3:9.13–17; 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 to which the letter was sent there seems to have been complete absence of formal trial and punishment through the regular channels. Peter proceeds to State the reason that the apostle 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 them that shame which falsely accuse them (3:16); and they are not to combat evil with evil nor answer reproofing or reproving triavvisre with 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 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 minister report to the effect that Nero himself instigated the burning of the city (July 19, 64), and "he [Nero] falsely diverted the charge on to the Christians" (Hist. X.15.4). The name of the Christians (of Christians), and who were detested for the abominations which they perpetrated." Nero andcleOPHIS AcTIFS The facts are well established, viz. that at the time the Christians were well known as a peculiar evil-doing sect, and that the government of Nero attached the dreadful sufferings inflicted upon them because they were Christians; and the persecutions at the time were instigated by the fear and hatred of the Christian sect. Peter likewise recognizes the fact that believers were disliked 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 imminent to the empire. Of course, where direct charges of a criminal character were brought against Christians, judicial inquiry into them would be instituted. But in the Ep. what believers had to endure and suffer were the detractio, the vituperation, the opprobrium and the vile and malignant slanders 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 statement that the letter 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, if not followed out, in the next" (1 Pet 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 left more faithful. The device which a certain state (South Carolina) has inscribed on its Great Seal is, 

*dom spiro spiro* (“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 to be old in the times of God’s first appearing and the word 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 stained 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 ‘faileth 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).

4. Testimony of Prophets. —

7. The session, 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 not the dream of an illusory prince, a man, a noble, a general, a statesman, will sometimes appear in public with his breast covered with resplendent decorations which mark his rank or his achievements. But such distinctions sink into insignificance in the light of the immortal bliss. 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 an adequate examination of this difficult passage would require more space than could be given in a Supplement. We quote a section 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, i.e. the preaching of Noah. It is not Noah 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:

(1) Christian privileges, 1—2 10.
(2) Christian duties, 2 11—4 11.
(3) Persecutions and trials, 4 15—5 11.
(4) Personal matters and salutations, 5 12—14.

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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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 these two opinions. It is not the purpose of this article to trace the history of these two opinions. It is not the purpose of this article to trace the history of these two opinions. It is not the purpose of this article to trace the history of these two opinions. It is not the purpose of this article to trace the history of these two opinions.

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 authorities differ. Thus, for instance, the name of ancient opinion Origen (c 240 AD). In his homily on Josh, he speaks of the two Epp. 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 his authority was questioned: “Peter has left one acknowledged Ep., and perhaps a second, for this is contested.” Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, regarded it with as much suspicion as did Origen, and accordingly he placed it among the apocryphal books. 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 states 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 Reformers’ Conference, Erasmus admitted 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, 341; and Carthage, 397) formally recognized it and placed it in the canon, on an equal basis 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 evidence 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 of the 1st century to searching criticism, and it must be frankly confessed that he has reduced the Ep. to a forgery, a pseudonymous and pseudograph, with no more right to be in the NT than has the Apocalypse 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
   1. In the letter itself we arrive at a conclusion of an authoritative character. It is the style of the two Epp. attributed to Peter is given as one prominent reason for ques-
   tioning 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 Bibles are common to the two Epp.
   Some examples are given in proof: “precious” (1 Pet
   1 7, 19; 2 Pet 1 1); “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
   7b), only in the spiritual, “servant” (1 Pet
   1 2; 2 Pet 1 12; 3 2); “verbal form” (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 revered); also positive side (2 Pet 2 13), “spots 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 “servant” (2 11). In the Second, the two great truths are brought together (10). Likewise, in both stress is laid upon prophecy (1 Pet 1 10–12; 2 Pet 1 19–21). Now, all this tends to prove that the writer of the First Ep. 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 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 (4 17, 18), and believers are 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 and practicing shocking 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: “Simon Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ.” The claim to Petrine Authorship is supplied by the opening words, “Simon Peter” (Simon = who has earned). The letter is written to “servant” (2 11). The claim to Petrine Authorship is supplied by the opening words, “Simon Peter” (Simon = who has earned). The letter is written to “servant” (2 11). The real problem of this particular letter is to be found in the variety of its character. It is a letter almost certainly by copying the First Ep. and simply writing, “Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ.” It is probable that Peter may have begun his letter in the Second Ep., but is absent from the First. He designates himself as a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ. “Simon” (Simon = who has earned). The letter is written to “servant” (2 11). The real problem of this particular letter is to be found in the variety of its character. It is a letter almost certainly by copying the First Ep. and simply writing, “Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ.” It is probable that Peter may have begun his letter in the Second Ep., but is absent from the First. He designates himself as a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ. (4 17, 18), and believers are 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 and practicing shocking 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.

3. Claim to Petrine Authorship

4. Christian Earnestness

5. Relation to Apostles


7. Quoted by Jude

8. Doctrinal Teachings of the Epistle—Only some of the more important features of the Ep. are
here noticed. If all were treated as they deserve to be, this article would expand into the proportions of a commentary.

The key-word of 1 Pet is Hope; of 2 Pet Knowledge.
The apostle gives to this gift of grace a prominent place (1:2-3:5; 8; 2:20; 3:18). The term he uses is largely in the intensified form, viz., "full knowledge;" that is, knowledge that rests on fact, knowledge that comes to the believer as something supernatural, as being communicated by the Spirit of God, and therefore is true and complete.
The grasping way of grace Peter, for the same reason, should issue in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Our Lord, who has granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of Him. (1:3)

(1) The basis of saving knowledge rests on the "exceeding great and precious promises" which He has made us, and which become ours by faith in Him. It leads us into acquaintance with the righteousness of God.

(2) The growth in true knowledge (1:5-11): "In your faith supply virtue," etc. He does not ask that faith be supplied, that believers already have faith but that faith be strengthened. All the other excellencies and virtues be richly and abundantly furnished. The original word for "supply" is derived from the Gr "chorus," in behalf of the members of the church who supplied all the equipments needed. Peter approving that fact urges Christians to give all diligence to furnish themselves with the gifts and grace he mentions, which are far more needful to the Christian than were the equipments for the ancient circus. See Sence.

What a magnificent cluster Peter here gives! Each springs out of the other: each is strengthened by the other.

(3) Inerrancy of the sources of saving knowledge (1:16-21). The apostle rests his teaching on two trustworthy facts: (a) the fact and meaning of the Saviour's Transfiguration; (b) the fact of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Taken together these two facts invest his teaching with infallible certainty. "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we were made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty." Pagans mythology, so widely prevailing at the time in Asia Minor, indeed over the whole heathen world, was composed of "myths" (Peter's word) skilfully framed and poet embellished. Jewish cabalism, and the wild vagaries springing up in the Christian brotherhood itself had no place in the gospel message nor in apostolic teaching. What Peter and his fellow-disciples taught was the very truth of God, for at the Transfiguration they saw the Deity, the Son of God, they heard the Divine Voice, they beheld the two visitants from the unseen world, Moses and Elijah. Of the majestic scene they were eyewitnesses. Peter adds, "And we have the word of prophecy made sure." The Transfiguration had made the word of prophecy inspired, the prophet's prophecy true in the sense that the future and God's purpose to fill the earth with His glory; every word He has spoken is to be made good.

Moreover, the apostle appeals to the inspiration of the prophets in confirmation of his position. No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy of scripture is come by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit. He recognizes this as primary truth, that prophecy is not of one's own invention, nor is it the outpouring of the spirit of the prophet. The prophecy was brought to him, as it is brought to us. Peter and his fellow-believers did not follow "what was said by the prophet for the time being by the Holy Spirit," but "what the Holy Spirit said by the mouth of all the prophets.

Of course in 3 5-13, where the three worlds are spoken of, three globes are not meant, but three vast epochs, three enormous periods in the earth's history. 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. Scoffers 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 world." (3:4). This is a surprisingly modern inquiry. The Bible appeals 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 any change; no catastrophe is likely, is possible. The promise of His coming is a hope.

(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 shall be very tempestuous round about him." (Ps 50 3 AV; 1sa 66 15.) In the "First Fruits" of Peter's Good Spirit the NT 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, specially reduce the present order of things to ashes. Peter's language does not signify earth's annihilation, nor its dissolution as an organic body, nor the end of time. He speaks of colossal convulsions and physical revolution of the whole sky and earth, such as 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 fulfilment: "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; 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 can suspend and control the scheme of things is able to transplant every vestige of sin and misery and imperfection, fitting it for the dwelling of perfect beings and of
PETHAHIAH, pē-thā-hi-ə (פֶתֶחִיאָה, pēthah'yāh), “Jehi opens up”:
(1) Chief of the 19th course of priests (1 Ch 24:16).
(2) One of the Levites having “foreign wives” (Ezr 10:23; Neh 9:5; “Patheus” in 1 Esd 8:23).
(3) Son of Meshezabel, descendant of Judah, who was “at the king’s hand in all concerns concerning the people” (Neh 11:24).

PETE, pē-thēr (פֵטֶר, pēthr; Phaetho, Phathoïra, Phathoïra, Bathyora): The dwelling-place of the Israelites situated on “the river” (the Jordan) in the land of Edom.

PETHEOR, pē-thērōr (פֵטֶהוֹר, pēthōr; Phathor, Phathor): Identified with the Pedru(i) of the geographical list of Thanesre III (c. 1300 BC) as the Pithor (Pitru) of the Assyrian kings Shalmaneser II, who states that in his 3rd year (857 BC) he took the city Ana-Assur-u-abat (meaning “I founded [it] anew for Assur”), which the Hittite (Hittites) called Pitu. He says that it lay on the farthest (western) bank of the Euphrates, by the Saqarru or Saqura River, the modern Suqar. The importance of Pitru is indicated by the fact that he received there the tribute of the kings of Carthage, Canaan, Moab, and other districts.

PETHUEL, pē-thū'ēl (פֶתֶוֹל, pēthū'ēl; Petha'il, “God’s opening”): Father of Joel the prophet (Jal 1:1).

PETITION, pē-tish'ōn: Used in EV only as a noun, usually as representing the Heb נאしてください (nā ḫādākāh) (Ps 20:5; נאしてください, mishākādākāh), from the common vb. נא, ḥādāk, “to ask.” The noun, consequently, has no technical meaning, and may be used indiscriminately in the active (Ezr 7:2) or passive (1 S 1:27) sense, or for a petition addressed to either God (1 S 1:17) or man (1 K 2:16), while in Jgs 8:24; Job 6:8; Ps 106:15, it is rendered simply “request.” Otherwise “petition” represents the Aram. נא (be'ā) (Arab. ṣāʾ), Elsewhere מילקת, נא (1 Macc 7:37, ṣāʾ, “supplication”), and the Lat. oratio (2 Esd 8:24). - Burton Scott Easton

PETER, pē'ter. See SOLA.

PEULTHAI, pē-ul'the, PEULLETHAI, pē-ul'the (פֵאלֵת, pē'ul'the, “Jeh’s seed”): One of the “porters,” 5th son of Obed-edom (1 Ch 26:5).

PHAATH MOAB, Pāth Moab, Phath Moab, B followed by Swete, Fāth Mūba, Phāthalimōb (1 Esd 5:11); 1 Esd 8:31 [AV “Phath Moab”]. B followed by Swete reads Māthaμōb, Māthāmōb; Fritzsche in both places reads Fāth Moab). One of the families, part of which, consisting of the sons of Jesus and Job 2:512, went up out of captivity with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1 Esd 5:11), and part of which, viz., “Elasians the son of Zarahais and with him 200 men,” went up with Ezra (1 Esd 8:31 = “Phath-moab” of Ezr 2:6; 8:4; [10:30]; and Neh 7:11 [3:11; 10:14]). As the name of a Jewish clan or family the name Phaath or Phath Moab presents difficulties of which explanations are offered, though none is convincing. It is generally taken as “ruler of Moab,” which may refer to the Israelite conquest of Moab in which this family may have distinguished itself, or it may have arisen from the settlement and incorporation of a Moabite family in Heb territory, or from the settlement of an Israelite family in Moabite territory (c. 1 Ch 4:22); or it may be the corruption of some unknown word or name. Instances of such corruption are quite common in these apocryphal Heb proper names. See PATAH-MOAB.

PHACARETH, fak'a-reth (פָקָרֶת, Phakaret), Paharketh, B followed by Swete correctly reads Fāk'-ērēth, Sabēz, together, as a name. A followed by AV reading “sons of Sabæe,” as a distinct family, 1 Esd 5:34: The same as “Pochereth-hazzebahim” of Ezr 2:57.

PHAIRUS, pā'i-rūs, fā'ir-ūr (B, Fawtōp, Phainoor, A, Fawo, Phainoos, Phainoos): Head of one of the families of priests some of whom had taken “strange wives” (1 Esd 9:22) = “Paabher” of Esr 10:22; styled “Phassurus” in 1 Esd 5:25.


PHALEC, fā'lek (Fālēk, Phallek, W, Fālak, Phallek): AV, Gr form of Peleg (thus RV) (Lk 3:35).


PHALLU, fālōō ( פָלַלּוּ, pāllōō): See PALLU.

PHALTIEL, fāl'tēl (פָלַתְיֶל, pāl'tēl). See PALTIT.


PHANUEL, fān'ō-ēl, fan'-ō-ēl (פָנָא-עַל, pān'ā-ō'ēl), “vision of God”; [Fawo, Phanuël]: Parent of Anna (Lk 2:36). See PENIEL.
PHARAKIM, far-a-kim (فاراکیم, Pharakim, Pharakéim, فاراقیم, Pharakim; AV Pharaccim): One of the families of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 31; not found in Ezra or Neh.).

PHARAOH, far-ō, far-ā-d (فارا‌ه, parōh; פaraoh, 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 a combination 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'u, king of Musri" to the North Arabian country. 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 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" (I K 14 25). This new custom in the use of the title Pharaoh does not appear in the Bible until we have "Pharaoh-nechoh." Pharaoh is certainly in the time of Rameses II, in the "Tale of Two Brothers" (Records of the Past, 1st series, II, 137; Recueil de Travaux, XXI, 13, 1 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 Nechoh 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 Pal would likewise have used Pharaoh-nechoh 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 give a late authorship (cf. Gen 12 14-29; 41 14; Ex 11 1; 3 11; 1 K 3 1; 14 25; 2 K 23 29; Jer 44 30; also 1 K 11 19; 2 K 18 21; 1 Ch 4 18).

PHARAOH HOPHRA, hóf'ra-hô'á-fra; Osbaat Hophra: He is so called in Scripture (Jer 44 30). He is known on the monuments as Ush'ab'Br 'ra. He was the son of Psammetichus II, whose Gr mercenaries have left inscriptions upon the rocks of Abu-Sim-bel, and in other places. He reigned alone from 589 BC to 570 BC, and jointly, by compulsion of his people, with his son-in-law Aahmes (Gr Amasis) for some years longer. No sooner had he mounted the throne than he was dethroned by the Egyptians in a fierce war and fled to the city of Shechem, which is the capital of Judah, where he was murdered by the captivity of Egypt, they might have killed him and much people,

Zedekiah had entered into the intrigue against the advice of Jeremiah, and it proved fatal to Zedekiah and the kingdom. Nebuchadrezzar was not slow to punish the disloyalty of his vassal, and in a brief space his armies were beleaguer ing Jerusalem. The Egyptians did indeed march to the relief of their allies, and the Chaldeans drew off their forces from Jerusalem to meet them. But the Egyptians returned without attempting to meet the Chaldeans in a pitched battle, and Jerusalem was taken, the walls broken down and the temple burnt up with fire.

When Jerusalem fell, and Nebuchadrezzar's governor, Ogad, had been assassinated, the dispirited remnant of Judah, against the advice of Jeremiah, fled into Egypt, carrying the prophet with them. They settled at Tahpanhes, then Daphnae (modern Tell Deir el-Derek), now identified with a mound bearing the significant name of Kot Bint el Yahudi, "the palace of the Jew's daughter." Here Pharaoh had a palace, for Jeremiah took great stores and hid them in mortar in the brickwork which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house at Tahpanhes, and prophesied that Nebuchadrezzar would spread his royal pavilion over them (Jer 43 8-13). The Pharaoh of that day was Hophra, and when the fortress of Tahpanhes was discovered and cleared in 1886, the open-air platform before the entrance was found. "Here the ceremony described by Jeremiah took place before the chief of the fugitives assembled on the platform, and here Nebuchadrezzar spread his royal pavilion. The very nature of the site is precisely applicable to all the events" (Flinders Petrie, Nebuchadnezzar and Deir el-Derek, 51). It was in 586 BC that the prophecy was fulfilled when Nebuchadrezzar marched into the Delta.

More recently, in 1909, in the course of excavations carried on by the British School of Archaeology in Egypt, the palace of King Nebuchadrezzar was discovered on the site of Memphis, the ancient capital of Egypt, which is now the grey mud hill, close to the squalid Arab village.
of Mitrokhenni, 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 there was 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 29 f), became the victim of a revolt and was finally slain.


T. Nicol

PHARAOH-NECOH, nɛ'kɔ (723-722), par'oh rekho, also νέκων, Nekos (2 K 23 29). He is commonly represented as a Pharaoh of the 22nd dynasty. His calendar year 233 is the 2 Ch 35 22; 36 4, AV Necho, 1. Pharaoh-Necho, NECO; 2 K 23 29, 2 Ch 35 22; 36 4, AV Necoh, 610-600 BC. No monuments—Gr Nekos—was the 24th king of the XXVth dynasty, being the son of Psammetichus I, famous in Gr contemporary history as the 21st king. After his death, many monuments in the Lower and Upper Egypt (Herod. ii.153, 158, 169). The great event of his reign (610-594 BC) was his expedition across Syria to secure for himself a share in 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 Syrian hordes which had reached his border on their western march, and now his son Necoh 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 as his ally. 2. Battle of Megiddo. Whatever may have been his reasons, Josiah remained loyal to his Assyrian overlord, 608 BC. The last mark of respect, he showed towards the army of Egypt, the Pharaoh was wounded and soon after died amid the lamentations of his people. Necoh marched northward, captured Kadesh, and pressed on to the Egyptian fortifications. 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 vassal of Egypt. Jehoiakim paid up the tribute of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold which Necoh had imposed upon the land, but he recovered it by exactions which he made from the people (2 K 23 35).

That expedition which still keeps some hold upon Syria, and his presence there had attracted the attention of the newly established Pharaoh-necoh at Carcchemish, under Nebuchadrezzar set out for the 604 BC. Euphrates, and, meeting the army of Pharaoh-necoh at Carcchemish, invaded upon him a signal defeat. The Chaldeans 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 commercial De- two fleets built, composed of triremes, velvement one of them to navigate the Mediter- ranean, 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 Israel- ite 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, marching 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 Mediterranean. They succeeded in the "Pharaoh's harbor" of Cape 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 no practical value. Herodotus, the "Pharaoh" of 450 BC, saw still remaining the docks which Necoch had built for the accommodation of his fleet.

LITERATURE—Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt. III, 335 ff; Wiedemann, Geschichte von Alt-Agypten, 178-90; Rawlinson, Egypt ("Story of the Nations"), 354 ff; Herodotus ii.158, 159.

PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER (υμής, bath- par'oh): 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. Positive identification of the "daughter of Pharaoh" 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 Hatashep, the "Queen Elizabeth of Egypt." M. G. Kjel

PHARATHON, far'-a-thon (Φαράθων, Pharathon): One of the strong cities of Judaea fortified by Bac- chides during the Maccabean war (1 Macc 9 50). LXX reads "Thamatha-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 pārāthôn. It is not if it was taken strictly as in Judaean territory, it cannot be identified with Pharathon (q.v.) of Jgs 18 15. In that case we should probably seek for it Smith in some fortress covering the top of Wady Farah. W. Ewing

PHARES, fâ'rez (Φαρές, Phares): AV; Gr form of "Perea" (thus RV) (Mt 1 3; Lk 3 33).
ANCIENT PAINTING OF AN EGYPTIAN PRINCESS
PHAREZ,  פַּרְצָא (AV 1 Esd 5 9; 8 30): The same as RV PHARSOS (q.v.).

PHARIDA, פַּרְיָדָא (חאַרְיָדָא, PHAREIDÁ, A, פָּרְיָדָא, PHARIDÁ; 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) as "Peruda" of Ex 2 25 = "Perida" of Neh 7 57.

PHARIRA, פַּרְיָרָא: AV=RV PHARIDA (q.v.).

PHARISEES, פַּרְיָסֵיא (חאַרְיָסֵיא, Prattahim; פַּרְיָסֵיאו, Pharaisioi):
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. Interpretation of Pharisaic Doctrines—Angels and Spirits—Resurrection
4. Traditions Added to the Law
5. Traditional Interpretations (Sabbath, etc)
6. Students of Scripture
7. Messiah Hopes
8. Almsgiving
II. Organization of the Pharisaic Party
1. The ḥîbbêrim—Pharisaic Brotherhoods
2. Character of the Pharisees
1. Pharisees and People of the Land
2. Pharisee Tendency toward Other Jews
3. Regulations for the ḥîbbêrim
4. The Ṭab'ah Account
5. Their Scrupulosity
6. Their Hypocrisy
7. Talmudic Classification of the Pharisees
V. Our Lord's Relation to the Pharisees
1. Pharisaic Attempts to Gain Christ Over
2. Reasons for Pharisaic Hatred of Christ
3. 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
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. Interpretation of Pharisaic Doctrines—Angels and Spirits—Resurrection
4. Traditions Added to the Law
5. Traditional Interpretations (Sabbath, etc)
6. Students of Scripture
7. Messiah Hopes
8. Almsgiving
II. Organization of the Pharisaic Party
1. The ḥîbbêrim—Pharisaic Brotherhoods
2. Character of the Pharisees
1. Pharisees and People of the Land
2. Pharisee Tendency toward Other Jews
3. Regulations for the ḥîbbêrim
4. The Ṭab'ah Account
5. Their Scrupulosity
6. Their Hypocrisy
7. Talmudic Classification of the Pharisees
V. Our Lord's Relation to the Pharisees
1. Pharisaic Attempts to Gain Christ Over
2. Reasons for Pharisaic Hatred of Christ
3. Our Lord's Denunciation of the Pharisees

In considering the characteristics and doctrines of the Pharisees we are in some difficulty from the nature of our authorities. The writers
2. Authorities 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, a contemporary and himself a Pharisee, is lessened in value by the fact that he modified his account of his people to suit the taste of his Roman masters. The Pharisees, with him, are a philosophic sect, and not an association of priests whose Messianic hopes are 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 Mish, 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 differences into consideration, we may make a fairly consistent picture of the sect. The name means "separatists," from פָּרָשָׁה, pârashah, "to separate"—those who carefully kept themselves from any legal contamination, distinguishing themselves by their care in such matters from the common people, the 'am ha-arets, 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 ere long energetically political. They were a closely organized society, all the members of which called each other ḥîbbêrim, "neighbors," this added to the power they had through their influence with the people.

I. History of the Sect.—The Assidæans (ḥâsg-dhim) were at first the most active supporters of Judas Maccabæus in his struggle for religious freedom. A portion of them rather than the latter retired 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 Maccabæus cleansed the temple and rededicated 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 be a shock to the Assidæan purists, as Judas, though a priest, was not a Zedókité; but his actions would be tolerated at that time on account of the imminent necessity for the work of reorganization and the eminent services of Judas himself and his family.

When Baccæus appeared against Jesus 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 and became the head of the sect of the Pharisees, Sadducæans and Essenes, therefore implying that then and in connection with this they had been prominent, although no notice of any of these parties is to be found that confirms this view. Later (II Macc 12), the Pharisees are represented as envious of the success of John Hyrcanus; Eleazar, one of them, insults him at his own table. From the fact that earlier in the history the Assidæans occupy a similar place to that occupied later by the Pharisees, it may be deduced that the two parties are in a measure one. See HASMONEANS; ASSONEANS. It would seem that not only the Pharisees, but also the Essenes, were derived from the Assidæans or ḥîbbêrim.

In considering the characteristics and doctrines of the Pharisees we are in some difficulty from the nature of our authorities. The writers
2. Authorities 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, a contemporary and himself a Pharisee, is lessened in value by the fact that he modified his account of his people to suit the taste of his Roman masters. The Pharisees, with him, are a philosophic sect, and not an association of priests whose Messianic hopes are not so much as mentioned. Although the Talm was written, both Mish and Gemara, by the
Pharisees  THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA  2362

The Puritans of the 17th cent. became in the 19th
"Non-conformists." The earliest instance of the
Pharisees' intervening in history is that of
2. Change 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
ameless 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 severely thenceforth.
The sons of Hyrcanus, esp. Alexander Janneaus,
expressed their hostility in a more active way.
3. Later Fortunes of the Sect seems to intimate overt acts of hos-
tility on their part which prompted
this action. His whole policy was the
aggrandizement of the Jewish state, but his ambition
was greater than his military abilities. His re-
peated failures and defeats confirmed the Pharisees
in their conception 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 Gr characters on his coins. Although a high
priest he 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
Sadducees; the former, 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
Pharisees. The Jews, however, were apathetic,
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
incidental to the Pharisees and rivals of the Sad-
ducees.

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-
ducees, 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 jubel, or
president, and the 'abh-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 Böchler ('Das grosse Synodenum in Jesus') has attempted to harmonize those Talmudic fables with
the aspect of things appearing in the NT and Jos. He assumes that two heathen philosophers
had to do with matters of government, in which the Sadducees were overwhelmingly predominant, and the other
sect, in which the Pharisees were equally predomi-

nant—the one the Senate of the nation, like the
Senate of the United States, the other the Senate of a
university. Both say of Jesus that he was rejected by Rabbi Lauterbach in the Jew Enc, 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 the Pharisees are ubiqui-

tous, in Jerusalem, in Galilee, in Perea and in the
Decapolis, always coming in contact with Jesus.
He was in contact with certain of the Pharisaic writers
to exonerate them from the guilt of the con-
demnation of our Lord has no foundation; it is con-
tricted 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 seal 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 other Pharisees had
had carried on with Stephen had possibly influ-
cenced him.

When Paul, the Christian apostle, was brought
before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, the Pharisaic party
were numerous in the Synagogue, but
5. In Post-

aphoric Times did not even form the majority, and
apostolic they readily became his defenders
against the Sadducees.

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 Gioras and John of Gischala
(BJ, v, i). The truth behind the Talmudic state-
ments that Gamaliel removed the Sanhedrin to
Jabneh and that Johanan ben Zakkai 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, called Tiberias, to
Galilee. There under the guidance of Jehuda ha-Kadhosh ("the Holy") the Mish was reduced to
writing. It may thus be said that Judaism became Pharisaic, 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
especial attention to the Pharisaic
ideas colored by opinion as to fate and free will, since
on this point the Stoic and Epicurean
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 Stoics that "all things are in the
hand of God." He says "The Pharisees ascribe all
things to fate and God, yet allow that to do what is
right or the contrary is principally in man's own
power." He further says that "civil, holy, or
Pharisaic, the Pharisees were equally predomi-

nant—"the one, the Senate of the nation. Like the
fatum, "something decreed," than in relation to the impersonal moira, or heimarmene, 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" (aidía tímória kaló̂deẑhetai). 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 would seem that Jos regarded 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 section in Josephus 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 Presentment of angels and spirits (Acts 23 8). From 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 belief in the resurrection is ascribed to the Pharisees.

Another point is that to the bare letter of the Law they added traditions. While the existence of these traditions is admitted to in the Gospels, too little is said to enable us to form a just estimate of them.

4. Traditions Added to their nature and extent (Mt. to the Law 16 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 'Abhùth: "Moses received the [oral] Law from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua and Josua 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-Kadîshoh in Tébaris, 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. Traditions—Less valuable, at times burdensome and burdensome to the Pharisees, was the precept of the Law by the Law. Sometimes the ingenuity of the Pharisaic doctors directed the Pharisees was the precept of the Law by the Pharisees, when they were led to regard 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 prescribed journey of the place he wished to reach, bread and water being included. This person was now to count the days of his house, and consequently from this all distances were to be ceremonially reckoned (Jens Ene. a. w. 'Erub"). The great doctors of the Pharisaic school, like Gau-los, make the whole of their system purely external. An act was right or wrong according to 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. Thus the Pharisaic theory of almsgiving: A man who has an alms-rest of his ass, though he rode on it, and hence did not break the Sabbath law, but if he carried a switch 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 their hair.

6. Close Students of the Text of Scripture. The Pharisees were the chief expositors of the Law. A specimen of Pharisaic exegesis which Paul turns against his 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 Aqeb in the reign of Hadrian to accept Bar-Cocbaeh 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 Hillel 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 Jos. But 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 "Héheru" affords representation of this kind. 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 hâ-
Pharisees
Phassurus

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

bôhêrth 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. Theôbôhêrth (Pharisee) is not to pay money, "tithe," or trûmâh, "heave offering," to a priest who does not belong to their community. They were only permitted to take this oath when their associates in the brotherhood certified to their right of including the candidate. He had to pass through a period of probation of 30 days, according to later "house of Shammai," of a year, according to the "house of Shammah." This latter element, being quite more Talmudic, may be regarded as doubtful. Further exclusion of a person not belonging to the Pharisaic society was put under numerous restrictions. It is at least not improbable that when the lawyer in Lk 10:29 demanded "Who is my neighbor?" he was muted 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 Pal 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 bôhêrth 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, unlike the Moslems, 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 received as, for instance, Poppaea Sabina.

IV. Character of the Pharisees.—Because the ideal of the Pharisees was high, and because they reverenced 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 hâ-ârêc, "the people of the land," was one of the oldest, that 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 Judaea.

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 Kareth. All they had confounded in a large measure to the habits of their heathen neighbours 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 Maccabean struggle, when the ceremonial precepts of the Law could with difficulty be observed. Those who were less careful of these were regarded as 'am hâ-ârêc.

The distinction as exhibited in the Talm shows an arrogance on the part of the Pharisaic bôhêrth that must have been galling to those who, though Jews as much as the Pharisees, were not Puritans like them. The people of the land, a bôhêrth, might not eat at the table of a man whose wife was of the 'am hâ-ârêc, even though her husband might be a Pharisee. If he would be a full bôhêrth, a Pharisee must not sell to any of the 'am hâ-ârêc and this would probably be true of all religion. If a woman of the 'am hâ-ârêc 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 Temple is kept in the New Testament is a reflection of the Pharisaic scrupulosity.

4. The NT. Pharisees exhibited itself was in tithing, hence the reference to their tithing and the phrase "sadducean and hypocrite" (Mt 23:3). In the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, one of the things that the Pharisee prides himself on is that he gives tithes of all that he possesses (Lk 18:12). He is an example of the Pharisaic arrogance of those "who trusted they were righteous and despised others at nought." Their claiming the first seats in feasts 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," poseurs. 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 case of the Pharisees, those who 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 act. 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 arrière-pensée. The succeeding generation, in continuing the practice, conscientiously, as it were, "went in his steps." They have 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 sacrifice, through 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 a condemnation. They fixed a term of reproach 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 Gospel. There were said to be seven classes of Pharisees: (1) the "shoulder" Pharisee, who wears his good deeds on his shoulders; (2) the "preceptor" Pharisee who places the precepts of the Law, using his own principle, but not expediency; (2) the "reader" or "scribe" Pharisees who read time in order to perform a meritorious action; (3) the "bleeding" Pharisee, who does not stop to examine himself, but a woman shuts his eyes and so bruises himself to bleeding by stumbling against a wall; (4) the "painted" Pharisee, who adorns his holiness, but 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 unpleasant 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. Its author, who, according to Josephus, said that the Talmud denounced ostentation; but unconsciously that cost of the Maccabees to its adherents: it commands a 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* not that of the people, as had been their attitude towards 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 criticisms became opposition. This opposition grew in intensity as He disregarded their interpretations of the Subhatic 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 demands of the Pharisaic temple. Not to 1. Pharisees try to use 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 hābber. 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 cajolery failed to win Him and susto question failed to destroy His popularity and with their opponents, 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. It 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.

**Pharos, fā'rosh (תַיְדָש, parash).** See PAROSH.

**PHARPAR, far'par (תַיְדָש, parpar; LXX B, Ἄφραδ, Aphrēdā, Αφαραδή, Phapharos): A river of Damascus, mentioned in 2 K 5 12, along with the Abana or Amann. See ABANA.

**PHARZITES, fār'tīts (תַיְדָש, ha-parash).** See PEREZ.

**PHASEAH, fa-sē'ah, PASEAH, pa-se'a (תַיְדָש, pāśēh, "lame"):**

(1) A descendant of Judah, son of Edson (1 Ch 4 12).

(2) Name of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2 49; Neh 7 51 [AV "Phaseah"]; "Phinom" of 1 Esd 5 31 RV).

(3) Father of Joiada (AV "Jehozada"), the repairer of the "old gate" in Jer 3 6).

**PHASELIS, fa-sē'lis (Φασσίλης, 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 probably 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 coined ceased in 466 BC, but it was resumed about 400 BC when the city again became politically independent. For some 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 considerably 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 roses which was produced. 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.

**PHASIRON, fas'ir-on (A, φασιρών, Phasirôn, B, Φασιρῶν, Phasirōn, V, φασιρῶν, Pharison): The name of an unknown Arab tribe whom Jonathan overcame in the wilderness near Bethshean, or possibly the name of an Arab chief (1 Mac 9 66).

**PHASSARON, fās'sar-ōn: AV=RV PHASHERUS (q.v.).

**PHASSARUS, fas-sar'us, fas'sar-ūs (Φασσάρος, Phassaros, B, Φασσάρος, Phassaros; AV Phassaros, PHASHERUS,
after Aldine): The name of one of the families which went up from exile with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5:25) = "Pashshur" of Ezr 2:38; Neh 7:41; according to Ezr and Neh and RV numbering, 1:247; according to AV following A, 1:047.

**PHEBE**, Ἱακεία (Phoebe, Phoibe). See PHEBE.

**PHENCE,** Ἰάκεία. See PHOEICIA; PHOENIX.

**PHOEICIA**, Ἰακεία (Φοινική, Phoinikē). See PHOEICIA.

**PHERESITES**, φερεσίτες (Phereisites). (1 Esd 8:69; 2 Esd 1:21) = "Pherezites."

**PHEREZITE**, φερεσίτης (Pherezite). AV form in Jth 5:16 for RV "Pheresite" and both AV and RV in 2 Esd 1:21 for "Pherizeite"; one of the Canaanish tribes.

**PHI-BESETH**, φιβιβεσθ (Fibbeoth). See PHI-BESETH.

**PHICOL,** φικόλ (Phicol, Phikol). AV Phichol: The captain of the host of the Phil king Abimelech of Gerar (Gen 21:22; 25:26).

**PHILADELPHIA**, φιλαδελφία (Philadelphia). A city of ancient Lydia in Asia Minor. It was 105 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 Virgil 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, Alad-hehir, is considered by some to be a corruption of the Turkish words Allah-hehir, "the city of God," but more likely it is a name given it from the reddish color of the soil. In addition to all 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 3:7. It was there in the seal as the seat 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 1206 and 1224, 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 his prisoners. Alad-hehir 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 liquorice 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

**PHILARES,** φιλαρές. See PHYLARES.

**PHILEMON,** φίλεμων, φιλέμων (Philémon, Philemon): Among the converts of St. Paul, perhaps while at Ephesus, was one whom he calls a "fellow-worker," Philemon (Phil 1:2). He was probably a man of some means, was celebrated for his hospitality (vs 5, 7) and of considerable importance in the ecclesia at Colossae. It was at his 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 ecclesia. 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 "fellow-soldier." The relationship between the Colossians and Philemon 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.

Tradition makes Philemon the bishop of Colossae (Apos Const, vii, 46), and the Gr Martyrology (Menae) for November 22 tells us that he together with his wife and son and Onesimus were martyred by stoning before Androcles, the governor, in the days of Nerva, Wied a writer of a treatise on martyrs agrees (of Lightfoot, St. Ignatius, III, 535). This evidence, however, is unsatisfactory and cannot be trusted as giving unquestionable facts as to Philemon. The only sure information is that in the ep. bearing his name.

CHARLES SMITH LEWIS

**PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO:** This most beautiful of all St. Paul's Ep., 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 Phils (qv.) stand apart, and was written more probably 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 letter. Certain scholars (Reuss, Schenkel, Weiss, 1. Place of Holtzmann, Hülgenfeld, Hausrat and 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 advanced 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 24 we read that he expected to go to Macedonia, and in Phil 22 ver 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 as probable 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 which Tacitus (Ann. xiv.27) and Eusebius (Chron., i. 207) write, is of force as opposed to the Rom origin of the letter only on the assumption that these writers both refer to the same event (by no means sure) and that the event was written after that event, and that it would be 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 epistle was 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 epistles 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 Ep. was written from Rome, and not from Caesarea.

The value for the epistle is less extensive than that of some of the other epistles, but it is abundantly strong. The play on the word

2. Authenti-

city

(Philem 11) is found in Ignat., Ep. to Polyc. This may not mean necessarily a literary connection, but it suggests this.

The epistle 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, 1. 27), and is quoted by Origen as early as St. Jer. (Hom. in Ps. 109, 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 Phil.) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (Spicil., in Solemn., i. 139), and the epistle was finally established in its earlier firm position. The later attack by Baur was inspired by his desire to break down the corroboration of Philo's other Captivity Ep., and has been criticized by Weiss as one of Baur's worst blunders. The suggestions that it is interpolated (Holtzmann), or allegorical (Weisseker and Phileldeph), or based on Philo (Ep. IX, 21) to Sabinus (Stock), are interesting examples of the vagaries of their authors, because only to be mentioned (2 Cor. 8). In its language, style and argument the letter is clearly Pauline.

The date will, as is the case with the other Captivity Ep., 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 is 'as my brother.' In this way 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 financial responsibility for the amount of his theft. The ease with which Paul, so often quietly refers to 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 epistle 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 over-estimated. 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 hospitality, the son, a man of position and importance in the church, the necessary and going of the Christian brethren, and the life of the brotherhood centering about this household.

LITERATURE.—Lightfoot, Col and Phil.; Vincent, "Phile and Philemon" (ICC), vol. iv; Warneken, Disc. on Phil.; Alexander, in Spalding's Comm.

CHARLES SMITH LEWIS

PHILETUS, fil'i-tus, fil'i-tus (Phil'etos, Philatos) [2 Tim 2:17]: This person is mentioned by Paul, who warns Timothy against him as well as against his associate in error,

1. The Nature of Hymenaeus. The apostle speaks of His Error Hymenaeus and Philetus as instances of men who were doing more serious injury to the church by their teaching and by the views 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, and held that the resurrection was a thing of the past. No resurrection was possible, so they taught, except from ignorance to knowledge, 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 Christ's resurrection. But this faith was utterly denied 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 foundation of ungodliness and every unrighteous desire. It leads 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 leper or gangrenous eat 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 (Phil'etos, Philippos, 'lover of horses')

(1) The father of Alexander the Great (1 Mac 1:1; 6:2), king of Macedonia in 359-356 BC. His influence for peace and wisdom 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 by Antiochus Epiphanes as governor at Jesus (c. 170 BC) and described in 2 Mac 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 Mac 6:11) and taking special measures to check the opposition of Judas Maccabeus (2 Mac 5:8). There is some ground for identifying him with—
PHILIP (Φιλίππος, Philippo): One of the Twelve Apostles. Philip belonged to Bethsaida of Galilee (Jn 1:44; 12:21). Along with Andrew and Nathanael, he was a follower of John the Baptist. He is mentioned as having brought up the son of Antiochus, a present of Antiochus from his youth, and on the death of his father set him up as king under the name of Eupator. The accounts of the rivalries of the regents and of the fate of Philip as recorded in 1 Macc 6:50; 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 Maccabaeus made a league on conditions described (op. cit.). The conflict 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, 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 to 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 notified this to Philip, and he went thence and preached the gospel at Gaza and Philis and other places, and sought to win the hearts of all, both Jews and Gentiles, to the salvation of Christ.
PHILIP, THE GOSPEL OF. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; PHILIP THE EVANGELIST.

PHILIPPI, by-lip'i (Φιλίππος, Philippoi, ethnic Φιλιππαῖος, Philippes), Philippi, Phil 4:15): A city of Macedonia, situated in 41° 5’ N.

1. Position. Int. and Name. Egnatian Road, 33 Rom miles from Amphipolis and 21 from Acastis, in a plain bounded on the E. and N. by the mountains which lie between the rivers Zygactes and Nestus, on the W. by Mt. Pangaeus, on the S. by the ridge called in antiquity Symbolon, 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. 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) andHorace say that Crenides was afterward called Dation, and that this name was changed to Philippi, but this statement is open to question, since Dation, 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 grounds.” Philippi was perhaps only a plain, as we have seen, some 9 miles inland. Many modern authorities, therefore, have placed Dation on the coast at or near the site of Neapolis. On the whole, it seems best to adopt the view of Heuzey (Mission archéologique, 3.22 ff.) that Philippi was not originally a city, but 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 settlers had perhaps been driven out by the Thracians about a century previously, the Thasians in 369 BC founded their colony of Dation with the aid of the exiled Athenian statesman Callistratus, in order to exploit the wealth, both agricultural and mineral, of the region. Philip II, who had ascended the Macedonian throne in 359 BC, possessed 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 inroads. Above all, the mines of the district might meet his most pressing need, that of an abundant supply of gold. The city was subsequently seized in 358, the city was enlarged, strongly fortified, and renamed, the Thasian settlers either driven out or reformed, and the mines, worked with characteristic energy, produced over 1,000 talents a year (Diodorus xvi.8) and enabled Philip to issue a gold coinage both in the West and in his Persian dominions (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 contemporaries were well known that no fortress was impregnable to whose walls an ass laden with gold could be driven. Of the history of Philippi during the next 3 centuries we know practically nothing. Together with the rest of Macedonia, it passed into the Roman hands 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 (vii.331 fr. 41) speaks of Philippi as having sunk by the time of Caesar to a “small settlement” (καρυόπολις μικρόν, kataolkia melēr). In the autumn of 42 BC it witnessed the death-struggle of the Roman 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 that followed the news of Caesar’s death reached Oenone, after 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 soldiers to give battle, his troops were routed and he himself fell on his own sword. Soon afterward Philippi was made a Roman colony with the title Colonia Julia Philippensia. After the battle of Actium (31 BC) the colony was reinforced, largely by Ital parcels of land, and was permitted in order to afford allotments for Octavian’s veterans (Dio Cassius li.4), and its name was changed to Colonia Augusta Julia (Victoris) 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 1 Cor 1:17; 2 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess First Visit 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 range called Symbolon and afterward traveling the Philippian plain. Of his experiences there we have in Acts 16.12-40 a
singularly 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 Pharisees, who had come together for purposes of worship.

One of those was named Lydia, a Gr proserbete from Thyatira, a city of Lydia in Asia Minor, to the church of which she had been conversed. She is described as a "seller of purple" (Acts 16:14), that is, of woolen fabrics dyed purple, for the manufacture of which Thyatira 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 house and her house (ver 15; cf ver 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 oracular utterance. In Acts xiii.11 (of an oracle 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 resented a rich revenue from this lucrative business, and 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 δομοφόρος 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 Roman citizenship, dragged them to the meeting of the attendant lidtiri 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 reminding him of the power of God and the respect in which the apostles were held, set free Paul and Silas and 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 dumpsters 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 lictors to the jailer with orders to release them. Paul refused to accept a dismissal of their case on the ground of the slave girl's legal immunity 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). Demetrius, a member of the city council, and 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 their hosts and encouraging the convicts 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 formations 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 Samaline in Cyprus (Acts 13:5), Antioch in Pisidia (13:14, 43), Iconium (Acts 14:1), Ephesus (18:10, 26), 18:11; Philo, Theophr. Baroco (17, 10). Athens (17:17) and Corinth (18:4). The number of resident Jews was small, their meetings for prayer or services on the Sabbath. The former were mostly or wholly women (16:13), and among them some, perhaps a majority of the Jewish converts, did not hear nothing, nor is there any word of Jews as either inquiring or joining the mob which draged Paul and Silas to the forum. The whole tone of the ep. to this church seems to prove that this at least of this possibility teaching was not being undermined by Judaism. True, there is one passage (Phil 3 2-7) in which Paul denounces "the conclusion," those who had "confidence in the flesh" but it seems "that in this warning he was thinking of Romans more than of Philippi; and that his indignation was aroused by the very word (πάθος) by which there thuram his daily work, than by any actual errors already determining the faith of his distant converts" (Lightfoot). (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 Aulus Celsius describes as "miniatures and pictures of the Rom people" (Noctes Atticae, xiv.13).

In the center of the city is the forum (συγγείο, agorê, ver 19), and the general term "magistrates" (ἀστερεῖον, ἀστερῆς, ἀστερικός, ἀστατικός) is exchanged for the specific title of praetors (ἀρχιπρατηρ, ἀρχιπρατεῖον, ἀρχιπρατικός), vs 20. 22:35.36.38); these officers are attended by lictors (λίκτορας) and by ἐρωμένος, ἐρωμένον, ἐρωμένως, which means that they were the city's only important officials. Of the many offices and customs applicable to the Rome law (vs 20.21), and Paul's appeal to his Roman citizenship (ver 22) was once inspired by his fear for the consequences of their action and made them conciliatory and apologetic (vs 38.39). The title of praetor borne by these officials has caused some difficulty. The supreme magistrates of Rom colonies, two in number, were called duumvirs or duumviri (duo trans), and that this title was in use at Philippi is proved by three inscriptions (Orelli, No. 3746; Hessey, Mission archéologique, 15, 127). 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 lege agraria H.34; Horace Sat. 1. 5, 34; Orelli, No. 3739).

(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 5th to the 1st person in ver 10 marks the point at which Luke comes in as the apostle, and the same criterion leads to the conclusion that Luke remained with Silas while Paul set out for Philippi and his third visit to the city (see below). Ramsay's hypothesis would explain (a) the fulness and vividness of the narrative (Acts 16.17) and (b) the concentration on the importance of Silus (ver 12); and the fact that Paul recognized Silus in the man whom he saw in his vision, although there is no hint in the text that 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, Ramsey, op. cit. 380 f.).

(4) Much discussion has centered round the de-

scription of Philip given in Acts 16 12. The reading of ἸΣΑϹ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ, (E.S.V., R.V., etc., is,

τῆς ἐν τῷ τέμνε τοὺς αἰγυπτιακοῖς τῶν κοινωνίων. Μετὰ ἐντὸς τῆς μετὰς Μακεδονίας πώλει κολονία. But it is doubtful whether Macedonias is to be taken with the words which precede or with that which follows, and further the sense derived from the phrase is unsatis-

factory. For πῶλει must mean either (1) first in political importance and rank, and to which the apostle paid a second visit. But the capital of the province was Thessa-

lia, and if he paid the second visit to the capital, most of the 4 districts into which Macedonia had been divided in 168 BC (though there is no evidence that that division survived at this time), Amphipolis was its capital and was apparently its most important city, though destined to be outstripped by Philippi somewhat later. Nor is the other rendering of πῶλει (adopted, e.g., by Lightfoot) more natural. It supposes that Luke reckons Amphipolis as the boundary of Macedonia as lying between Philippi and its seaport: moreover, the remark is singularly pointless; the use of εἰς rather than ἐν is against this view, nor is πῶλει found in this sense without any qualifying phrase. Lastly the πῶλει in this position suggests natural B and it is placed after, instead of before, μετὰ, while D (which is in accordance with B) reads εἰς τῆς μετὰς Μακεδονίας, κεῖται πώλει τῆς Μακεδονίας. Of the emendations which have been suggested, we may notice three: (a) for μετὰς Μακεδονίας "a chief city of Pierian Mac-

edonia"; (b) for πῶλει τῇς we may read πῶλει, "which has a seaport, city of Macedonia"; (c) πῶλει may be regarded as a later insertion and struck out of the text, in which case the whole phrase will mean, "which has a seaport, city of Macedonia of first rank" (though not necessarily the first city).

Paul and Silas, then, probably accompanied by Timothy (who, however, is not expressly mentioned in Acts between 16 1 and 17 14), left Philippi for Thessalonica, but Luke Later Visits Macedonia (Acts 17 2, 14) then remained behind, for the "see" of Acts 16 19-17 16 does not appear again until 20 5, when Paul is once more leaving Philippi on his last journey to Jerusalem. The presence of the evangelist during the intervening 5 years may have had much to do with the strength of the Philippian church and its steadfastness in persecution (2 Cor 8 2; Phil 1 29.30). Paul himself did not revisit the city until, in the course of his third mis-

sionary journey, he returned to Macedonia, pre-

ceded by Timothy and Erastus (after a stay of over 2 years) (Acts 19 22). Acts 19 20. Here we do not definitely know that he visited Philippi on this occasion, but of the fact there can be little doubt, and it was probably there that he awaited the coming of Titus (2 Cor 2 13; 7 5.6) and wrote his 2 Cor. Philippi, while he was staying in Thessalonica, spending 3 months in Greece, whence he intended to return by sea to Syria, he was led by a plot against his life to change his plans and return through Macedonia (Acts 20 5). The last place at which he stopped before crossing to Asia was Philippi, where he spent the days of unleavened bread, and from (the seaport of) which he sailed in company with Luke to Troas, where seven of his companions were awaiting him (20 4.6). It seems unlikely that Paul paid at least one further visit to Philippi in the interval between his first and second imprisonments. That he hoped to do so, he himself tells us (Phil 2 24), and the journey to Macedonia mentioned in 1 Tim 1 3 would probably include a visit to Philippi, while if, as many authorities hold, 2 Tim 4 13 refers to a later stay at Troas, it may well be connected with a further and final tour in Macedonia. But the intercourse between the apostle and this church of his founding was not limited to these rare visits. During Paul's first stay at Philippi he had already written to them on two occasions from the Philippian Christians (Phil 4 16), and their kindness had been repeated after he left Macedonia for Greece (2 Cor 11 9; Phil 4 15). Again, during his first imprisonment at Rome the Philippians sent a gift by the hand of one of their number, Epaphroditus (Phil 2 25; 4 10.14-19), who remained for some time with the apostle, and finally, after a serious illness which nearly proved fatal (2 27), returned home bearing the letter of thanks which has survived, addressed to the Philippian converts by Paul and Timothy (1 1). The latter intended to visit the church shortly afterward in order to bring back to the im-

prisoned apostle an account of its welfare (2 19.23), but we do not know what actually was carried out or not. We cannot, however, doubt that other letters passed between Paul and this church besides the one which is extant, though the only reference to them is a disputed passage of Poly-

carp's Epistle to the Philippians (iii.2), where he speaks of "letters" (ἐπιστολάς) as written to them by Paul (but see Lightfoot's note on Phil 3 1).

After the death of Paul we hear but little of the church or of the town of Philippi. Early in the 2d cent. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, was

5. Later History of the Church condeemed as a Christian and was taken to Rome to be thrown to the wild beasts. After passing through Philadelphia, Smyrna and Troas, he reached Philippi. The Bishop of Macedonia then asked him every mark of affection and respect, and after his departure wrote a letter of sympathy to the Antiochene church and another to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, requesting him to send them copies of any letters of Ignatius which he possessed. This request Polycarp fulfilled, and at the same time sent a letter to the Philippians full of encouragement, advice and warning. From it we judge that the condition of the church as a whole was satisfactory, though a certain presbyter, Valens, and others were severely censured for their avarice which belied their Christian profession. We have a few records of bishops of Philippi, whose names are attached to the decisions of the councils held at Sardica (344 AD), Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), and the see appears to have outlived the city itself and to have lasted down to modern times (Le Quien, Oriens Christ., I, 70; Neale, Holy Eastern Church, I, 92). Of the destruction of Philippi no account was given by Dio. The city appears to have been buried in that of the Turkish hamlet Filiobajik, but the site is now uninhabited, the nearest village being that of Rakhtcha among the hills immediately to the N. of the ancient acropolis. This latter and the plain around it (737-2-3) have been the subject of systematic excavation has yet been undertaken. Of the extent remains the most striking areas are portions of the Hellenic and Hellenistic fortification, the scanty vestiges of the theatre, the ruin known among the Turks as Derelid, 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).
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I. PAUL AND THE CHURCH AT PHILIPPI.—Paul was on his second missionary journey in the year 52 AD. It is believed that he first visited Philippi shortly after his missionary journeys had been delayed 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 second 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 open to them, and in three days they came to Philippi, a journey of some 8 miles. There was no Jewish congregation in Philippi, and the little company of Jews gathered for Sabbath worship at “a place of prayer” (προσευχῆ, θητεία, Acts 16:13), about a mile to the W. of the city gate on the shore of the river Gangites (see PROSEUCHA). Paul and his companions addressed 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 Roman citizens and besought them to leave the city (Acts 16:6-40). Paul had had his first experience of a Roman scourging and of lying in the stocks of a Roman prison at Philippi, yet 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 Church at Philippi seemed 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 writing to Corinth, he sent a letter to the Corinthians and being in doubt as to the spirit in which it would be received, he appointed a meeting with Titius in Macedonia, and probably spent the anxious days of his waiting at Philippi. If he met Titius 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, but in his absence (1 Cor 16:15). 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 into the Christian faith, and she is a 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. to two women who held 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. Paul complains to them that their quarrel was 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 set up their own tables, and in some of the other communities, 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 money to the work of the Christian church, and there had 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.

Haugerth declares that the Macedonians represented the “nobest and soundest part of the ancient world.” Here was none of the shuffling and the indecision of the Aristocrats of the Jerseys or the vanity and the uncertain levity of the Greek communities. They were men of sterner mold than 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.

III. ADDRESS TO THE ROMAN CONGREGATION.—The historical and theological, local and general, have been considered. What shall we say of the spiritual in Philippi? Two characteristics are apparent. First, the Christian church in Philippi are, like the Romans themselves, firm in their faith. The individual members are firm and the church itself is firm. We find the Christian church in Philippi firm in its faith. (1) It adheres firmly to the apostles’ teaching and the tradition of the church. (2) It adheres firmly to the apostles’ teaching and the tradition of the church. (3) It adheres firmly to the apostles’ teaching and the tradition of the church.

IV. OCCASION, DATE AND WRITING OF THE EPISTLE.

V. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

VI. LITERATURE.
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 they would enter before they die (3:14). He asks the Philippians to keep even, solidly step by step with him in the Christian walk (3:16). These metaphors have been adopted by an athletic and military race, and they bear their testimony to the high regard which Paul has for the Philippian Christianity and the great honor in which he lives it was displayed. We do not know the names of many of these men, for only Clement and Epaphroditus mention that we gather them together by 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, and one of these is a Jewess, another a Jew, 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, Euodia 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. They 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 liberahty (2 Cor 8:2).

Surely 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 amount to which they affect the position of one's material possessions, if one measure of Christianity in Christ's coming, that is, if all the Philippians may well stand supreme among the saints in the Pauline churches, Paul seems to have loved them and blessed them enough to follow them in his contribution toward his support. Elsewhere he refused and held aloof and stoutly refrained to his own end 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 engaging personality of the apostle was removed from their sight. It was a special 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 the Philippians had not. They continued, just as they had in the time of the mission, to maintain the support of the apostle and 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 Epp. of Peter are. It is a simple letter to personal friends. It has no theological discussions and no rigid outline and no formal style. It rambles along just as any real letter would with personal news and personal feelings and outbursts of personal affection before tried friends. It is the most spontaneous and unaffected of the Pauline Epps. It is a personal letter rather than any of the others addressed to the churches.

It is a letter of love. All of the other epp. have mixed feelings manifest in them. Sometimes a feeling of grief and of indignation is dominant, as in 2 Cor. Sometimes the predominant desire of Paul in his writing is 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. But here 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 very 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 pen is triumphant 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, unclouded, and unqualified hope. He has removed from the first, he loves them to the end.

It is a letter of joy. It was Bengel who said, Summa epistolae; gaudeo, gaudeo, "The sum of the ep. is, I rejoice; rejoice ye." Paul was a man whose spirits were un- joy daunted 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 arder. 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 some Gentile people had been 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 had succeeded in getting him into prison and keeping him there for years. Perhaps Kneucker, Hultig, Hengel, and Frenzel were right, and 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 elephant 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, "The eye of the Lord is on them, that they may be accounted unto a people." For an Englishman, who was free to do and to 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 lost, but his hope was not.

It is of great importance theologically. It is one of the paradoxes to which this passage has given rise. Paul's writings that simplest of his letters, most epistolary and most personal in form, should yet contain the fullest and most important putting of the theology shaped in the experience and education that 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" (2:5-11). It is the most theological passage in the ep. 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 miracle of the redemption, the certainty of the exaltation, and the sure hope of the universal adoration in the end. The most vital and most important teaching of Christianity is definitely formulated for all time. Jesus was a real man, a man of the commonwealth, of the common life, in whom would be inconsistent with real and true humanity, but in whole-hearted surrender of sacrifice submitting to The Father, the Son of Man, which was more necessary to the very life of the human incarnate conditions. He was equal with God, but He emptied Himself of the omnipotence and the omnipresence and the omniscience and the omnibenevolence of the Divine. He was 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 equal footing. 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 on the subject of Christ and the kingdom.

IV. Genuineness of the Epistle.—The genuineness of the ep. is generally admitted today. It was in the Codex Vaticanus, a manuscript of the 4th century, and a Muratorian Fragment. It is found in both the Pesh and Syriac versions. It was quoted by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, quoted in the letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, in the Ep. of Diognetus, and in the writings of Tertullian and Clement. Paul's signature was a determining factor upon its authenticity. He declared that it was not dictated by another, and that he had written it himself (1 Cor. 15:32), and that it was full of shallow imitations of these. He said it had no apparent motive and no connected argument and only a loose chain of thought (Phil. 4:9-10). In these Epistles, some of the historical data and suspected gnostic influence in certain places, an entirely different character. They are partly derived from a perverted interpretation of certain passages in the ep.; they partly rested upon arbitrary harmonizations; and they were so weak that it hard to believe that he could have attached any importance to them himself. It is not surprising that few critics have been found willing to follow Baur's leadership at this point. Biederman, Jülicher, Holzmann, Tischendorf, etc., have not mentioned among them. The genuineness of the ep. has been defended by Weissacker, Schenkel, Schiel, Hengel, Harnack, Holtzmann, Mangold, Lipsius, Renan, Godet, Zahn, Davidson, Lightfoot, Parzer, Farrar, and all of the English writers on the subject. Weissacker says that the reasons for attributing the ep. to the apostle Paul are "very strong." It is not in the least surprising that anyone else would or could have produced this name a large amount of material, or ecclesiastical motive can be discovered, and in which the personal element so largely predominates and the manner of its composition is so highly consistent with great vividness and fidelity. The ep. deserves to rank alongside of the other great epistles, and Romans, Colossians, and Thessalonians, 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 (L 7.13.14.17). He was for 2 years a prisoner in Caesarea (Acts 24:27). Paul and others have been imprisonment under the name of "the prisoner" (Paul or Peter was written during this imprisonment; but the references to the prætorian guard and the members of Caesar's household have led most critics to conclude that the Rom imprisonment was the one to which the ep. refers. Philem, Col and Eph were also written during the Rom imprisonment, and these three form a group by themselves. Paul is evidently separated from them by some interval. Was it written earlier or later than they? Bleek, Lightfoot, Sanday, Hort, Beet and others think that the ep. to the Phil was written prior to the ep. to the Col. Others agree with Zahn, Ramsay, Findlay, Shaw, Vincent, Jülicher, Holtzmann, Weiss, Godet, and others, who argue for the writing of Paul 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 Philip- pi 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 2 years or greater or less. It was stated by Herod that the distance between the two cities was some 700 miles. Communication was entirely by sea, the most usual route between Rome and Brundusium and across the narrow straits there to the Egyptian Way, which led directly to Philippi. There were many more necessary to the visitor; one would occupy a month at least, and the four journeys suggested in the ep. were not in direct succession. (2) Paul says that the Rom imprisonment had been known throughout the whole prætorian guard (1:13). It must have taken some time for this to become possible. 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 (1:15-17). 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 dedication to the Philippians in this ep. He would surely have done so if he had been with Paul at the time of its writing. It is difficult to believe that Paul wrote the ep. to the Colossians, and so was Demas (Col 4:14). In this ep. Paul promises to send Timothy to Philippi, and says, "I have no one like you, the only helper, my heart's desire, the one who owns your state" (2:20). This must mean that Arístarchus, 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 complete freedom (Phil. 4:2). He did not have a case of imprisonment at Rome, living in his own hired house and accessible to all persons (Phil. 1:19-20). The prison has now been removed, possibly to the guardroom of the praetorium of Caesarea. Here he was in more rigorous confinement, in want and in bonds. (6) Paul mentions some incident which would be decided soon (23:24). He seems to be facing a martyr's death, but he expressed himself and then to be at liberty to do further missionary work. This was not in harmony with what we find in the other ep., and therefore they would seem to be earlier
Christ, and chooses the lesser blessings in pure unselfishness in the sense that the spiritual lives of their choice are radically different; and Paul lives with rejoicing while Hamlet lives in despair and in shame. The apostle was a soldier, but he would rather live than die before his work was done.

(4) His example (vs 27-30): Paul was a Roman citizen and so were they. He tried to live worthy of his citizenship and was worthy of it. He 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 asparted by the adversaries. Let them follow his example. They were engaged in the same conflict. To them he said, "Beloved, see that, whether you 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, Paul said, "know 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): (a) in the repudiation of all confidence in the flesh (vs 1-7): There are certain things that Paul did not belong to the old Jewish persuasion who gloried in the flesh. Paul does not impugn the confidence of the Corinthians of their perfection. He longs for them and prays that they have confidence in the Lord. They may be wise to discriminate among the most excellent things and that they may be able to choose the very best, until they are filled with the fruits of righteousness. Paul calls them the enemies of Christ, unto the glory and the praise of God. (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 by his evangelism. He has been chained as a soldier, but that has given him many opportunities for personal and private and prolonged conversation. When the people have gathered to hear the guard has listened perforce; and when the crowd was gone, more than once the soldier has seemed curious and interested and they have talked on about the Christ. Paul has told his experience over and over to these men, and his story has been carried through the entire camp. (9) His tolerance (vs 15-18): Not only has the gospel found unexpected havoc evil work in the past, but it has gone 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 brethren in Christ. "In every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." (2: 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 answer to the secret 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 chooses 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. Plotinus blushed that he had a body. The Church, Paul says, should honor 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 humification. It bound Him to the earth. It weakened when He was on the cross, He says, and He needed strength. Paul says that our bodies are like the body of Jesus of Nazareth now, and they shall be like the body of Christ when He appears 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 sidelights thrown upon the character of the apostle who had taught and preached and practised these things.

That 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 rare in their ability to sacrifice 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 friends began to love them. They could depend upon him. (b) His sympathy for men and all good women and his desire that they live in peace (ver 23): The true yoke-fellow mentioned here cannot be identified now. He has been variously identified by that of the Epaphras, Barnabas, Luke, Silas, Timothy, Peter, and Christ. There was a strong, according to the translators, of either Gen- silus 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 phrase in the O.F. He called it "courtesy." It is a combination of forbearance and graciousness, of modesty and courtesy, of consideration and esteem such as was characteristic of Paul. Paul had it. There was a sweet reasonableness about him that made his personality unique and attractive, as (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. (f) His habitual high thinking (ver 8): All that was worthy in the ideals of the Greco philosophers Paul made the staple of his thought. He delighted in them as something admirable and just and pure and lovely and of good report. He knew that virtue was in these things and that all praise belonged to them. He had lived by it and the whole mind was filled with these things he lived in serenity and peace.

(8) Thanks for their gift (4 10-20). (9) Salutations (4 21.22). (10) Benediction (4 23). This is not a theological ep. and therefore it is not an esp. Christological one. Yet we count the number of chapters in Paul's first letter, 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 ep.


PHILISTIA, fli-sists'ia:-The country is referred to under various designations in the OT: viz. מֹלֶשֶׂה (Philistia) (Ps 60 8 [Heb 10]; 87 4), פֶּלֶשׁיתִים, 'ereq p'lishthim, "land of the Philistines" (Gen 21 32.34), פִּלְשִׁיתִים (Heb 19 9), פֵּלֶשֶׂה pa'lishth; LXV get ton Philistian, "the regions of the Philistines" (Josh 13 2). The Egypt monuments have Pithathu, Pulsath (Buqei), Pleset (Breasted), and Patast (Hegg), according to the different vowelings of the radicals; the Assyr form is Palastu or Pilita, which corresponds very closely to the Egypt and the Heb. The extent of the land is indicated in Josh 13 2 as being from the Shihor, or Brook of Egypt (RV), to the border of Ekron, and from the borders of Egypt in the south to the Philistian border on the line of Beth-shemesh (1 S 6 9) with the sea on the W. It was a very small country, from 25 to 30 miles in length and with an average width of about half the length, but it was fertile, being an extension of the plain of Sharon, except that along the coast high sand dunes encroached upon the cultivated tracts. It contained many towns and villages, the most important being the five so often mentioned in Scripture: Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Gath, and Ekron. The population must have been large for the territory, which enabled them to contend successfully with the Israelites, notwithstanding the superiority of position in the hills to the advantage of the latter. H. Porter

PHILISTIM, fli-sistsim, fil'lis-tim (פִּלְשִׁיס, p'lish-tim [Gen 10 14 AV]). See Philistines.

side by side with Mongols (see Hittites) at least as early as the time of Moses. It is very likely therefore that this reading is correct.

According to the OT and monuments alike, the Philistines were a Sem people, who worshipped two god, Dagon (1 S 5 2) and Ashitaroth (30 10), and were conquered by the very early Israelites (Judg 1), Babylonians, both, however, having names of Akkadian and not of Sem origin. In Sem speech 1 and 2; for this reason so understood stood in the time of Philo of Gebla, a Gr-Phoen writer who attributed the origin of the name of these god, the original name was Dagon, and in Akkadian de la "the upper part of a man," and gula (Turkish goda) means "the large fish." The name Dagon was well known to the Assyrians, and is represented in cuneiform by: with Sennacherib's worship of Ea, the sea-god, when he embarked on the Pera Gulf. Thus Dagon was probably a title of Ea ("the water spirit"), called by Herodotus "Acheron, lord of the fish," and said to have issued from this same Gulf. We consequently read that when the statue of Dagon at Asdod fell (1 S 4 4), its head and hands were broken off, and only "the great fish" was left. In 1574 the present writer found a seal near Asdod representing a bearded god (as in Babylonians) with a fish tail (see Dagon). As to Ash- toretah, who was adored in Philistia itself, her name is derived probably from the Akkadian ister ("light maker") a name for the moon-goddess and—later—for the planet Venus (see Astarte).

The Philistines had reached Gerar by the time of Abraham, and it was only in the age of the Hyksos ruled by the Delta, Can, tribes, who could be described as akin, not only to the individual Babylonians, but also to certain tribes Philistines in Egypt, a circumstance which favors the antiquity of the ethnic chapter, commerce, and even of the cities of Philistia. We have 9 Philis names in the OT, all of which seem to be Sem, including Abimelech—"Moloch is my father"—(Gen 20 18; 28 22 26; 5 11) at Gerar, S.E. of Gaza, Ahaziah ("possession," Gen 20 26), and Phicol of Cush ("delight", with Dagon). Igs 16 4, Goliath, (probably the Bab gula, "great"), and Saph (2 S 21 18), perhaps meaning "increase." These two brothers were sons of Pharaoh ("the tall") but Ishi-benob (ver 16), another of the families, perhaps only means "the dweller in Nob" (Beit Nabi, N. of Gezer). The king of Gath in David's time was Achish ("the gift" in Bab), who (1 S 27 2) was the son of Maouch, "the oppressor." According to LXX, Jonathan killed an Philis (1 S 13 34, where AV reads "a garrison"). If this is correct the name (meaning "pillar") would also be Sem.

Besides these personal names, and those of the cities of Philistia which are all Sem, we have the title given to Philis lords, goren, which LXX renders "Lord" and "ruler" and which probably comes from a Sem Circum- scision meaning "to command." It con- stantly applies to the rulers of Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath and Ekron, the 5 chief cities of Philistia. The fact that the Philis were unincoruscenced does not prove that they were not a Sem people. Herodotus (ii.104) says that the Phoenicians acknowledged that they took this custom from the Egyptians, and the Arabs according to the passage of Eusebios, or is it known that this was a custom of the Babylonians and Assyrians. The LXX translators of the Pent always render the name Philistiaem, and this also is found in 8 passages of Josh and Jgs, but in the later books the name is t4 as meaning "strangers" throughout, because they were not the first inhabitants of Philistia.

The Philis conquered the "downs" (gitalah, Joel 3 4) near the seacoast, and were so powerful at the time of the Heb conquest that none of their great towns would be taken. While the Bible of the time of Samson (about 1158 BC) they appear as oppressors of Israel for 40 years (Jgs 13 1; 15 20), having encroached from their plains into the Shphelah (or low hills) of Judah, at the foot of the mountains. The mountain of the Philis 5. History was woman, living in the valley of Sorek, in the OT close to Samson's home. In the last to Death year of Eli (1 S 4 1) we find the Philis Saul attacking the mountains near Mizpeh, where they captured the Ark. Samuel drove them back and placed his monument of victory between Mizpeh and Jeshanah (Shen; see LXX; 1 S 7 12) on the mountain ridge of Benjamin. He even regained towns in the Shphelah as far as Ekron and Gath (ver 14), but at the opening of Saul's reign (10 5) the Philis were under the Gibeon—or a chief named Hasib according to LXX. They raided from this center (13 17-23) in all directions, and prevented the Hebrews from arming themselves, till Jonathan drove them from Michmas (14 1-47). David's victory (17 2) was won in the Valley of Elah E. of Gath, and the pursuit (ver 52) was as far as Ekron. We here read that the Philis champion wore armor of bronze (vs 4-7), his spear head being of iron. They still invaded the Shphelah after this defeat, ravaging the threesholds of Keilah (23 1) near Adullam at the foot of the Hebron Mountains (see 23 27 34 1). David's band of outlaws gradually increasing from 400 to 600 men (22 2 27 2), being driven from the Jeb lands, accomplished him to the plain of Philis (?) where he placed at Tell es-Sâfi, at the point where the Valley of Elah extends toward the Philis plain. It appears that Achish, king of Gath, then ruled as far as Ziklag (Josh 10 31; 1 S 27 6) in the Beerseba plains; but he was not aware of the Philis raids at this distance. Achish supposed David to be committed to his cause (27 12), but the Philis lords suspected him and his Jeb followers (29 3) when going up to Jearas.

After they had killed Saul, we hear no more of them till the 5th year of David, when, after taking Jerus, he apparently went down to Adullam (2 S 17) and fell upon them in their rear as they advanced to the mountains. Deliah was a Philis woman, whom the Philis smote as far as Gaza (2 K 18 8) before 702 BC, in which year (accord- ing to the Taylor cylinder) Sennacherib made Hez- kiah deliver up Padi, king of Ekron, who had been carried prisoner, "The accounts it Ch refer to David's taking Gath (1 Ch 18 1), which was recovered later, and again taken by Uzziiah (2 Ch 26 6). The Philis sent gifts to Jehoshaphat (17 11), but invaded the Shphelah (28 18) in the time of Ahaz.

In this age the "lords" of the 5 cities of Philistia are called "kings," both in the Bible and on Assyrian monuments. Isaiah (2 6) speaks of the Philis superstitions, Ezekiel (25 15 16) connects them with the Cherehthim on the seacoast. They still held Gath in the time of Amos (6 2), and Gaza, Ashdod and Ekron in that of Zephaniah (2 5), who again mentions the Cherehthim with Philis, as inhabitants of Canaan or the "land of the Philis." The last notice (Zec 9 6) still speaks of kings in Askelon, Gaza, Ekron and Ashdod at a time when the Ionians had become known in Judah (ver 13); but the Philis are unnoticed by Ezra or Nehemiah, unless we suppose that the "speech of Ashdod" (Ezra 4 11) and their "land of the Canaanites in general in earlier times—to have resembled that of the Babylonians and Assyrians,
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 Egypt. Scarabs as old as the XIIth Dynasty were found, and in the 15th cent. BC Gezer was held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this kind 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 1450 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Rosh 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 held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this kind 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 1450 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Rosh 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 held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this kind 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 1450 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Rosh 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 held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this kind 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 1450 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Rosh 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 held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this kind 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 1450 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Rosh 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 was not Sem. Aryan—invaders of the country, arriving about 1200 BC, they appear not only to contradict the Bible, but also to contra-
we have seen, placed Caphtor in Cappadocia. The Cherethites and the Gittites (1 S 14) as a people of Philistia (ver 16), near Ziklag, and their name probably survives at the present town called Keratyhe in the Philin plain.

Yet, many theories are founded on this old idea about the Choridites. Some suppose that Tachitus confused the Jews with the Philistians, whereas the name comes from Crete; but what he actually says (Hist. v.11) is that "the Jews ran away from the Philistians and took "the inhabitants of Diadi from Mt. Ida, which, with a barbarous augment, becomes the name of the Jeadan." This absurd derision shows at least that Tachitus does not mean the Philis. Stephen of Byzantium said that the god Marnu and his shrine were called Kret, and their tradition was that they had seen the huge statue of a seated Jove found near Gaza, and now at Constantinople, but this is late Gr work, and the name Kret is Sem. Stephanus thought that Minuee—the port of Gaza—was named from the Cretan Minus, though it is an Arab, word Minueh, 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 contra-
diction of the Bible. Yet these theories that, in later times the supposed Caphtor of Homer's Iliad, 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 Cret seems somewhat resembles them. There are many indications that this figure—painted on the wall of the later palace—is not older than about 500 BC, and the Sidonians had colonies in Crete, where also potters have been known, and marked by a Phoen inscription in Cyprus. The Kefau youths bring vases as presents, and these—in all their details—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 (238 BC), the Kef region is said to be "Phoeinica," and the Gr translator naturally knew what was written by the Ecphraxes of Kef in Sem. In fact it is the Sem word for "palm," occurring in Heb (Isa 9 14; 19 15), and thus applicable to the "palm" land, Phoeinicia. Thus, even if Kef were related to Caphtor, the evidence would place the Phili home on the Phoeinician coast. The Kef الأوكة had indeed no evidence that any European race settled near the coasts of Pal before about 600 BC, when Esharhadon speaks of Gr kings in Cyprus. The Cretan theory of Michælis was a literary conjecture, which has been disproved by the results of exploration in Asia.

IV. David's Guards.—Another strange theory, equally old, represents David as being surrounded with foreign mercenaries—Philis and Canaries or Carian mercenaries. The suggestion that the Cherethites were of this race is scarcely worth notice, since the Heb ḫaph is not represented by žg 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 (khrethi, in sing) and "the Peleti (pirēthi), commanded by the latter Jehodea (2 S 18 15; 18 7; 1 K 1 35 44), together with the Gittites under Itai of Gath. These guards are never said to have been Philis, but "the Cherethi" is supposed to design the Cherethites tribe, and "the Peleti" to be another name for the Phelites. In 2 S 23 29, where the Gittites, the fact that they 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 Itai an "enemy" and an "exile," but it is probable that he was the same hero, named (2 S 23 29), who was the son of Ribai from Gibeah of Benjamin. He had himself not long joined David, being no doubt in exile at Gath, and his tribe at first opposed David, taking the side of Eshbuh. When Itai was joined the Cherethi and Peleti 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 Philis; 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 Jehodea (2 K 11 4) would have admitted foreign mercenaries into the temple. In this passage they are called כַּרִית, as also in 2 S 20 23, where LXX has Chereethi. The suggestion of Wellhausen that they were of Carians does not seem probable, and Carians 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 powerful king—was not likely to 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 "Chereethi" (k'rethi, or k'rethi) is formed from the place name. It is passed to "pelerithi" (pirēthi) means "a swift one" or "pursuer." In the time of Josiah the temple-guards are called כַּרִית (2 K 11 4-19, Carites), which LXX treats as either sing. or pl., and ṭוּרֶם or "runners" (see 1 S 22 17; 1 K 14 27: 22; 2 K 10 25), these two bodies perhaps answering to the Cherethi and Peleti of David's time; for כַּרִית means "stammerer." The term ṭוּרֶם, or "runners," is however of general application, since Jehu also had troops so called (2 K 10 25). We have seen that these were not a body of troops—as among the Romans—the heavier regiment of "destroyers," or "stammers," being armed with swords, daggers or spears; while the "swift ones" or "runners" pursued the defeated foe. Thus in Egypt the same name, the runners, are mentioned 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 Tighlath-pileser III representing an Assyrian soldier on a camel. The Peleti 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 Jered (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 acquired this title through the Philistines of "destroyers" or Cherethim, who were not Cre-

than, it would seem, any more than the "stammers" were Carians.
The general result of our inquiry is, that all monumental notices of the Philis agree with the statements, which make them to 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, possibly 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 Rom empire, and the prominence of Philo's family is attested by the fact that his brother, Alexander Lyonsachus, 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 grievances which included specifically dissent from worship of himself. Philo records his distaste for political activity, and, so far as we know, the Rom 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 Rom imperial system, but also the beginning of the end of ancient classical civilization in its dominant ideas, and the plantation of Christianity. Prominently an era of transition, it was marked by significant displacements in culture, the effect of which was to weaken the old 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 Rom 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 circumscribed 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 interpret the inner spirit of his age. The "universalism" of the Rom empire has been so named because, within the political framework, various peoples and divergent civilizations mingled and came eventually to share something of 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 they were, permeating cultures which otherwise were so far apart, 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 perspectives, 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. On the other, he was a man fallen upon iniquity, 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, involved similar almost identical. He thus represented an eclectic standpoint, one 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 and tudes, 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 poietic myths. Philo reduces it to an expert art, and uses it as an instrument to dissipate all difficulties. 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 the spiritual reality, a 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 theology in his mind, in the midst of 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.

4. Changes and New Problems

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 penetrated intellectual supers" 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 God's laws, 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, not simply in his fresh pedagogical difficulties 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 immeasurable. He was 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 ineradicable 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 distant tendencies of rational 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 factors: and this was done not as 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 thought.

3. Subjects of Inquiry

Philosophy's three main subjects of inquiry are: (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 school, is hazy, yet dualistic. No doubt, it is determined largely by certain human analogies.

(2) God's relation to the world—At this point Philo's thought assumes a phase of great interest. A relation to the NT. It would seem that Philo's thought was influenced by the Hellenistic psychological notion, that a word was a "shadow" or "image" of a thing. Thus the Logos was called the "shadow of God."—God being the "deed" whereby the "shadow" is cast. As a direct issue, the Logos presents two aspects. On the one side
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 the "Word of God," "Wisdom of God," "Mediator," the "Ransom," the "Image of God," "Member of the Trinity," "High Priest." The external Logos "abides in man," is the "Prophet," "Shepherd," "Ambassador," "Artist," "Elder," "Interpreter," "Manifestation 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 G r dualism. Philo attempted to combine the two tendencies, and was able consequently to face the obvious contradiction between the idea of a material mediator and the Logos as a perfect type of 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. But the Logos embraces everything 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 sufficiently realize the idea of the soul, 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 its purity unalloyed. 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 humanity never cleared. In so far as Philo needs the Logos to connect God with the world, he inclines 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. 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 never cleared. 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 an "intelligible world," as a concept, there is 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 the Logos 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, as the only medium for its action, is 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 must note the effect of the Stoic idea. When he 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 the "fair man" is "given" the throne of God. 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 comprehended the meaning of the word "Divine." 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 "form" of the world, reason is a "manifestation of 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 conflict of external 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 Roman embassy. They show how he tried to apply for philosophical conceptions to Jewish beliefs, history, and usages exclusively. The voluminous re-
PHILOLOGUS, βιολογός (Φιλολόγος, Philo-
logos, "fond of learning," "learned") was 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. Philo-
logus and those united with him in this salutation formed by themselves one of the "Christian
oracles," groups or circles in the Christian community. The name is found in inscriptions connected with the imperial house, with reference to one of which Bishop Lightfoot has the following note: It has been suggested that Philologus was given by the master to the freedman mentioned in this
inscription, as being appropriate to his office [Fried-
länder 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, φιλομήτωρ. See PTOLEMY VI.

PHILOSOPHY, φιλοσοφία (philosophia, philo-
soφία):

1. Definition and Scope
   (1) Intuitive Philosophy
   (2) Speculative Philosophy

2. Greek Philosophy
   (1) Philosophy in OT and Judaism
      (1) Of Nature
      (2) Of History
   (3) Alexandrian
   (4) Christianity of the NT
      (1) The Teaching of Jesus Christ
      (2) Apostle Teaching
   (3) Attitude of popular classes toward Philosophy

LITERATURE

Only found in Col 2 8; lit. the love and pursuit of
knowledge. In its technical sense, the term is now 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 applied to a wish for experience, or parts of experience, however
obtained, whether by revelation, intuition or uncon-
scious speculation. No hard-and-fast line can be
drawn between the two kinds of philosophy. Some of the most ancient
speculations, 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 kind of speculation. From the lowest animism and fetichism up to
the higher religions, ideas are found which served men as explanations of those features of experience
which attracted their attention. They were often regarded as given by vision or by
some method of revelation. In the higher religions, the
mind reflected upon these ideas, and elaborated them into systems of thought that bear some re-
semblance 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 Babylonia enshrined in their legends
theories of the world and of man and his institutions.
In India, both the Vedanta and the school of
Mysticism developed into pantheistic Brahmanism, 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
reaction, and led to the pessimistic and nihilistic
philosophy of Buddhism. In Persia, when Zoroas-
trian consciousness awoke earlier, and the attempt
to systematize the multiplicity of polytheism issued in
the dualistic philosophy of later Zoroastranism.
The whole range of natural and supernatural
kingdoms, created and ruled by two lords: Ahura
Mazda, the creator of light and life, law, order and
goodness, and Anrō Mainyūs, the author 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 Babylonia, and of Persia,
are likely to have come into any contact with Bib-
lical 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, as a dualistic influence, in 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
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
(aesthetics). And as these ideas were related to society
as well as to the individual, the Greeks developed theories of the ideal organization of society, of the
true, the good and the beautiful, or politics and peda-
gogy. The early branch of speculation to which the
Greeks made no unappreciable contribution was the phi-
losophy of religion, which is a modern development.

The progressive growth of philosophy is something
itself naturally into three main periods: (a) ancient, from the
6th cent. BC to the 3rd cent. AD. In this period the
influence of Greek thought on the Western world is
manifest. From the 16th cent. onward, some of the ruling
conceptions of Greek thought were utilized for the
systematization of Christianity, or modified, however, some independent Arabian and Jewish speculations;
(b) medieval, from the 3rd to the 16th cent.; and
(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.
Greek philosophy was the only speculative system that could have been influenced by OT thought. Its main development was contemporaneous with the later OT writers, but the two were essentially alike in being rooted in one another and no interchange of ideas was possible.

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 Sokrates, it was potentially a great new philosophy, and attempts to explain the nature of reality by reducing the phenomenal world into some one of its elements. Sokrates 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 morality and knowledge. 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 marred by 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, with presuppositions, 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 is viewed 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 concealed than solved the dualism of Plato.

Meanwhile, the moral principles of Socrates were being developed with a more directly ethical interest, by the Cyreniaces and Epicureans, into a system of Hedonism, and, by the Cynics and Stoics, into a doctrine of intuitive right and duty, resting consistently 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 Greek thought in this period was its small group 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 JUDEUS). He tried to graft Plato's ideals upon Heb monotheism.

He starts with Plato's two principles, pure being or God, and protoexisting 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 idea of justice, and a number of mythological stories of the Bible: the story of Creation, the word, the name, of God, the heavenly man and the heavenly virgin, the Logos, 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).

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 wrought for and 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 of the course of moral and religious ideas, 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 word (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, 42; 45 3; 46 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 of God, of His free grace, made with man (see COVENANT), which show the progress of the Noahist covenant fixed by 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 that with David the kingship, which in the future lies in the new covenant (Jer 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, drew the Jews to probe deeper into the problem of existence. They adhered to the cardinal principle of Heb 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 processes of God's goodwill and purpose (see ECOLOGY), 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 thought, however, is not absent. "The Mace, seems (1), 51. He Ch He series 2; A 6; God Esd He later Col whom the 20; Paul 15-17; the 8 Cor Rom of combined works "subtle philosophy, through theming in the world, and man's in the... ingenious. (ch 8). (d) The teaching of the Pharisees esp. reveals the tendency to twist or deform in later Judaism; they interposed between God and the world various... they name 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 resurrection and immortality. How far these tendencies were due to the dualistic insights of the sages is a question for future research. (e) Esseneism represents another effort to get from the world to God by a crude kind of mysticism and asceticism, in contrast with both Judaism, dualism and evil. But they approach them under the direct influence of Gr thought. The Heb 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 4. In the NT propounded answers to the practical demands of His time. (a) 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 conduct 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. (b) 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 Philonic 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 no abstract conception standing between God and man, but a living person uniting the ideas of the Logos (1 Jn 1 18-19). Although the term "Logos" is not mentioned, in this sense, in Paul or He, the Philonic concept 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 exist in Christ. Each of Paul's interpretations 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 the spiritual 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 and angelology" (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 Gnosticism of the Gnostics (1 Cor 1 24; 2 5.6). A similar tendency may be in view in the warning to Timothy against false doctrines (1 Tim 1 4; 4 3; 2 Tim 1 14.16 ff). But with the true spirit of philosophy, as the pursuit of truth, and the endeavor to the name of Jesus Christ clearly and clearly the nature of reality, the spirit and work of the NT writers were in complete accord.


T. KIES

PHINEES, 1Phineias (9Phineas, 1Phinees, 1Phineas [1 Esd 8 31]):
(1) Phineas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron (1 Esd 5 5; 8 2 29; 2 Esd 1 2; 1 Mac 2 26; Sir 46 23).
(2) The father of Achias and son of Heli (El), a descendant of (1), and one of Ezra's progenitors (2 Esd 1 2); but this link is not found in Ezra's genealogy (cf. Ezra 3 1); neither is it found in Ezr Ch 6, and its insertion in 2 Esd 1 2 is a mistake, while Ezra's descent was from Eleazer, 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 8 33. But it is just possible that the well-known Eleazar (1) is referred to, and so not another and different Phinees.
(4) AV = RV "Phineas" (1 Esd 8 31).

S. ANGUS

PHINEHAS, fin'ê-as, -as, fin'ê-has, -has (a'fi, e'fi, pin'häa, "mouth of brass"): (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 calf worship, and slew a Midianite woman he had brought into camp (Nu 25 6-18). This incident is referred to in Ps 106 30.31 (cf 1 Mac 2 26.54; Sir 46 23.24). As priest he accompanied the new ships of the Greek navy (2 Mace 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 (Jos 20 28 ff). His faithful services secured to his house the succession of the priesthood (Nu 25 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 Jos 24 33). His character was marked with strong moral indignation and fine integrity.

(2) The younger son of Eli (1 1 3; 2 Esd 1 2, "Phineas"). See HOPNI AND PHINEHAS.
(3) Father of a priest named Eleazar (Ezr 8 33; cf ver 2; 1 Esd 8 63, "Phinehas"). HENRY WALLACE

PHINEOB, fin'ê-b (9Phineas, 9Phineus; AV Phinehas): 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, fê'gôn, fêk'ôn (phê'gon, Phêgon): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul
sent greetings (Rom 16.14). Of him nothing is known.

PHOEBE, ἤπειρος (Φοίβη, Φωβή; 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 16.1.2). (1) "Our [Christian] sister": Paul calls the believing 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 Gr word τητρας "servant is διάκονος. "Servant" is vague, and "deaconess" is too general. 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 διάκονος. (3) The Gr word προστίθησις τητρας "helper" is better "patroness." The msc. is "the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of clients and persons who took up residence there. She was a very popular figure among the early Christian communities had 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 poor. The ancient name of Phoebe is works. Phoibe; thus, not only was Phoebe a Christian, but she was one of those who 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 had participated on behalf of herself and others. 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 16.1.2).

PHOENICE, φοινίκα (Φόινιξ, Φωινίξ). See PHOENIX.


The term "Phoenicia" is Gr (φοινικίτης, Φωινικίτης, "land of dates, or palm trees," from φοινίξ, "the date-palm")). It occurs in the Bible only in Acts (11.19; 15.3; 21.2), the Land 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 Cannanites or to Sidon (Gen 10.19; 49.13; Josh 11.8; 1 K 19.7). The limits of P. were indefinite almost throughout its history. It is described by chronic 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 Cabalas (Cabalas, Cabala) 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 there were still groves farther S., it was applied to that region also. The palm tree is common on the coins of both Aradus 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 rôle 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 at the sandy beach in winter when navigation was suspended. The promontories are few and do not mark the edges of the coast but rather more marked the entrance of the harbors; the coast, forming 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 5,000 to 6,000 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-Abiyadh to Sarepta; the plain of Sidon extending from Sarepta to the Bostraeus (Nahr el-Abiyadh); 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 Arka to Arados or even beyond, including the river Leuktherus (Nahr el-Khabir). 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 Dakeb, 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 Kašmatiyeh. 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, Assyry and Bab kings engraved their monuments; and the Nahr Ibrahim (Gehlaweh), which comes down from 'Ajjeh (Ahecheh, Josh 13 4), noted for the rites of Venus and Adonis (see TAMMUZ); and the Elus- therus, already mentioned, which runs through the valley between Bargylus and Lebanon and provides the sea with two mouths into the interior. 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 cedars and pine, esp. the former, which were fit for shipbuilding and architectural purposes, and was highly prized, not only by the Phoenicians, but also by Egyptians, Assyrians and Babylonians, who transported it to their own countries for buildings. The mineral products are few, and the independent character of their colonies and other lands for what they needed of these.

The narrowness of the land and the difficulty of access on account of the lofty mountain ranges and the banks and shores of 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 (1 Kgs 18). But the Phoenicians, was not displeased with Solomon's gift of 20 cities in Galilee, probably not desiring to assume responsibility for their defense. The Phoenicians became traders, and the possession 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 2d millennium BC, probably about 1500. On the southern coast they planted various colonies, such as Citium (Larnaca), Amathus, Curium and Paphos, and on the eastern, Salamis, Ammochostos and Sal; and, in the interior, Isauria, Salamis, Limassos and Salamis, besides other less important settlements. The evidences of the Phoenician occupation of the island abound. The southern portions of Minor also attracted them at an early date, esp. the rich plains of Cilicia, and Tarus became the most important of its towns. Its coins bear Phoenian type legends, among which Baal is conspicuous. Other points along the coast were occupied by them, and the island of Crete as well, perhaps certain ports on the south coast of Crete, and most of the islands of the Aegean. Their presence is noted on the Attic coins, and at various places, and in the legends of Diod, the reputed son of Ugarit, king of P. F. But it is doubtful whether they really colonized the mainland of Greece. They were more attracted by the lands farther to the W.

The colonies of the Phoenicians 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 extending their discipline among barbarous tribes and imparting to them their culture. In this they were far surpassing 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 also called Sidonian (Gen 10 19; Nu 21 1). 

3. The Colonies

Their colonies were very many, and 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 Heb (Is 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 (1:2; 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 this statement. Certain it is 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 BC. Some of these are found in Sidon as early as the IVth Egypt Dynasty, about 3000 BC, and we may fairly conjecture that the Canaanites were in possession of the seacoast as early as 2500 BC. It is possible that they were among the Hyksos invaders of Palestine before the 11th century BC.

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 to explore the deeps of the earth. It is not incredible that they crossed the line of the Pillar 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 tribes with whom they traded. The wealth of their enterprise, which is not confined to commerce, but extends to colonies in other countries, is well illustrated by the story of the Increase of the oxen, which are so often spoken of in the OT. The Phoenicians were the first to introduce the art of navigation amongst the nations of the world, and their trading in the far-off islands and countries is a remarkable testimony to their enterprise and their skill. Their chief object, however, was trade.
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 incapable of being falsified. It helped them for the 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, and the Phoenicians and their hunder and permanence of color were unequalled by the ancients and made the Tyrian purple famous throughout the world. For all, the finer qualities of the Phoenician fabrics were so precious that only the very 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 Phoenian 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 Murex, from which it was obtained.

(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 shores of the Mediterranean, and those of the Near East.

(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 speciality of the Phoenicians, and they were for centuries the leading copper-workers, since they controlled the sources of supply of the copper and tin used in its manufacture. The remains of their bronze manufactures are numerous, such as arms for offence and defence, knives, toilet articles, axes, sickles, cups, patens, 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 the Lord in Jerusalem, have exhibited considerable artistic merit. Their bronze was of good quality and was tempered so as to serve well for edged tools. The composition was about 9 parts copper to 1 of tin. They seem also to have made iron (2 Ch 2:14), though in very small quantities, which we cannot judge from their scarcity as to the extent of their manufactures in this metal, since most of the articles have perished by corrosion.

Aesthetic art among the Phoenicians was of low grade, as it was among the Semites generally, and where we find some works of moderate merit they undoubtedly manifest the influence of Græt art, such as those found in Cyprus by General Di Cesnola and others. In Phoenicia proper there was no great art with a culture, as in ancient Egypt, and the Phoenician artists were not original in their work. The Phoenicians were skilful in making glass, bronze and later in iron. They were also skilful mariners and producers. Their caravans travelled the well-beaten routes of the East, the deserts of Arabia and the mountain defiles of Armenia and Asia Minor, and their ships pushed boldly out to sea and explored the Mediterranean and the Euxine and did not hesitate to brave the unknown dangers of the Atlantic and perhaps even penetrated to the Baltic, emulating the mariners of a later day in their zeal for discovery and search for new avenues of trade. Could we find a detailed account of their voyages and discoveries, it would be a most interesting document, but we have little except what others have written about them, which, however, gives us a pretty fair idea of the extent of their commercial enterprises. The Phoenicians have given us a remarkable catalogue of the wares of Tyre and of the countries with which she traded (Ezk 27). There we have mention of nearly all the regions of Western Asia, Egypt, Greece and the islands, and Spain, indicated by the names of races, tribes and countries. The materials of their traffic include the most important known to the ancient world, the products of agriculture, such as wool, linen, oil, balm, spices, frankincense, wine, corn, etc.; of metals, such as gold, silver, copper, brass, tin, lead, etc.; precious stones and the articles of manufacture, the "multitude of handiworks," which they were so skilful in producing. They traded in animals also, horses, mules, lambs, rams and goats, and, what is less to their credit, in the persons of men (ver 13). 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 ships there. They also went to the west coast of Africa as far as Cape Non, and perhaps farther, for Herodotus tells us that Pharaoh-nechoh dispatched a crew of Phoenician sailors to circumnavigate Africa, which they accomplished in 3 years.

We know that they had been in India, sailing from Elath or Eacon-gard (1 K 4:26,27), and it is quite possible that they were allowed by some of the kings of Egypt to avail themselves of ports on the other branch of the Red Sea. They must have visited the eastern shore of Africa and perhaps struck across the Indian Ocean, after skirting the coast of Arabia, and thus carried on trade with India. The Ophir mentioned in connection with these voyages has not been definitely located, but it was perhaps in southern Arabia, though possibly in Southeast Africa (see Gold and Silver). 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 superiority is testified to by classical writers. In the famous condition of Xerxes to Greece the Phoenian ships exceeded all others in size, speed, and the sea. They were used to sail again and again, and when they left the land together, when they embarked upon the sea (Herod. vii.100).

The ships of the Phoenicians were large and fast. The Phoenicians knew how to use the sails, both on the open sea and in the Mediter- ranean, and the Phoenician sailors, particularly those who served in the Phoenician navy, were the best in the world. The elegance and grace of their ships was known throughout the Mediterranean.

Trade was the very life of Phoenicia. The contracted limits of the land forbade any extensive agriculture, and the people were forced to get their living by other means. They applied themselves to industrial arts, and this led them to seek the means for distributing their wares. Trade was essential to them, and they sought to carry it through all parts of the world. They had a great position esp. favorable for commerce. In the very center of the ancient world, with the great rich and populous nations of antiquity at their back and on either side, they faced the young, vigorous and growing nations of the West, and they harbored the merchants and producers. Their caravans traveled the well-beaten routes of the East, the deserts of Arabia and the mountain defiles of Armenia and Asia Minor, and their ships pushed boldly out to sea and explored the Mediterranean and the Euxine and did not hesitate to brave the unknown dangers of the Atlantic and perhaps even penetrated to the Baltic, emulating the mariners of a later day in their zeal for discovery and search for new avenues of trade. Could we find a detailed account of their voyages and discoveries, it would be a most interesting document, but we have little except what others have written about them, which, however, gives us a pretty fair idea of the extent of their commercial enterprises. The Phoenicians have given us a remarkable catalogue of the wares of Tyre and of the countries with which she traded (Ezk 27).

There we have mention of nearly all the regions of Western Asia, Egypt, Greece and the islands, and Spain, indicated by the names of races, tribes and countries. The materials of their traffic include the most important known to the ancient world, the products of agriculture, such as wool, linen, oil, balm, spices, frankincense, wine, corn, etc.; of metals, such as gold, silver, copper, brass, tin, lead, etc.; precious stones and the articles of manufacture, the "multitude of handiworks," which they were so skilful in producing. They traded in animals also, horses, mules, lambs, rams and goats, and, what is less to their credit, in the persons of men (ver 13). 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 ships there. They also went to the west coast of Africa as far as Cape Non, and perhaps farther, for Herodotus tells us that Pharaoh-nechoh dispatched a crew of Phoenician sailors to circumnavigate Africa, which they accomplished in 3 years.

We know that they had been in India, sailing from Elath or Eacon-gard (1 K 4:26,27), and it is quite possible that they were allowed by some of the kings of Egypt to avail themselves of ports on the other branch of the Red Sea. They must have visited the eastern shore of Africa and perhaps struck across the Indian Ocean, after skirting the coast of Arabia, and thus carried on trade with India. The Ophir mentioned in connection with these voyages has not been definitely located, but it was perhaps in southern Arabia, though possibly in Southeast Africa (see Gold and Silver).

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 superiority is testified to by classical writers. In the famous condition of Xerxes to Greece the Phoenian ships exceeded all others in size, speed, and the sea. They were used to sail again and again, and when they left the land together, when they embarked upon the sea (Herod. vii.100).

The ships of the Phoenicians were large and fast. The Phoenicians knew how to use the sails, both on the open sea and in the Mediterranean, and the Phoenician sailors, particularly those who served in the Phoenician navy, were the best in the world. The elegance and grace of their ships was known throughout the Mediterranean.

Trade was the very life of Phoenicia. The contracted limits of the land forbade any extensive agriculture, and the people were forced to get their
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 Phoenicians. 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 contributions to the knowledge of the world. The Phoenicians were a great debt to this people for this invaluable aid to literary, scientific and religious progress.

The Phoenician alphabet comprises 22 letters and is deficient in consonant vowels, which were left to be supplied by the reader. This defect is common to all alphabets, and was soon remedied when the Greeks adopted the Phoenician. Some of the letters have to serve for two sounds, such as the sign for $s$ and $h$, for example, th, and a redundant sign for the sound of $w$. Also the sounds of $v$ and $y$ are unrepresented.

Phoenicians, however, adopted hieroglyphic signs for words and syllables used by the Egyptians, and are not altogether to be regarded as having merely preserved the memory of their own. Thus the first letter, $a$, which makes the"ox," was evidently derived from the picture of an ox's head and then reduced to a conventional form.

Phoenician letters are probably to be found in the hieroglyphic signs for words and syllables used by the Egyptians, and are not altogether to be regarded as having merely preserved the memory of their own. Thus the first letter, $a$, which makes the "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. They had many productions found in Western Asia. The M S testifies to their use in the Jordan, and the Siloam Inscription likewise for Israel, and the same characters have been found in North Syria. This would be natural, for people of these regions had become largely Sem by the 9th cent. B.C., when we suppose that the Phoenician alphabet was in general use.

It is strange to the Phoenicians, who had an alphabet so early, and made it so widely known to the world, that they found it for little words, and the remains of their language are very scanty, mostly inscriptions, and these generally very brief. The longest inscription in Phoenician is on a sarcophagus in Egypt, which Philo of Byblos claims to have treasured from the Phoenician original. This, however, is doubted, and both the ancient and modern conceptions of thePhoenician alphabet are mythical.

The other work is genuine: the short account of the voyage of the Phoenician king beyond the Pillars of Hercules, called the Periplus of Hanno, is not without merit as a narrative, and indicates that the Carthaginian king had a sea beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and his lands were long as alive, but it is unfortunately lost. It is not, however, that it was very extensive or very important, as such a work of it would then have been preserved. The conclusion is natural that the Phoenicians were so absorbed in commercial enterprises and the pursuit of wealth that they neglected the nobler uses of the invaluable instrument of culture they had found in alphabetic writing.

A very prominent rôle was assigned to religion in the life of the Phoenicians. As a Sem people, such a characteristic was but natural and

Religion they seem to have possessed it in large measure. Their religious ideas are important account of the influence they had on the Hebrews, which is so apparent in the OT. The worship of the Canaanitish Baal and Ashthoreth, or Astarte, led the Israelites astray and produced most disastrous results.

There can be little doubt that the chief deities of the Phoenicians, as well as the forms of their cult, were derived from Babylonia, brought with them probably when they migrated to the W., but afterward modified by contact with Egypt and Greece. Some regard the earliest conception of the deity among them as a result of the Semitism, and we find traces of this in the attributes ascribed by the Phoenicians to their chief god. He is Baal, the chief deity of Phoenicia, and was usually worshiped, being usually designated by the identity in each place: Baal of Tyre or Baal-Taur, 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.

Ashthoreth (Phoen שׁתרת, 'ashthòrëth) was the great Nature-goddess, the Magna Mater, queen of heaven (Jer 7:18), and was associated with Baal in Sidon, so she was often represented under the lunar aspect, Ashthoreth-karnain, "Ashthoreth 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 Aphaca (see Ashtoreth).

Among the other gods we may mention: El, or El ( אלי, 'el), originally the designation of the supreme God, but afterward a subordinate deity who became the special divinity of Byblos (Gebal), and was regarded by the Greeks as the same as Kronos.

Melkarth (Phoen מלקתר, 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 worshipped 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 ( דגון, dāgôn) seems to have been the tutelary deity of Arvadus, his head appearing on the early autonomous coins of that city. He seems to have been regarded as the god of agriculture by the Phoenicians, rather than of fishing as generally supposed.

Adonis ( אדוניס, 'ădônîs, "lord") was regarded as the son of Cinyras, a mythic king of Gebal and the husband of Ashthoreth. The myth of his death by the wild boar led to the peculiar rites of celebrating it, instituted by the women of Gebal at Aphaca and on the river named after him (see Tamuz).

Esmun ( אסמע, 'esmûn) one of the sons of Siddik, the father of the Cabiri, 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 Cabiri, 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
The goddess Tanith (Τάνθι) occupied a lofty place in the pantheon, since in inscriptions she takes the precedence over Baal when the two names occur together. She is esp. honored at Carthage and to her name is attributed the excised mark given, such as "the highest of all"; "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 Melech, and the custom is denounced in the OT (Lev 20:2–5), but other gods went along with this vice. The Phoenician temples, like the Phoenicians, were undoubtedly deep, but sadly 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 in 874 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 fall of the kingdom under the XXth 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 they were called upon to succor 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 Pelaet, 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 13th BC. Sidon came to the present city of P., which is referred to by Joshua as "Great Sidon" (Jos 11:18). 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 Philis of Askelon, and the inhabitants were expelled from their city, called by the Philis, "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 political history of P. is that of the towns and cities belonging to it. The country as a whole had no centralized government, but in 874 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 fall of the kingdom under the XXth 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 they were called upon to succor 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 Pelaet, 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 13th BC. Sidon came to the present city of P., which is referred to by Joshua as "Great Sidon" (Jos 11:18). 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 Philis of Askelon, and the inhabitants were expelled from their city, called by the Philis, "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 Melech, and the custom is denounced in the OT (Lev 20:2–5), but other gods went along with this vice. The Phoenician temples, like the Phoenicians, were undoubtedly deep, but sadly corrupt and depraved.
although the town on the mainland was destroyed, it is doubtful whether the king of Babylon took the island itself. Yet it must be attributed (585 BC). P. remained subject to Babylon until that 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 kings does Eff not seem to have used force to gain the adherence of the Phoenicians. He 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 desert the scheme. 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 were succeeded by Taphron (Tobron), who declared her independence and induced most of the Phoen cities to do the same. The Pers garrisons were massacred or driven out. Ocyus, the king of Persia, marched with an army of 300,000 infantry and 3000 chariots against Tyre and Sidon; but the citizens, 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 Ocyus, who, as treacherous as Taphron, slew the traitor (see Sidon). The other cities were subjugated, 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 Tyrians 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.
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PHOENIC, fēnik ( פּוֹאִינִיק, Phōniiks, AV Phoenice); a harbor on Crete. Acts 27:12. W. the ancient name of a 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 Salmoniæ, kátath Salménaion; the ship was then able to make her way along the S. shore of Crete to a harbor called Fair Havens (Καλός Αυτέρ, Kalós Æterne), near a city Lasea (Lassia, Lassotia). Thence, in spite of St. Paul's desire to winter in Fair Havens, it was decided to sail to Phoenix (πεινίκία, Phōnikē; τῇ Κρήτῃ βῆμαντα κατά Χάρω καὶ κατά Χάρων (τοις Φωνίκης, limēna τῆς Κρήτης) βῇμαντα κατά Λίβα κατά καθόρων, a description which has been translated by two ways: (1) "looking toward the S.W. wind and toward the N.W. wind, i.e. looking S.W. and N.W."; (2) "looking down the S.W. wind and down the N.W. wind, i.e. looking N.E. and S.E." On the way thither, they were struck by a wind from the N.E., called Euraquilo, and ran before it under the lee of an island, called Cauda or Claudia (Kláúa, Káuda [N-B-E], Kláusa, Klaída [N-A] etc.) in Acts 27:7-17. It will be convenient to discuss those places together. The following account is based on Smith's elaborate study in his Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, which has been followed by all later writers.

The ship, when it left Myra, was obviously making for Italy (Puteoli or Ostia) by the shortest route, round Cape Malea, but off Chiusus it encountered a strong N.W. wind and had to pass the lee of Crete. Salamine, now called Cape Sidero, was the promontory which forms the N.E. corner of the island. Thence along the S. shore of Crete, as far as Cae Matala, a sailing ship is sheltered by the mountains and the violence of the N.W. wind. At Cape Matala, where the coast turns toward the N.W., there is no such shelter. Fair Havens must therefore be looked for to the E. of Cape Matala, and there is a harbor, lying 6 miles E. of Cape Matala, which is called Fair Havens by the modern Greek inhabitants of the island. There is no doubt that this is the harbor in which the Alexandrian ship took shelter. It is sheltered only from the N. and N.W. winds.

The ruins of a city which has been identified with Lasea have been found 5 miles E. from Fair Havens, and 12 miles S. of the important city of Gortyna. It has been suggested that St. Paul's desire to winter at Fair Havens (Acts 27:10) may have been due to its proximity to Gortyna, and the opportunity which the latter city afforded for missionary work. There were many Jews in Gortyna. See CRETE.

From Fair Havens, against the advice of St. Paul, it was decided to sail to Phoenix, there to pass the winter. While the ship was on its way thither, it was struck by a storm. N.E. winds from the Scylla of Scopas, called Euraquilo, and carried under the lee of an islet called Cauda or Claudia. When this happened, the ship was evidently crossing the Bay of Messaria, and from this point a N.E. wind must have carried her under the lee of an island now called Caudino in Greek and Goziano in Italian, situated about 23 miles S.W. of the center of the Gulf of Messaria. The modern name of the island shows that Cauda (Caudus in the Nōsitēs Episcopqum), and not Claudia is the true ancient name.

The writer of Acts never saw Phoenix, which must have been a good harbor, as the nautical experts decided to winter there (Acts 27:11). Now the only safe harbor on the S. coast of Crete in which a ship large enough to carry a cargo of corn and 280 souls could moor is the harbor beside Loutro, a village on the S. coast of Crete, directly N. of Cauda. All the ancient authorities agree in placing Phoenix in this neighborhood. The harbor at Loutro affords shelter for a large ship, and a road runs from Phoenix seems certain. But a serious difficulty arises on this view. The words describing the harbor of Phoenix ordinarily mean "looking toward the S.W. and the N.W.", but the harbor beside Loutro looks eastward. Bishop_wordsworth to identify Phoenix with an open roadstead on the western side of the isthmus on which Loutro
stands. But this roadstead 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 Egypt shows that Egyptian writers were wont to lie up there for the winter.

W. M. CALDER

PHOROS, fôrôs (Φόρος, Phorós, B. Swete), fôrôs, Phorês [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 which had taken “strange wives” (1 Esd 9 20).

PHURAI, frû'ti, frû'ti'rî (Φούραι, Phorrai; al. in Ν and A. Φορραία, Phorrraia, and Φορρύπι, Phorroupi; AV Phurrim): In Ad Est 11 1, “the ep. of Phurrai” means the preceding Book of Est. See Pehem. 1

PHRYGIA, frîj'i-a (Φρυγία, Prugia): A large ancient country of Central Asia Minor, very mountainous and with table-lands reaching 4,000 ft. in height. It is derived from the Indo-European name of Thrace, which in early times invaded the country and drove out or absorbed the earlier Asiatic inhabitants, among whom were the Hitites. 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 name Midas and Gordius, with which classical tradition has made us familiar. It seems that at one period the country may have extended to the Hellespont, even including Troy, but later the Phrygians were driven toward the interior. In Rom 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 Pisdian Mountains, but among its important cities were Antioch, Iconium and Apollonia. And the 20 AD city of Hierapolis, in Galatian Phrygia, was no longer kept together, its different parts were known as Phrygna Prima and Phrygna 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. Silk 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 18 6, Paul traveled while on his second journey 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 14 7. Among the inhabitants were the Jews of Antioch on the Euormus, Acts 18 23, yet it did not spread there rapidly. Churches were later founded, perhaps by Timothy or by John, at Colossae, Laodicea and Hierapolis.

E. J. BANKS

PHURAH, fû'râ (Φούρα, Phurah, "branch"). See Phurah.

PHUT, fut (Phuth, pît). See Puth.

PHUVAH, fu'va. See Phurah.

PHYGELUS, fi-jè'lus (Φυγέλους, Phygelus; Tischendorf and WH, with others, read Φυγέλος, Phygelos, Phygelus or Phygelus [2 Tim 1 15]; AV Phygelus, fi-jel'us): One of the Christians who deserted Paul at the time of his 2d imprisonment at Rome. Paul mentions him, along with Hymenaeus and Philetus, as being among those “that are in Asia,” who turned away from him then. What is meant may be that Phygelus and Hymenaeus, along with other native Christians from Asia, were 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 Phygelus and Hymenaeus from Paul took place not in Rome, but in Asia itself.

The times during and immediately following the Neronic persecution were more dreadful than can easily be conceived, especially with the Christian foreboding for 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 promise of those times, when for a mere word—a word, however, denying the Lord that bought them—men were once set free under persecution, from the loss of property or of home, and from death. I Pet records how the aftermath of the Neronic 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 epistle 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 be afraid to hear him or to judge him, there was also another which pressed upon some of the churches, the temptation to repudiate the authority of Paul. Many passages in the NT bear witness to the fact that Paul was sometimes very lightly esteemed, and how his authority was repudiated, 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-la-ktek'-ré (φυλακτήριον, phylaktērion, "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, יָּפֵלָה (yappâh or kempâh) (Kemay in HDB) suggests pointing as the segolate fem. sing,
Phoras
Physician

Phylacteries for Head and Arm.

fastening it to the arm being in the form of the letter γέθ (γ), 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 24th 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 דילך (ד), with the letter שׁלא (שׁ) 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 ס of the arm-phylactery (see 1 above), formed the Divine name נָנָה, shadday, "Almighty." Quite elaborate ceremonial accompanied the "laying on" of the phylacteries, 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 Jehovah (Dt 6:1).

The passages on which the wearing of the phylacteries 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 Jehovah 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 13:9). "And Jehovah's name shall be 8. 1. Interprete frontibus timentem Deo (Dt 31:16; n. translation of OT 10): "thou shalt bind them i.e. the words passages of Jehovah 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 anticipate the birth of Christ. In conservative Jewish circles it has been maintained that the custom became, 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 make more pronounced the un-Scriptural formalism and the crude literalism of the phylacteries by making them obtrusively large, as they also seek notoriety for their ostentation, by the enlarged fringes, or "borders." See FRONTELS; PHARISEES.

LITERATURE.—The various comms. on Ex and Dt; tractate Tophilin: the comprehensive art. by A. R. S. Kennedy in HDB: arts. in EB and Jew Enc.

EDWARD MACK

PHYLARCH, φιλάρχος (phularches), Phularches: Given in AV of 2 Mac 8:32 as a proper name "Phylarchus" but in RV the phylarch of Timotheus's force; "probably the captain of an irregular auxiliary force" (RVm), rather than a cavalry officer.

PHYLARCHEES, φιλάρχες (AV Philarches). See PHYLARCHES.

PHYSICIAN, φισίσχιαν (φισίσχιαν), raphht; latrēs, 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 (eus) and a class of healers (iowtēs). 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 mummiied corpses 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 20). 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 obnoxious and infectious forms when such persons came near, 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 as miracles, not as curative treatment. The salt which cured the noxious water at Jericho and the meal by which the poisonous gourds were rendered innocuous, like the manipulation of the Shunammite’s son, can scarcely be regarded as adequate remedies. There is an implied reference to a healer of wounds in Ex 21:19, as also in Isa 3:7, and it is recorded in Pātāhāv, iv.9 that there was in existence in the time of the monarchy a book of cures, sēpher ṭēphēʾīṯ, supposed to have been written by Solomon, but withdrawn from public use by Asa. The function of Herod’s physicians is 2Ch 15:13, but Asa is obviously regarded by the Chronicler as prepossessing in trusting to their skill. In 2K 8:20 Joram, king of Israel, is said to have gone to Jezebel to be healed. Not, I imagine, by any of the above, but by some at Gilead, which possibly may also have been a place resorted to by those needing medical treatment, as indicated by Jeremiah’s query: “Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?” (Jer 8:22). Job, irritated by the claims of his friends, calls them physicians of no value (13:4).

In the NT Our Lord’s saying, “They that are whole have no need of a physician,” etc., shows that there were physicians in Galilee (Mt 9:12; Mk 2:17; Lk 5:31), and 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 Canaarea (Philippi who had the issue of blood (Mt 5:36; Lk 8:45). Of her there is a curious story told in Eusebius (VII.18).

There are several Talmudic references to physicians; in Sīḥāṭim 5:1, it is said that there was a physician at the temple to attend to the priests. A physician was appointed in every city (Gittha 12), and was supposed to have a house from the local authorities (Bāḥbah Ḳaṭrā 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 sinneth 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 by Melita in Acts 28:8–9: for the cure of Publius’ father the word used is ἰέσας, but for the healing of those who came later it is ἑθέρωνιαν, which he renders “received medical treatment.” From this he infers that Luke helped Paul with these (Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 1908).

PI-BeSeth, pl-bē’seth (ךְִּבְּסֶת, pl-bhēseth; LXX Βυβάςτος, Bubástos; Eng Py-BAsh, “the house of Baarth,” the cat-headed goddess; the Egyptian form is usually Ha-BAsh: it is doubtful if the form Pi-BAsh has yet been found): A city of ancient Egypt. The only occurrence of the name of this place in the OT is in Ezek 30:17: where it is coupled with Aven, i.e. On (Heliopeis). Pi-beshet 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 beautiful as his day. The annual festival of the goddess, Baarth, was celebrated here with revolting license, similar to that of the festival of Syr禹 ol-Bedawer now kept in Tauna.

Pi-beshet was explored by Professor Naville under the Egypt Exploration Society in 1887–89. There were uncovered ruins of Egypt from Egyptian Dynasty of the Old Empire, from the Middle Empire, an important Hyksos settlement, and ruins from the New Empire down to the end, and even from Rom times. The first structure of which the remains are the most complete, and of the most unique in all Egypt, is the cemetery of cats. These cats, the animal sacred to Baarth, were mummified at other places in Egypt, but at Pi-beshet they were burned and the ashes and bones gathered and buried in great pits lined with brick or hard clay. Bones of the ichneumon were also found mixed with those of the cats in these pits (Egypt Exploration Fund Report, 1891).

PICTURE, pik’är: This word (in the pl.) is found 3 t in AV, viz. Nu 33:52; Isa 2:16; Prov 25:11. In Nu and Prov “pictures” represents the Hebrew word רֵעוֹז, 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 Canaan 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 Gen, viz. קָסָם, kēsām: RV renders “imagination.” There is a watchword in the rabbinic proverb: “If a picture (of gods) in animal or human shapes) on the prows of vessels.”

T. Lewis

PIECE, pēs: 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; Ezek 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 3:11.9.5); of an ear (Am 3:12); of cloth or garment (1 K 11:39); of mullenstone (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 κομμένα, εἴδικμά, “piece” or “a piece of 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). T. Lewis


PIECE OF MONEY: Two words are thus rendered in AV (ךְִּשַּׁהל, k-siḥeh; στατήρ, statēr). RV gives only the first this rendering (Job 42:11).
PIECE OF SILVER: Two words are thus rendered in the OT (יָם הָבֵּשׁ, raqê-khâsheph, and וְקַרְשׁ, k'tâshîh) and two in the NT (ἀγγυρία, argyria (Mt 26 15; 27 3-9), is τραγή as pieces of silver, but probably means shekels. In Acts 19 19 the same word occurs, but in this case the reference is probably to the denarius or drachma (cf Lk 18 5 f). Thus the 30 pieces of Mt would be equal to about £4 or $20, and the 50,000 of Acts to about £2,000 or $10,000.

PIETY, πτει:—Only in 1 Tim 5 4: “Let them learn first to show piety towards their own family,” where “let them show piety” represents a single Gr vb, ἐπιτείνεται, in its only other occurrence (Acts 7 20) being rendered “worship.” In Egyptian hieroglyph “piety” (like the Lat pieta) could be used of devotion to one’s parents (as still in the phrase “filial piety”), as well as of devotion to God. Hence there is no explicit statement here that filial devotion is one form of Divine worship.

PIGEON, пi'vn (πῖς), yânâh; πεταύρια, peris- tēr: Lat pipâre: A bird of the family Columbidae. See Dove. The Heb yânâh seems to be τρα, either pigeon or dove, yet almost every reference made to these birds pictures that there were distinct branches of the family recognized, and one or the other or both are designated. On the other hand, some of the τρα read doves, where the remainder of the text makes it very clear that pigeons were the birds intended. The Lat pipâr means “to be cheap,” and refers to the unusually clumsy young in the nest. The old birds coo, moan and wail as doves. The birds are almost 12 in. long, have full, plump bodies that are delicious food, and beautifully marked and shaded plumage. They feed principally on grain, seeds, small buds and fruit. Beyond question wild pigeons were the first birds domesticated and taught to home with man. They appeared in the OT much complete domestication, that they flew free, yet hobbled and bred in places provided by man at the time of the very first attempts at keeping 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 regarded when an estimate was made of a man’s wealth.

The rich provided large and expensive cotes of moulded pottery for their birds, each section big enough for a pair. The right and left rows of openings resembling lattice work, so that Isaiah refers to them as “windows” (60 8). LXX reads σῶν νασσόν, σῶν νασσοῖς, 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 caverns and ravens, and over the plains of Gennesaret, the forests of Gilad, and the woods of Lebanon. 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 only 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 a 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 only one pigeon was required. It seems probable that the people protected their domesticated pigeons by using the wild for sacrifice, whenever possible. Young birds could be taken from a nest at almost any time. The old birds, among the wild, were shy creatures and 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 if his means suffice 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 couch of the feck, 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 comely.”

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 on the mountain-tops, and among branches 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 stone diamond-studded coves were cut at a little distance, like latticed windows. This should read “pigeons” instead of “doves.” For the same reason see Jer 48 28: “O ye inhabitants of Moab, leave the cities and dwell in the rock; and be like the dove that maketh her nest over the mouth of the abyss.” Again the bird specified is the rock pigeon. Lk 2 24: “A sacrifice according to that
PI-HAIROTH, pi'-ha-hi'roth (πι'νεός ἢ ἄρος, πι'-ha-hi'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 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 comparable to the account in the Bible itself. If any one of the places mentioned 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 heretofore been treated 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 that 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 'Alak, 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, ACTS OF. See following art., 4, and APOCYPHAL GOSPELS.

PILATE, pi'lat, pi'lat, PONTIUS, pon'shi-us (Ποντιος Παλατίων, 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

PIRATE,Acts of.

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons." This describes the sacrifice offered in the temple by Mary following the birth of Jesus. GENE STRATTON-PORTER

PI-HAIROTH, pi'-ha-hi'roth (Πι'νεός ἢ ἄρος, πι'-ha-hi'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 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.
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PILATE, ACTS OF. See following art., 4, and APOCYPHAL GOSPELS.

PILATE, pi'lat, pi'lat, PONTIUS, pon'shi-us (Ποντιος Παλατίων, 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 names Pontius indicates the stock from which Pilate was descended. It was one of the most famous of Samnite names; it was a

name as often mentioned in Roman history after the Samnites 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 familia, or branch of the gens Pontius, to which Pilate belonged. It has been derived from pilum, the javelin worn by freedmen; 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 its origin is nowhere mentioned. Pilate was 5th procurator of Judaea. The province of Judaea had formerly been the kingdom of Arachdus, and was formed when he was deposed (3 AD). Speaking roughly, it took in the southern half of Pal, including Sa-
Pilate tells us (Lk 23:2) that on another occasion he dedicated some gilt shields in the palace of Herod in honor of the emperor; but there was no representation of any forbidden thing, but simply a shield, 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 Pilate, 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 led to the name of the donor and of him in whose honor they were set up. The 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 Marcianus 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 meantime when he was there, Pilate 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. There we are told that Pilate asked Jesus if he was the king of the Jews, received 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, notwithstanding the express wish of the people, delivered him to be crucified; and that Jesus, when he had been scourged and mocked, was led away to be crucified. Mk tells further how Joseph of Arimathea begged of Pilate the body of Jesus. Pilate was surprised that Jesus died so quickly, and quizzed him about it. In 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 (Mt 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 (Mt 27:24); also how Pilate granted a guard for the tomb (Mt 27:62-66).

Lk alone narrates the sending of Jesus to Herod (Lk 23:6-12), and reports Pilate's three times repeated assertion that he found no fault in Jesus (Lk 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 the name of the donor and dates 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 one who holds all the Gospels to be, in the main, authentic and trustworthy narratives 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 accusation (Mt 27:1-2; Mk 15:1-2; Lk 23:1-2). Pilate enters the praetorium, questions Jesus about His alleged kingship, and receives the answer that He rules over the kingdom of truth, and, perceiving that men acknowledge the truth, Pilate asks: "What is truth?" (reported in identical form in Mt 27:4-6; Mk 15:2; Lk 23:3-4; and with more detail Jn 18:38-39). Pilate brings Him forth (this is the only detail that needs to be supplied in order to complete the harmony of the Gospels, and in itself is probably enough), and many accusations are made against Him, to which, to Pilate's surprise, He makes reply (Mt 27:11-14; Mk 15:2-5; Lk 23:3-5). His innocence, but the charges are repeated (Lk 23:4). Pilate sends Him to Herod, who in mockery clothes Him in shining raiment, and sends Him back (Lk 23:6-12). Pilate declares that neither Herod nor himself can find any fault in Him, and orders to scourge and let Him go (Lk 23:13-16; Jn 19:38). Pilate offers to release Jesus upon a compliance with certain demands (Mt 27:15-18; Mk 15:6-10; Jn 19:39). Pilate's wife sends him a message warning him not to harm Jesus because Jesus is a holy man (Lk 22:13). The people, persuaded thereto by the chief priests, ask Herod to release Jesus (Mt 27:19). In spite of the repeated protests of Pilate, demand that Jesus shall be crucified (Mt 27:20-23; Mk 15:11-14; Lk 23:18-23; Jn 18:38). Pilate orders the sentence to be carried out, and before the people, and they take the guilt of the deed upon themselves. Pilate then frees Barabbas and orders Jesus to be scourged (Mt 27:26; Mk 15:15; Lk 23:24). Jesus is scourged and mocked, and the crowd stoned and spat upon (Mt 27:27; Mk 15:19; Lk 23:29). Pilate again declares the innocence of Jesus, and brings Him out to the people, saying, "Behold the man!" The chief priests and officers cry out: "Crucify him!" They accuse Him of making Himself the Son of God, and say He claims to be the King (Mt 27:39). He is brought before Herod, who, hearing of the saying, once more interviews the prisoner in the praetorium. He tries to release Jesus, but his efforts to reconcile the people of Judaea with the emperor are frustrated. Pilate gives up the body of Jesus (Mt 27:50; Mk 15:45; Jn 19:38). 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 passage of Peter (Acts 13:27), in a thanksgiving of the church (4:27), and in a speech of Paul (Acts 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 Or historians that Pilate fell into such misfortunes that he committed suicide. Various in tradition apocryphal writings have come down and Legend to us, written from the 3d to the 5th cent., with others of a later date, in which legends and details are given, in which 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 Or church her name is found on the date October 27.
We find no unhistorical references to Pilate in the recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of Peter, which was discovered in the 20th cent. as the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus, which belongs to the 1st or 2nd cent. We find, in the first part, called the Acts of Pilate, a long account of the trial of Jesus from the standpoint of the standard-bearers of the Jesus movement. There is no mention of the trial in the hall of judgment bowed down before Jesus, in spite of the efforts of the standard-bearers, and others who supported them. The standard-bearers of the Jesus movement were often the leaders of the movement. There is also a reference to the Jewish standards of the Jews. The text of the gospel of Nicodemus and the gospel of Peter gives a great mass of material to the subject, but there is no text for a monograph on Pontius Pilate. In Germany there is no A. Müller. Pontius Pilatus der fade (Pilgrimage of the fourth century). See also the various articles on Pilate in books of reference on the NT, notably BE (von Denffer), BDAG (G. H. V). For the name of Pilate see arts. on "Pontius Pilatus et les autres" by D. H. B. (e.g. Apocryphal Gospels art. on "Gospel of Nicodemus" in BDAG, also art. "Apocryphal Gospels," in the supplementary volume of BDAG). See also: De Vries, J. H. (The fragment of the Apocryphal "Gospel of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter" by T. Caesarius of Rome, A.D. 140). For the name of Pilate see arts. on "Pontius Pilatus et les autres" by D. H. B. (e.g. Apocryphal Gospels art. on "Gospel of Nicodemus" in BDAG, also art. "Apocryphal Gospels," in the supplementary volume of BDAG). See also: De Vries, J. H. (The fragment of the Apocryphal "Gospel of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter" by T. Caesarius of Rome, A.D. 140). For the name of Pilate.
"pillars" of heaven, of earth (Job 9:6; 36:11; Ps 75:3; 99:7), etc. 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 on the journeyings of Israel in the wilderness at the time of the Exodus. Jehovah was, in fact, present 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, depending on the needs of 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 ratiocinatively explained; what is depicted is a true theophany. Criticism has sought to establish discrepancies between the allusions to the cloud in the JE and the P parts of the narrative, but these are not made without strain; 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, 82ff.

JAMES ORR

PILLAR OF SALT. See SLIME; LOT.

PILLAR, PLAN OF. See PLAIN OF THE PILLAR.

PILLARS OF THE EARTH. See ASTROLOGY, III, 2.

PILOTA. See PILOT; CUSHION.

PILOT, pil'ot. See SHIPS AND BOATS.

PILYAI, pi'li'ai (πυλάι), probably "Jehove's deliverer": One of the priests, described as "the chief of the fathers," in the days of Joakim (Neh 12:17).

PIN (פִּין), "yāḥādōh, from yāḥād, "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 wool 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; Ezr 9:8); 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 "nail," RV "tent-pin"); cf 5:26, where Jehovah has the same word, RV "nail"). 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 38:18; 39:40; Nu 3:57; 4:32; cf Is 33:20). From the acts of driving in the tent-pin (.publish) and pulling it out (nādāh) are derived the technical Heb terms for pitching a tent and for breaking camp. See also CRUISING PIN (Isa 33:22, RV "satchels"); STAKE.

NATHAN ISAACS

PINE, pin. See PINING SICKNESS.

PINE TREE, pin tr: (1) לֵגָה יִנֶּה (Lēgha yineh), "threshers, tr drive "wild olive," AV "pine" (Neh 8:15); RV "oil-tree," in "oleaster" (Isa 41:19); "oileum-wood" (1 K 6:23.31-33). See OIL TREE. (2) לֶגָת כִּינָס (Lēghat kins), LXX, "palm" (Isa 41:19) m. "plane" (60:13); סָכָר (sahar), RV "fir." Lagarde, from similarity of tidhāh to the Syr dadrād, usually the "elm," considers this the best tr. Symmachus also tr ṭidhāh (Isa 41:19) by ṭēkhē, pētekē, the "elm." The elm, Ulmus campe-}

tris, 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 as "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

Pine Forest at Beïtâr.

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, pin'ing, SICKNESS, sick'ness: In the account of the epileptic boy in Mk 9:18 it is said that "he pineth away." The vb. used here (συκαίνω, συκαίνων) 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 pīnian and is often found in the Elizabethan literature, occurring 13 t in Shakespeare. In the OT it is found in Lev 26:39 (biśr) and in Ezk 24:23 and 35:10. In RV it replaces "consumed" in Ezk 4:17. In all these passages it is the rendering of the Heb mōkkāk, 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 mind" is also replaced in RV by "pinning of soul," the word so rendered being dāḇhōn, which in these two passages is expressive of homesickness. In Is 24:16 the reduplicated exclamation, "my leanness," of AV is changed into "i pine away," the word being rāzāh. The starving people in Lam 4:9 are said to pine away, the word so tr being zōāh. All these Heb words have a general meaning of to dry or to waste or wear away, or to be exhausted by morbid discharge.

Pining sickness in Isa 38:12 AV is a mistranslation, the word so rendered, dalālūth, meaning here the thurm by which the web is tied to the loom. The figure in the verse is that of Hezekiah's life being removed from the earth by his sickness as the web is removed from the loom by having the thurms cut, and being then rolled up. Both AVm and RVm have the correct reading, "from the thurm." LXX has ἐπίθου ἐγκαίνων ἐκτενεῖ, crithou egekainōn ektenēin, and Vulg damn adhibet ordinem, sutcidii me. The other reading is due to another interpretation of the word which in a few passages, as Jer 65:15, like its śād, means something small, poor, and decaying or weak, such as the lean kine of Pharaoh's dream (Gen 41:19).

ALEX. MACALISTER
PINION, pī'yon (πηγή, ἐβήρ, πηγήσ, ἐβήραθ): RV has `tr` these Heb words uniformly by "pinion," where AV uses 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, (ἐβήραθ) 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

PINCALLE, pin'a-kāl (πινακᾶς, πινακάς, "darkness"): One of the "chiefs of Edom" (Gen 36:41; 1 Ch 1:52).

PIPE, pip. See Candlestick; Lamp; Music.

PIRA, pī'ra (οἱ ἐκ Πειρᾶ, οἱ εἰκ Πειρᾶς [1 Ead 5:19]): Thought to be a repetition of CAPHIRAH (q.v.) earlier in the verse.

PIRAM, pī'ram (πυραμ, pī'rām, "indomitable"): King of Jarmuth, one of the five Amorite kings who leagued themselves against Joshua's invasion (Josh 10:8 ff).

PIRATHON, pī'rā-thon, PIRATHONITE, pī'rā-thōn-īt (πηραθων, πηραθωνῖς, πηραθονίτης; B. Pārāthōn, Pharaohm, Α. Pārāthōn, Pharaohm, Faraonitis, Pharaohonitis): The home of Abdon the son of Hillel the Pirathonite (1 Jgs 13:18 AV), where also he was buried, "in the land of Ephraim in the mount of the Amelekites." To the latter name may have clung to a district which at some former time had been held by the Amelekites. From this town also came Benahaz, 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 W. of Nahal. A possible rival is Fer'ion, 15 miles W. of Nahalot. G. A. Smith suggests a position at the head of Wady Per'ah (HGL, 555). Moore thinks it may have been in Benjamin, Abdon being a Benjaminite family (1 Ch 8:25:30; 9:36). It is just possible that the place may be identical with Pharet, one of the towns fortified by Baecides (1 Macc 9:50).

W. EWING

PISGAH, pis'ga (πισγά, ha-pisqah; פִּסְגָּה, Phisag, πῆσγα, τοῦ λαζέζουνόν, α΄ λαζέζουνόν, δέ λαζεζουνό, ἕλαζεζουν): This name, which has always the definite art., appears only in combination either with ṣō'šh, "head," "top," or ḥṣḏōth, not tr in AV save in Dt 4:49, where it is rendered "springs," RV uniformly "slopes," RVIN "springs." Pisgah is identified with Nebi in Dt 34:1; cf 3:27. "The top of Pisgah, which looketh down upon the desert" marks a stage in the march of the host of Israel (Nu 21:20). Hither Balak brought Balaam to the field of Zophim (23:14). Here Moses received the blessing of God, as Edom, had been, and died. See NEBO. Many scholars (e.g. Buhl, GAP, 122; Gray, "Numbers," ICC, 291) take Pisgah as the name applying to the mountain range in which the 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 'Tāl'at ez-Za'fūm found here, which seems to correspond with the field of Zophim.

Ash'doth is the constr. pl. of 'ašēdāh (sing. form not found), from 'ēshedh, "foundation," "bottom," "lower part" (slope); of Assyр 'īṣud, "foundation." Some would derive it from Aram. One, "fall" or "slope" (OH, s.v.); Ashdod-pisgah overlooked the Dead Sea from the E. (Dt 3:17; 4:49; Josh 12:3; 13:20). There can be no reasonable doubt that Ashdod-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 λαζέζω, "to hew," or "to dress stone" (Nu 21:20; 23:14; Dt 3:27; 4:49). Jerome (Onom, s.v. Ashdoth) gives a translation as the Latin equivalent of Fasga. He derives Pisgah from πασγα, 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 Jēhū Nīḇād as viewed from the Dead Sea.

W. EWING

PISHON, pī'shon (πησόν, pī'shōn; AV Pison, pī'son): A river of Eden (q.v.), said to compass the whole land of Havilah where there is gold, bdellium and the crystal stone (Gen 2:11), most probably identified with the Kunur River which comes down from the mountains of Media and formally emptied into the Pers Gulf.

PISIDIA, pī-sī'di-a (ἡ Πισιδία, ἑν Πισιδιαίν [Acts 14:24]); in Acts 13:14, NABC give "Ἀντιοχειαν ἑν Πισιδιαίν, "the Pisidian Antioch," the other MSS, "Ἀντιοχειαν ἑν Πισιδίασ, Antiocheian ēn Pisidias," "Antioch of Pisidia." The former, but not the latter, reading correctly describes the condition of affairs at the time when St. Paul traveled in the country; see below.

Pisidia, as a strict geographical term, was the name given to the huge block of mountain country stretching northward from the Taurus 1. Situation range where the latter overlooked the land and History Pamphylia coast land, to the valleys of the and Asia Minor mountains, and thence to the line of Apamea with Antioch, and Antioch 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 Analecta of Xenophon, who informs us that the Pisidians were independent of the king of Persia at the end of the 5th cent. 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 his kingdom 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 mountain ranges—Comana, Comana, Olbas, Parlas and Lystra—and all were connected by military roads with the main garrison city Antioch, which lay in Galatian Phrygia, near the northern border of the Euphrates.
Pisidia. An inscription discovered in 1912 shows that Quirinus, who is mentioned in Lk 2 2 as governor of Syria under Nero, was a Pisidian, and a religious ceremony of the colony of Antioch, and his connection with Antioch dates from his campaign against the nomads—who had resisted and killed Antymas—about 8 BC (see Ramsay in *Expos.,* November, 1912, 385 ff, 406). The military system set up by Antiochus, and based on that of Antioch, and from this fact, and from its proximity to Pisidia, Antioch claimed the 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 is designated "of Pisidia" in the majority of the MSS.

Pisidia remained part of the province Galatia till 74 AD, when the greater (southern) part of it was assigned to the new double province Lycaonia-Pamphylia, and the cities in this portion of Pisidia now ranked as Pamphylia. The northern part of Pisidia continued to belong to Galatia, until, in the time of Dioecletian, the southern part of the province Galatia (including the cities of Antioch and Iconium), with parts of Lycaonia and Asia, were formed into a province called Pisidia, with Antiochus as capital. For the first time 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 Harnack and Howson 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 Pisidians in Carmel, the nearest city of the variegated settlements of Pisidians, inscribed polished stones and soldiers who kept the peace in this region, while others refer to a conflict with robbers, or to an escape from drowning in a river (The Church in the Rom Empire, 22 f; cf *Journal of Rom Studies*, 1912, 82 f). Adana, a city on St. Paul's route from Perga to Antioch, is called by the Turks Kora Bawo; "Bawo" 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.


W. M. CALDER

PISMA, pispa (NzSE, pispa, '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) *yà, bôr,* "pit" or "cistern," made by digging (Gen 37 20); hence "dungeon" (Jer 38 6, m. "pit"); (2) *Sn, bâr, bîr,* "pit" or "well" made by digging (Gen 21 25); (3) *Sn, shôl,* generally rendered "hell" in AV (*Heb.*); (4) *gâgâh, shabath,* 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" (Ps 113 4; 30 3; Job 30 24). AV sometimes incorrectly renders (4) by "corruption," (5) *gâbâh,* pethah, "pit," literally (2 S 17 9), and figuratively (Jer 48 43). In the NT "pit" renders *bôthôw,* bôthônos (Mt 16 14), which means any kind of hole in the ground. In the corresponding passage of Luke (Lk 14 24 AV) has *pit,* same as (2) above. For "bottomless pit" (Rev 9 1, AV, etc) see *Abyss.*

T. LEWIS

PITCH, peh: The tr of the noun *Pîs, kophér*, and the vb. *Pîsâr, kâphar,* in Gen 16 14 and of the noun *Pîpeth,* zepheth, in Ex 2 3; Isa 9 17. In Gen 16 14 the words are the ordinaries for "covering," "cover," so that the tr "pitch" is largely guesswork, aided by the LXX, which reads *apistaios, aisthastos,* "bitumen," here, and by the fact that pitch is a usual "covering" for vessels. The meaning of zepheth, however, is fixed by the obvious Dead Sea imagery of Isa 34 9—15—the streams and land of Edom are to become burning bitumen, like the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah. In Ex 2 3 zepheth is combined with *hêmr,* which also means bitumen (Gen 14 10; see *Salamis*), and the distinction between the words (different consistencies of the same substance?) is not clear. BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PITCHER, pihcher (*Pîs, kôdhas; kôpalos, krmion*): The word is found chiefly in the OT in the reference to the vessels of Nebuchadnezzar. The vessels of Nebuchadnezzar are also called their lamps in pitchers (Jgs 7 16.19). Eccl speaks of the pitcher broken at the fountain (13 6). The single use in the NT is in Mk 14 13 | Lk 22 10. The pitcher was an earthenware vessel (cf Lam 4 18 (LXX), with one or two handles, used for carrying water, and commonly borne upon the head or shoulder (cf Gen 24).

PITHOM, pithom (*Pîsâh, pithom; Pîthô, Peithô* [Ex 1 11]): Champollion (Gesenius, Lex. s.v.) considered this name to mean "a broad mouth.

1. Meaning. "Place" in Coptic, 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 *Ramesses*), and according to Wessel was the *Thoum* of the Antonine Itinerary.

Brugsch (*Hist Egypt.,* 1879, II, 343) says that it was identical with *Heracleopolis Parva,* the capital of the Sesostritic nome in the age of the Greeks and Romans—half-way on the great road from Pelusium to Tanis (Zoea), and this indication given on the authority of the inscriptions furnishes the sole means of fixing its position. This is, however, disputed. Tomb was discovered at Tanis, at Zaxoer, and at Philae (Brugsch, *Geogr. L.,* 354) was also called *Pa-tum.*

There were apparently several places of the name; and Herodotus (I, 158) says that the Cadus of Darius began a little above Bubastis, "near the Arabian city Patomus," and reached the Red Sea.

(1) *Dr. Naville's theory.* In 1885 Dr. E. Naville discovered a Rom milestone of Maximian and Constantini, proving that the name of the town was **Told el Mabûd** ("the walled mound") in *Wady Tumulât*. The modern name he gives as **Tell el Mabûd.****
PITY, pit' i (יִצְאַס, kāmāl, כָּמָל, ħāṣ; ḥātō, cēdō): "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 of the object the thing of which Pity is excited. None was found to be older than the time of Rameses II—who, however, is well known to have defaced older inscriptions, and to have substituted his own name for that of earlier builders. A statue of later date, bearing the title "Recorder of Pithom," was also found at this same site. Dr. Naville concluded that this city must be the OT Pithom, and the region round it Succoth—the Egypt T-k-u (but see Succoth). Brugsch, on the other hand, says that the old name of Heroopolis is Kēs (see Goshen), which recalls the identification of the LXX (Gen 46:28); and elsewhere (following Lepsius) he regards the same site as being "the Pa-Khetam of Rameses II" (see Eratost), which Lepsius believed to be the OT Ramesses (see Ramses) mentioned with Pithom (Brugsch, Geography, I, 302, 262). St. Silvia in 389 AD was shown the site of Pithom near Heroopolis, but farther E., and she distinguishes the two; but in her time, though Heroopolis was a village, the site of Pithom was probably unenclazed. In the time of Rameses, son of Ramesses I (Brugsch, Hist., II, 125), we have a report that certain nomads from Aduma (or Edom) passed through "the Khetam [or fort] of Minephthah-Hotepheim, which is called the city T-k-y, to the border [or canals] of the city Pi-tum of Minephthah-Hotepheim, which are situated in the land of T-k-s, in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds."

(2) Patumos of Herodotus.—These places seem to have been on the eastern border of Egypt, but may have been close to the Bitter Lakes or farther N. (see Succoth), whereas Tell el-Mabkhah is about 12 miles W. of Isna'adīkh, and of Lake Timāsh. The definition of the Pithom thus noticed as being that of Minephthah suggests that there was no more than one place so called, and the Patumos of Herodotus seems to have been about 30 miles farther W. (near Zagazig and Bubastis) than the site of Heroopolis, which the LXX identifies with Goshen and not with Pithom. The latter is not noticed as an object 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 Minephthah, because Pithom was at Heroopolis and was not a city, is not very probable. The time of Ramesses II, not however, should be regarded as very hazardous. See Exodus. The Patumos of Herodotus may well have been the site, and may still be discovered near the head of Wady Tumādāl or near Bubastis.

C. R. Conder

PITHON, pit' thon (Πήθων, pithōn): A grandson of Meribbaal, or Mephibosheth (1 Chr 35; 941).

PITIFUL, pit'i-fūl: As found in Scripture, means "full of pity;" it is expressed by נָדָע, nādāʿ, from רָדָע (pl. rādāʿam), "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 πολισθυόμενος, lit. "of many bowels," a word which does not occur elsewhere, it might be tr "large-hearted" or "tender-hearted." In Exod 2, 2, the Lord's bowels were pitiful (αιτειμένος) εἰσπλαγχος, "well-hearted." "compassionate," "full of pity," occurs in 1 Pet 3:8, "Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous," RV "loving as brethren, tender-hearted, humble-minded." The word is found in Fr Man 7; XII P, Zeb 8 2.

W. L. Walker

PLACE, pālē: Normally for פָּלֵג, mākōn, OT, and παλαιος, παλαιος, NT, but in AV "place" represents a great number of Heb and Gr words, often used with no difference in force (e.g. 2 Chr 35:10, 15). RV has made few changes, but occasionally has attempted to specialize the object; (Gen 40:13; Job 37:8; Acts 8:22; Jas 1:11). See PLACE, BROAD; HIGH. See City, II, 3, 2; High Place; Open Place.

PLAGUE, plāg (πάγω, nephā, נַפָּה, makkāb, מַמְּכָב, ἀντίφορός, mātirē, μάτίρη, plāgō): This word which occurs more than 120 t is applied, like pestilence, 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 Bubastis it has occurred so frequently that it may almost be regarded as endemic. The suddenness of its attack, the promptness of its incubation period and the rapidity of its course give it the characters which of old have been associated with manifestations of Divine anger. In the early days of an epidemic it is an infrequent occurrence that 00 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 houses of eastern towns, the disease spreads rapidly. In a recent epidemic in one village of 534 inhabitants 311 died within 21 days, and I 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 of Egypt (Ex 10:6)—the 10th plague. The only other plague we have too little information to identify it. (Ex 11 1). The Philis, however, used the same name, negha', for the Egypt plagues (1 S 4 8) as is used in Ex. The next outbreak was at Kibroth-haathanah (Nu 13 23). This was synchronous with the phenomenon of quails, and if these were, as is probable, driven by the wind from the plague-stricken Syrian region, they were equally probable the carriers of the infection. Experience in both India and China indicates that animals of very diverse kinds 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-rebellious (Nu 16 47). These may have been reoccurrences of the infection brought by the quails. The fifth outbreak was that which followed the gross religious and moral defection at Baal-peor (Nu 25 8.9.18; 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 5 6). We read of the tumors which were probably the bubo swellings, and also that at the time there was a plague of rats (6 5) — 'mice,' in the version, but the word is also used as the name of the rat. The castle seem to have carried the plague to Beth-shemesh, as has been observed in more than one place (Ps 22 19). Consider the two days' pestilence that followed David's census (2 S 24 15; 1 Ch 21 12), see Jos, An, VII, xiii, 3. The destruction of the army of Sennacherib may have been a sudden outbreak of plague (2 K 19 35; Isa 37 36). It is perhaps worthy of note that in Herodotus' account of the destruction of this army (iii.144) he refers to the incursion of swarms of mice.

One of the latest prophetic mentions of plague is Hos 13 14, where the plague (debker, LXX dikê) of death and the destruction (kalath, LXX kéntron) 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 (kéntron) with death, and changes the dikê into nikos.

ALEX. MACALISTER

PLAGUES, plaga, OF EGYPT (παλάγα, παλάσ, παλά, "wonders," from πλαγία, πλάσα, "to be separate," i.e. in a class by themselves; also called παλάγα, negheph, "plague," from πλάσα, naghaph, "to smite"
[Ex 9 14], and παλάσ, negha', "a stroke," from παλάσ, nagha', "to touch" [Ex 11 1; cf Josh 24 10]):

INTRODUCTION
I. NATURAL PHENOMENA
1. Turned to Blood
2. Frogs
3. Lice
4. Flies
5. Murrain
6. Boils
7. Blight
8. Locusts
9. Darkness
10. Death of the Firstborn
II. MIRACULOUS USE OF THE PHENOMENA
1. Intensification
2. Prediction
3. Discrimination
4. Orderliness and Increasing Severity
5. Assignment 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 "I Am Who Am," etc.
4. Exhibition of the Divine Use of Evil

LITERATURE

The Heb words are so used as to give the name "plagues" to what 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 Jeh with Pharaoh. The account of the plagues is found in Ex 7 8—12 31; Ps 78 42—51; 105 27—31. 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 consumption 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 and 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 Zoan" is mentioned as the scene of the contest between Jeh and the Egyptians. But this is poetry, and the "field of Zoan" means simply the territory of the great capital Zoan. This expression might be localised 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 the account, our present text, tells us that Aaron smote the waters (7 19.20). But this is quite in accord with the preceding statement (4 16) that Aaron was to be the spokesman to deal with God, Aaron with Pharaoh. Again it is noticed that some of the plagues are ascribed to the immediate agency of Jeh, some are presented as coming through the mediation of Moses, and still others through the mediation of Moses and Aaron. 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. The power necessarily has a physical basis, in 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 passing 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 Sinai were manifested in the "cloud" and the "brightness of the "voice" and the "sound of a trumpet" (Ex 19 16). The Deity of Jesus was attested on the mountain by a "voice" (Mt 16 3). Jesus Himself was "God...manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim 3 16 AV). He was "3 sound in fashion as a man" (Phil 2 8). And all the miracles of Jesus are "a sensible phenomenon: He sent the waters 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 "lives," the "flies," 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 done.

The first of the plagues (אָדַם, dām, from אָדָן, 'adān, "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 delamination of the water so that it became as 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 very lowest season, the water is withal all 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 in the same month 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, 11, 46-54). 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 enchantments. It was a phenomenon, however, if it may be, 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 prov'd of (Ex 8 18-20). Frogs (Egyptian, σαμφρακτάμ, probably "marsh-leapers" [Ex 8 1-15]) are very abundant just after the high Nile when the waters begin to recede. 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." The "frogs" are greenish in the marshes, but in this case they came forth to the horror and disgust of the people. "Frogs in the houses, frogs 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 Heq, a form of Hator, and seems also at times to have been worshiped as such.

Plague of Frogs

This plague created such horror that thus early Pharaoh came to an agreement (8 8-10). 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" (8 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 what the true troublemaking pest of Egypt is meant by the 4th plague, whether body-lie or mosquitos or sandflies or ticks or fleas or other insects. The repetition of the term "wonders," etc., in the context, and the theophanies immediately following (Ex 8 19), do not seem to indicate the presence of any inferior insect that had been series of plagues. The 5th plague, "wild beasts" (Ex 9 1-7), could have been a series of storms and tempests, a vast inundation of water, a thunderstorm, etc.

Plague of Lice

Those who have experience of these pests in Egypt are quite ready to accept 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 one kind that torments both man and beast. All the other insect pests appear in incredible numbers but of the "abomination" when the pools have dried up after the receding 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 were not removed at all. The Egyptians are disposed to think it was not! Certainly that reason of the Jews spent in Egypt, not on the banks of 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 seem to have acknowledged that Jeh was the only one (8 19), but Pharaoh would not heed them.

As the seasons pass on, after the recession of the waters, the flies (אָדָן, dān, "swarms," probably of flies [Ex 8 20-32]) become more and more numerous and they are almost a plague every year. The insects increased severity of this plague, and the providential interference to separate between Israel and the Egyptians, drove Pharaoh and his people to such desperation that Pharaoh gave a half-promise of liberty for Israel on his sacrifice "of the land." The Israelites were told that if they should sacrifice the "abomination of the Egyptians." This may have referred to the sacrifice of sheep, which were always held in more or less detestation by Egyptians, or it may have referred to the sacrifice of the first-born, the cow being the animal sacred to the goddess Hator. The new element of separation between the Israelites and the Egyptians introduced into this plague was another step toward establishing the claims of Jeh to be the God of all the earth and to have taken Israel under His especial care.
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, like leprosy, have been known for many centuries, as Egypt has always been a land of swarms of locusts. The plague of swarms of locusts (Ex 10:7) and of cattle 4 days after the plague of insects 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. The plague of insects was at times in Egypt, so that beef becomes very scarce on the 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 the beasts of the desert into 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 (בָּעַל, בָּעַל, מִנְסָרֶת, "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 animal flesh was from the danger inherent in starting an epidemic of plague among men (Dr. Merrins, Bib. Sacra, 1908, 422–23).

Hail (בָּעַל, בָּרַד, "hail") [Ex 18:18–35] is rare in Egypt, but it 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). 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. This plague also marks another great step forward in the revelation of Jehovah to Israel and to the Egyptians. First only His power was shown, then His wisdom in the timing of the plagues, and now His mercy appears in the warning to all godly-disposed Egyptians to save themselves, those before the plagues by protecting all indoors (9:19–21). Pharaoh also now distinctly acknowledged Jehovah (9:27).

The plague of locusts (גְּזָרָה, גְּזָרָה, "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 of Egypt and over the land of Canaan; they devoured everything before them. They also devoured the Nile and 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 not the least doubt, but it is evidence of the impatience 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 21–29). has come. When this dreadful scourge comes with its hot sand-laden breath more unendurable than a London fog, it is in very truth a "darkness of very great intensity" (Ex 10:29). 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 hedge 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 the people in the very palace? Possibly 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 Ramses II, instigator 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 (בָּרַד, בָּרַד, "firstborn," "chief" or "best") 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 the most shocking and overwhelming violence, takes 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 intimation 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 with the 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 systematic and 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 cessation 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 mean of such foresight that magicians "did mimic 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 was or called for frogs, they would seem to be successful. But the evidence which Jeh 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, 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 the plagues of hand 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 Jeh as Ruler over all, and educating the people to know Jeh 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 them be rid of the plagues. 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 Jeh is Lord, and acknowledged it (9 27; 10 16). To this end the issue was clearly drawn. Pharaoh challenged the right of Jeh 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) 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 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 unto 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 led the Divine to life in the experience of men in this world. As experience of Job illustrates the Use of Evil in the life of the righteous, so the plagues of Egypt illustrate the same great pattern of evil in this world. 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.

LITURGICAL.—The liturgy of this subject is almost endless. It will suffice to refer the reader to all the general commentaries and the special comments on discussion of doctrinal and critical questions. Two admirable recent discussions of the plagues, in English, are Lamb, *Miracle of Science*, and Merry, *The Plagues of Egypt*, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1908, July and October.

M. G. RHYE

PLAIN, plán, pîn ([1] פין, kikkâr, "circle," "circular," or "round loaf"; [2] פין, mishâr, from פין, yâshâr, "to be level"; cf. Arab. ميشر, muisâr, "that which is easy"; [3] פינא, bikhâh; of Arab. בקח, baḵât, "a plot of ground," or "a wet

(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 40; 2 Ch 4 17); "Plain of the valley of Jericho" (Dt 34 3); "cities of the Plain" (Gen 13 12; 19 29); "all the Plain" (Gen 19 17:25); "by the way of the Plain" (2 S 18 23); but "the plain round about jerus" (Neh 12 28). See GIZAHAH; CIRCLE.

(2) Mishāh, EV "plain," RVm usually "table-land," 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 "table-land"] of Medeba."

(3) Bītâk is more often trd "valley" (q.v.).

(4) "Arabah 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 22 1; 26 3:6; 31 12; 33 49.49:50; 36 1; 36 13; 34 14; Josh 13 32) and "plains of Jericho" (Josh 1 4: 10:2 K 25 3; Jer 35 5; 52 8) are the low plain or ghawr N. of the Dead Sea. "Arabah is here equivalent to kikkâr (see above). Note the distinction between mishâh used of the highlands, and kikkâr and "Arabah used of the gallery. See ARABAH.

(5) Skrpheílákh is by RV throughout trd "lowland" (q.v.), and includes the western slopes of the Judeaean hills and the maritime plain.

(6) Topos petínou occurs only in Lk 6 17.

(7) ἄμμος 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 Moenemim" (Jgs 9 37); "plain of Tabor" (1 S 10 3). RV has throughout "oak," RVm "terebinthus", cf "oak" (Gen 35 4, 8, etc) and "oak of Elaphah" [1 S 17 23, 19]; "oak of Beeronah" [1 S 17 40]; "oak (q.v.)

(8) "Abhēth kermim (Jgs 11 33) is in AV "the plain of the vineyards," RV "Abel-cheramim," RVm "the meadow of vineyards." Elsewhere in EV "abhēth is "Abel" or "Abel." See ABEL-CHERAMIM; MEADOW. ALFRED ELY DAY

PLAIN, plain, PLAINLY, planii: In Gen 25 27, AV "plain" represents דֵּין, tam. If a contrast between the vocations of Jacob and Esau is meant, RV ("quiet," "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. (De 1 29; 34 13), "steps of Moab" (Nu 22 1, etc; Dt 34 13). 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 (בֵּין הַרְבּוֹת, 'élón muq- ḁab; B reads prós 'élón qâlaq 'éveret 'l ṣàr- àwos 'l śâ'âwos, prós 'eḇalāw té heureót 'l šā'āwos té 'elów qâlaq 'éveret, and the second יָהוָא): 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 MEON- ENIM, 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).

PLAIN OF THE VINEYARDS. See ABEL-CHERAMIM.

PLAISTER, plâst'êr. See PLASTER.

PLAITING, plaits'ing, plaits'ing (from OFr. pleit, from Lat placatum, "fold"): An interweaving, braiding, knot; an elaborate gathering of the hair into knots; χωροσ, emplokhé, "outer adorning of plaits of the hair" (1 Pet 3 3). Compare "plaited" (q.v. of thorns) (Mt 27 29; Mk 15 17; Jn 19 2). See Braid, Braiding.

PLANE, plan (Isa 44 13). See TOOLS.

PLANE TREE, plan'tre (יוֹפָע, 'armôn; śk-lâ- vâves, platanus [Gen 30 37], δάμας, δάδατ ["pine" or "fir"] [Ezk 31 8]; AV chestnut): "Armôn is supposed to be derived from יִפְע, 'armâm, meaning "to be bare, to be naked." 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 planâ, Planâs orientâlis, is one of the finest trees in Pal, flourishing esp. by water courses (cf Eccles 24 14).

PLANETS, planets (יוֹפָע, nazzâlōth). See ASTROLOGY, II, 3.

PLANK, plank: Thick beams or pieces of wood, for which several Heb words are used. RV changes "planks" (of fir) into "boards" in 1 K 6 15, and in a few instances substitutes "planks" where AV has "boards" (Ex 27 8; 38 7, the altar; Ezk 27 5). So in the NT in Acts 27 44, for σκόπας, skopas. See SHIPS AND BoATS, II, 2, (3).

PLANT, PLANTS. See BOTANY.

PLASTER, plaits'êr (יוֹפָע, śîdâh): 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
that milk or some similar substance was added to the mortar to give a better surface.

The ancient plastered surfaces for decorating, and even the finest granite was covered with sloping process to create the desired effects (Dt 27:2; Dnl 6:5). Columns were often first stuccoed and then painted.

The Aramaic word for mortar is ḥbn, which really means "clay." The Heb יִשְׂרֵאֶל, šēhāḏ, lit, "to boil up," refers to the boiling of the water with which the lime is mixed, because of the heat generated during the process. In Dnl 5:5, occurs יֵקִיע, īqīḵ, i.e. "burned in a kiln," which might mean either lime or gypsum. In Lev 14:42 occurs יִשְׁדַע, ūšēḏ, "to smell."

JAMES A. PATCH

PLASTER, plas' tér (יוּתֶר, mōrāh): Only used in Isa 38:21 of the application of the cake of figs to the boil from which Hezekiah suffered. In Papyri Ebers, figs are used as the ingredient in a plaster (xxv, lxxix, lxxxii). Dioscorides also recommends figs with other substances as a poultice in some skin diseases.

PLASTERING, plas'-ter-ing. See CHAPTS, II, 15.

PLATE, plät: A term seemingly not used in the Bible for a dish as it is so commonly used at present, but always for a tablet or sheet of metal. (1) יִשְׁלֹחַ, gîš (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) יִשְׁלֹח, gîb (Ex 33:3; Nu 18:35), of plates or sheets of metal produced by hammering. (3) יִשְׁלֹח, lhîḥ, 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 יִשְׁלֹח, sêrên, is rendered "plate" in 1 K 7:30 AV, manifestly incorrectly, RV "axle." WALTER R. BETTERIDGE

PLATTER, plät'ër: (1) יִשְׁלֹח, kîshāḏ, "a deep dish" (Nu 7:13 f.84.85). In AV and ERV "charger," ARV "platter" (cf Ex 25:29; 37:16); LXX ἀποθέσαν, triblion, and in the NT rendered "dish" (Mt 26:23; Mk 14:20). In Ex 9:9, ARV יִשְׁלֹח, ἄμφανταλ, rendered "platter," AV and ERV "chargers," probably a deep dish or basin used in sacred feasts, intended originally a side dish, for relishes, entrées, but of dishes for food, in general, esp. meats, fish, etc, used with יָפַר, πόλεμιον, "cup" or "drinking vessel" (Mt 25:51); also מָשָׁא, pinax, originally a large wooden dish or plate (Lk 11:39; rendered "charger") in Mt 14:8.11 AV, and Mk 6:25.28 AV and ERV. EDWARD BAGBY POUILLARD

PLAY, plää. See GAMES.

PLEAD, plëd: In modern non-legal Eng. is a synonym of "pray" or "beseech," but in legal phraseology "plea," "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 ERV 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 ARV that is clear modern Eng. The most obscure instances are due to AV's employment of "plead" to translate the Niphal of פַּלֶל, hâphâl, חַפֶל 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 truth" (Isa 66:4) means "none of their lawsuits are honest." Accordingly, when God is said to "plead with" man (Isa 66:16 AV, ERV, etc), the meaning is that God states His side of the case and not at all that He supplants man to repent. And this statement by God is a judicial act that of course admits of no reply. Hence RV has changed "plead" into "enter into judgment with" the judgments of God. In Dnl 5:5 occurs יֵקִיע, i.e. "burned in a kiln," which might mean either lime or gypsum. In Lev 14:42 occurs יִשְׁדַע, to smell.

JAMES A. PATCH

W. L. WALKER

PLEDGE, plej (vbs. בָּבָד, hâbadh [10], יָבָד, yôbadh [2 K 18:23 = Isa 36:8]; nouns בָּבָד, hâbadh [Ezk 18:12,16; 33:15], יָבָד, hâbadh [Ezk 18:17], יָבָד, yôbadh [1 S 18:17], יָבָד, yôbadh [Gen 38:17,18,20]; also יָבָד, 'abhâd [Dt 24:10–13] and [RV only] יָבָד, 'abhâd [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 guaranties of their subsericivency to the Chaldaean; 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 RY) Rasheshke mockinglv dares Hezekiah to stake a "pledge" that he can produce 200 oxen for the defence of Jerusalem, although the mighty Assyrv 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 (preserved?) 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 exaction of a pledge from such persons worked genuine ship, 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 contrast was the creditor who took the garment the borrower was wearing (Am 2:8; Job 22:6; 24:9 m), and special legislation controlled this practice. A garment (the outer "cloak"—see Dress—not worn while doing manual labor) so that the "CHRORO." and "neighbor" (Ezk 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 24:7). The "pledge" was the item sold for loans (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) AV gives "pledge" for AV and ERV "faith" in 1 Tim 5:12. See also EAR- NEST. BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PLEIADES, plē-á-dēz. See Fullness.

PLEROMA, plē-rō'ma. See Fulness.

PLOW, plou (377, hārash; ἀπορίσω, arōrtāvō): 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 hoz, 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 at right angles to the stem 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. It can be said that there is a slight bend at the middle. Theshare 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 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 also used: ἱαῖνα, "to serve," "walked," or "plowed" (Dt 21:4); ἀπόρισσο, "to 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 ἄδρωκη, 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; cf 6:10), and this is particularly true when the evil comes after plowing, so surely will Jehovah carry out His decree of destruction (Isa 28:23–25). "Jehovah 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). "Beat their swords into plowshares" (or hoes) (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3) typified peace; "beat your plowshares into swords"—war (Jed 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, unfits a man for the kingdom of God (Lk 9:62; cf Gen 19:26; Phil 3:19).

JAMES A. PATCH
PLUCKING, pluki'ng, OFF THE HAIR. See Hair, 7; PUNISHMENTS.

PLUM-BINE, plüm'ín. PLUMMET, plüm'et, plüm'it. See Tools.

POCHERET-HAZZEBAIM, pok'ér-réth, po'ké-réth, po-ké-réth, ha-chaz-bé'im (הכזרב'ים, הָכוֹרֶת הָשֶׁבִּיִם, po-khereth ha-shébá'îyim) [Ex 2 57], or, הָכִרֶת הָשֶׁבִּיִּים, p. hâ-chirâ'îm [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; cf kôleth ("preacher"), the Heb title of the Book of Ezech. The name Pochereth has been regarded as the suggested that the gloss states that "of" is not in the 1611 ed.

POET, po'ët (σάπετης, poíte's, "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 present Jupiter as the father and controller of all things, and worthy to be worshipped. In his poem and 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, po'ë-tré, HEBREW:

I. IS THERE POETRY IN THE OT?

Poetry Defined:
1. In Matter Concreto and Imaginative
2. In Form Emotional and Rhythmic

II. NEGLECT OF HEBREW POETRY: CAUSES

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF HEBREW POETRY, EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL
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   (3) Rhythm
   (4) Metre
   (5) Other Literary Devices
   (6) Units of Hebrew Poetry
   (7) Classification of Stiches or Verses

2. Internal or Material Characteristics
   (1) Themes of Hebrew Poetry
   (2) Species 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 dismissed here.

I. 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 one 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. 

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, Babylarians, 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 17th cent. We can thereby see this 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. Indeed, as is 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. 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 of language, even as the sense was clear and unambiguous. It was in this spirit and animated by this conception that the Christian Church, under the influence of the Church of the East, 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, who rendered invaluable service to cause of Bible science when he refuted against theologists, 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. "The language of the Bible is fluid ... and literary, not rigid, fixed, scientific" (Preface to 1st ed. Literature and Dogma). The Bible contains literature, poetical and prose, equal as literature to the best, as Matthew Arnold, Carlyle and Froude have well shown. 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 Heb Scriptures 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 accepted 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
Omitting “Yahwe,” which belongs alike to both members, 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 17; Isa 6 4; 13 7).

(ii) Antithetic parallelism: in which the second member of a line (or verse) gives the obverse side 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 3; 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.

(iii) Synthetic parallelism: called also constructive and pathetic. In this the second member adds something fresh to the first, or else explains it, e.g. Ps 19 5 ff.

The precepts of Yahweh are right, rejoicing the heart: The commandments of Yahweh are pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of Yahweh is clean, enduring for ever:
The judgments of Yahweh are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; Sweeter also than the honeycomb and the honeycombs' (see Prov 1 7; cf 3 5 ff; Ps 1 3; 15 4). In addition to the three principal species of parallelism noticed above, other forms have been traced and described.

(iv) Introtroversial parallelism (Jebb, Sacred Lit., 53) in which the hemes of the parallel members are chiastically arranged, as in the scheme ab.

Thus Prov 23 15:

(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) Palillogrammatic 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 reserves wrath for his enemies.'

(cf Jgs 5 3.6.11 f.15 f.23.27; Ps 2 7.12.17; 121; 124; 126; Isa 2 7; 24 5; Hos 6 4).

(vi) Climatic 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) Rhetorical 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 15 3; 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 values 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 strophes 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 have similar meanings, and words to words, we should expect obscure or unknown words to derive some light from words corresponding to them in parallel members or clauses. Not a few cases are enabled to us by comparison of words to restore with considerable confidence different words to different contexts in a general way as follows: ab: cd. We know what a, b and c mean, but are wholly in the dark as to the sense of d. That by the aid of parallelism we have an illustration in Jgs 5:28, which may be thus literally translated: "Through the window she looked," and (iii) Sisera's mother "through the a." Here we see that the use of parallelism is considerable, corresponding to known terms. The Heb vb. accompanying "through a window," wattp, is EV. "and cried." But no such vb. (ghaddab) is known for the Talm, as usually, follows the traditional interpretation. We want a vb. with a meaning similar to "looked." If we read בפל, wattp, 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 Tgs of Onkelos and Jonathan, and even of the LXX (A and Luc). What about the other Heb word untranslated in the Talm, which translates "looking," "to face" (probably Prov 7:6 is dependent). We get no help from etymology or in this case from the VSS, but parallelism had suggested to our translators the meaning "through the window," and the rendering of "window," Wattp, and the 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, of which we are otherwise unable to understand, and frequently a textual emendation is suggested which is otherwise supported.

(c) Prevalence and value of parallelism: Two statements areent parallelism in the OT may be safely regarded as characteristic of all OT poetry. Lowth had so much to do with its discovery and 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 Assyria (see A. Jeremiahis, Die babylon. Vorstellung vom Leben nach dem Tod), in Egypt (Georg Ehlers, Nord u. Süd, 1), in Finnish (Gefährter, Die deutschen Volks-Aberglaube 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 necessarily be that in OT parallelism is held 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 be hardly be more than enumerated.

(a) Alliteration: e.g. "Round and round the rugged rocks." We have good examples in the Heb of Ps 6:8 and 27:7. (b) Assonance, or the use of many (see for Bible examples the Heb of Gen 49:17; Ex 14:14; De 32:1) rhyme. There are so few examples of this in the Heb Scriptures that one can regard it as a feature in Heb poetry, though in Arab, and even in the Gk, there are examples. Two Hebrew stichs in the Heb text of Genesis 4:23: Job 10: 8: "The case of the wise is: In the days of the ancient kings in the days of four generation, there are few examples of this in the Heb text. The cases of the ancient kings. (c) Rhyme: There are so few examples of this in the Heb Scriptures that one can regard it as a feature in Heb poetry, though in Arab, and even in the Gk, there are examples. In the days of the ancient kings there are few examples. (d) Assonance and effactual working belong to it, "are with (lit. "are with") his err, and that err that he causes to err." Man's rhetorical instincts are quite sufficient to account for this phenomenon without assuming that in Heb poetry there is an objective standard. Those who adopt this last view and reject the idea that man's intuition is a help to his poetry are indeed correct. For an examination of the metrical systems of Hubert Grümme, who takes account of quantity as well as accent, and of Eduard Sievers, who holds that the versification of the Heb

(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 have similar meanings, and words to words, we should expect obscure or unknown words to derive some light from words corresponding to them in parallel members or clauses. Not a few cases are enabled to us by comparison of words to restore with considerable confidence different words to different contexts in a general way as follows: ab: cd. We know what a, b and c mean, but are wholly in the dark as to the sense of d. That by the aid of parallelism we have an illustration in Jgs 5:28, which may be thus literally translated: "Through the window she looked," and (iii) Sisera's mother "through the a." Here we see that the use of parallelism is considerable, corresponding to known terms. The Heb vb. accompanying "through a window," wattp, is EV. "and cried." But no such vb. (ghaddab) is known for the Talm, as usually, follows the traditional interpretation. We want a vb. with a meaning similar to "looked." If we read בפל, wattp, 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 Tgs of Onkelos and Jonathan, and even of the LXX (A and Luc). What about the other Heb word untranslated in the Talm, which translates "looking," "to face" (probably Prov 7:6 is dependent). We get no help from etymology or in this case from the VSS, but parallelism had suggested to our translators the meaning "through the window," and the rendering of "window," Wattp, and the 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, of which we are otherwise unable to understand, and frequently a textual emendation is suggested which is otherwise supported.

(c) Prevalence and value of parallelism: Two statements areent parallelism in the OT may be safely regarded as characteristic of all OT poetry. Lowth had so much to do with its discovery and 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 Assyria (see A. Jeremiahis, Die babylon. Vorstellung vom Leben nach dem Tod), in Egypt (Georg Ehlers, Nord u. Süd, 1), in Finnish (Gefährter, Die deutschen Volks-Aberglaube 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 necessarily be that in OT parallelism is held 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 be hardly be more than enumerated.

(a) Alliteration: e.g. "Round and round the rugged rocks." We have good examples in the Heb of Ps 6:8 and 27:7. (b) Assonance, or the use of many (see for Bible examples the Heb of Gen 49:17; Ex 14:14; De 32:1) rhyme. There are so few examples of this in the Heb Scriptures that one can regard it as a feature in Heb poetry, though in Arab, and even in the Gk, there are examples. Two Hebrew stichs in the Heb text of Genesis 4:23: Job 10:8: "The case of the wise is: In the days of the ancient kings in the days of four generation, there are few examples of this in the Heb text. The cases of the ancient kings. (c) Rhyme: There are so few examples of this in the Heb Scriptures that one can regard it as a feature in Heb poetry, though in Arab, and even in the Gk, there are examples. In the days of the ancient kings there are few examples. (d) Assonance and effactual working belong to it, "are with (lit. "are with") his err, and that err that he causes to err." Man's rhetorical instincts are quite sufficient to account for this phenomenon without assuming that in Heb poetry there is an objective standard. Those who adopt this last view and reject the idea that man's intuition is a help to his poetry are indeed correct. For an examination of the metrical systems of Hubert Grümme, who takes account of quantity as well as accent, and of Eduard Sievers, who holds that the versification of the Heb
Bible that Heb poetry is normally anapaestic, see W. H. Gubb, Criticism of Systems of Heb Meter, 152 ff., 169 ff. Herder, K. J. Budde, F. R. Eckardt, B. Dölle, and Toy reject all the systems of Heb meter hitherto proposed, though Budde has a leaning toward Ley'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 "kinah measure" (from הַכָּנָה, kinnedah, "a lamentation"). In this each 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 (3 + 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 ZATW, 60, 152, "Das heb. Klagegedicht." It must, however, be borne in mind that even Herder (d. 1805) 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 Hebrew Poetry, 1833, I, 40). But the present writer submits the following criticisms:  

(i) Budde is inconsistent in rejecting all other 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 hexameter and tetrameter 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 "verses" 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) Series of stichs (verses): In Heb poetry a stich hardly ever stands alone. We have practically always a distich (couplet, Job 18:5), a tristich (triple, Nu 6 24-26), a tetristich (Gen 44 23), or the pentastich.  

(d) Strophes or strophers (Stud. Krü., 1831, 40-114, "Die Strophen," etc) maintained that all poems in the Heb Scriptures are naturally divisible into strophes (stanzas) of similar, if not equal, length. Thus Ps 119 is arranged in strophes named after the letters of the Heb alphabet, each stich containing eight verses, or sixteen metrical verses or stichs, most of the stichs having three meters or rhythmic feet. But though several Bib. poems are composed in strophes, many are not.  

(e) Song: This (םירָד, síhráh) is made up of a series of verses and in some cases of strophes.  

(f) Poem: We have examples of such strophes in the books of Job and Cant which consist of a combination of the song.  

(7) Classification of stichs or verses.—Stichs may be arranged as follows, according to the number of meters (or feet) which they contain: (a) the trimeter or trisyllabic, with three meters or feet; (b) the tetrameter, with a stich four meters or feet; (c) the pentameter or pentasyllabic, which has five meters or feet: this is Budde's "kinah measure" (see Lam 1:1, etc.). Though this consists of six meters or feet, and is often used to distinguish from two separate trimeters or tripods.  

Our first and most original authority on the internal characteristics of Heb poetry is that great German theologian and man of letters, J. G. Herder, the pastor and friend of Goethe and schiller at Weimar. In his Vom Geist der ebräischen Poesie, 1784, he discussed at length and with great freshness these internal aspects of the poetry of the OT (down to Nature, Budde, etc.) which impressed him as a literary man. Reference may be made also to Goethe's Theory of the Poem, 1821 (popular), and Isaac Taylor's Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, 1834, it is a strange but striking and significant coincidence that these two poets and much if any knowledge of the Heb language. They studied the poetry of the ancient Hebrews only extensively. They do not, however, the Hebrews who concerned themselves with the preservation of the literature as such. (b) Within the Bible Canon itself there are numerous poems or snatches of poems reflecting the everyday life of the people. (c) We have love songs (Ps 45), a wedding song (Ps 66), parts of ditties sung on discovering a new well (Nu 21 17 f), on drinking wine, and there are references to war songs (Nu 21 14; Josh 10 13; 2 S 1 18).  

(2) Species of poetry.—Bib. poetry may be subsumed under the following headings: (a) folkore, prophetic, (b) poetical, (c) speculative, (d) lyrical.  

(a) Folklore: "Poetry," said J. G. Hamann (d. 1788), "is the mother tongue of the human race." In both folk-music and folk-poetry, each the oldest of its class, the inspiration is immediate and spontaneous. We have examples of folk-songs in Gen 11 1-9; 19 24 f.  

(b) Prophetic poetry: This is the expression of the inspiration under which the seer wrote. One may compare the oracular utterances of diviners and prophets, and invariably poetical in form as well as in matter. But one 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 as a rule a means of various kinds. The OT prophet professed to speak directly and partially inspired by 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.  

(c) 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 proverb or parable (דָּבֶר, māshāḥ), also comes in here.

(c) Lyrical poetry: This includes the hymns of the Psalter, the songs of Cant and the many other lyrics found in the historical and prophetical 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 charged, 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) Dramatic poetry: Defining dramatic 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 acceptable. 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 poetical books in the OT, Job, Prov, and Ps, known in Jewish circles by the mnemonic abbreviation גָּמֶל, Ṣemeth, the three consonants forming the initial letters of the Heb names of the above books. These three books have been supplied by the Massoretes with a special system of accent marks known as the poetic accents, and involving a method of intoning in the synagogue different from that followed when the prose books are read. But these accentual marks cannot be traced farther back than the 7th or 8th cent. of our era.

It is customary to divide the poetical books of the OT into two classes, each containing three books: (1) those containing lyrical poetry (יָשָׁר, ašhr, or יָשָׁרָה, shirāh), i.e. Ps, Cant, Lam; (2) those containing for the most part didactic poetry (דָּבֶר, māshāḥ), i.e. Job, Prov, Eccl.

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 Hengelr, The Historical Poetry of the Hebrews, 2, 1879-80).

We have examples in Gen 4 23 f.; 49; Ex 15; Nu 21 14 f.27-30 (JE); 23 f (Balaam’s songs); Dt 321 (song and blessing of Moses); Josh 10 12-14 (JE); Jos 8 (Deborah’s Song); 9 8-15; 1 S 2 1-10; 2 S8; 13 39 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 are a full list of works dealing with Heb meter in W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Heb Metre (1907). The first edition of the world’s still usable "Essay on Hebrew Poetry" prefixed to his comm. on the Ps was published in Eng. in the Journal of Sacred Literature (1854), 74 ff. In 1905 J. W. Rothstein issued a suggestive treatise on Heb rhythm (Grundzüge der hebräischen Rhythmik mit kritischem Kommentar, Halle, 5ff), reviewed by the present writer in Review of Theol. and Philos. (Edinburgh, 1905). 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.

POETRY, NEW TESTAMENT: No one questions the presence of poetry of 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 even the ordinary reader of the Scriptures called to the beauty and wealth of its poetical passages. The messages of the NT are 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 post-exilic 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 religion founded by revelation, 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 readily lend themselves to song. In fact it is thought by Delitzsch that Jesus was no less careful of the form than of the content of His message, and that all the finer types of Heb 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 our 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 poesy in novicew 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 Cleanthes’ Hymn to Zeus (Acts 17 28). He also quotes from Epicenides and the Athenian dramatist Menander in 1 Cor 15 32. St. Paul knew the genius of the Hebrews, and enriches his own message with many quotations from it. He was acquainted with the Christian hymnology 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 grace; 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 NT see the Exegesis of the Prophetic 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 qualities of Heb poetry have 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 context. When a text 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 PARASYLE; POETRY, HEBREW.

C. E. SCHENK

POINTS, points: The word occurs in Ecc 5 16, “In all points (ggΟνη, ummah`) 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 ποινά, katê poínta, “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. They are too replete for us to summarize here. The temptations of Christ were, as He afterwards said, “as many against me as against you” (John 14 29). Such temptations 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 (γάλακτος, hemah`, γάλακτος, rôsh`; σουλόδος, thumôs, lôs, lûs): Residents in Pil 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 fellahin as any of the reptiles, not to speak of the mice, 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 their bite” (44 20). These and other 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 (Citrusulus colocynthis) of 2 K 4 39, and the grapes of gall, probably the fruit of Colotropis procera, the apples of Solom of Jos (BJ IV, viii, 4). Some, however, believe that these are poppyheads. Poisonous waters are referred to at Marah (Ex 15 20) and Jericho (2 K 2 19). There is no direct record of any person dying of poison except in 2 Mac 10 13, where the suicide of Ptolemy Macron is recorded. Our Lord’s promise in the appendix to Mk 16 18, however, that poisons were known and might be administered by way of healing was in the unknown “water of jealousy” (Nu 5 17). In connection this story in Eusebius (HE, III, 39) is interesting, that “Justus surnamed Barsabas, though he drank a deadly poison, suffered no injury, through the grace of the Lord.” Other passages which mention the word are Dt 32 4, where serpents (RV “crawling things”) of the dust, probably Ceraastes hasselquisti, the little horned vipers, are mentioned, and in ver 33: “poison of serpents, and the cruel venom of asps.” The asp may be the eobra 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 tongue like a serpent; adders’ poison is under their lips,” indicates, what is still a common belief, that when poison (the forked tongue of the serpent) is the poison-bearer. This is referred to in Jus 3 8. That it was the fang and not the tongue which carried the poison was known to Phiny (xlii.62). This verse of Ps 140 is given in St. Paul’s composite quotation in Rom 3 13. There may be a reference to the giving of an intoxicant poison in Hab 2 15, where RV reads “that addeth 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 this 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 ἑμαθή, “lizard” (AV “spider”), mentioned in Prov 30 25 (LXX kolobôth) was formerly regarded as poisonous and it is still much disliked by the fellahin, as they believe that it makes mocking gestures mimicking them at their prayers. They are really not poisonous. It is doubtful whether the lizard mentioned by Agur is really this scorpion; the description better fits the gecko.

ALEX. MACALISTER

POLE, pôl: Nu 21 8. AV for POL, nēg, RV “standard.”

POLICY, pol`i-see: Lit. “method of government,” and so “ability to manage affairs.” In a bad sense, “cunning,” “craft,” in Dal 8 25 (γάρδας, sekel, “understanding”); in a good sense in 1 Mac 8 4 (πολιτική, boulê, “counsel”); also in AV 2 Mac 13 18, 14 29 31 (μεθόδοι, méthodos, στρατηγική, stratėgenê, stratē̇genês, stratîgenos, stratîgėnês), where RV has “strategy.”

Policies occurs in Jer 11 8 AV for πανοπλισμος, πανοπλίσμον, “readiness,” in a good sense; RV “subtil devices.”

POLISHED, pol`isht. See CORNER-STONE, (2).

POLL, pôl: The word (on the derivation of which see Skeat, Concise Etym. Dict. of the Eng. Language, 360) has been eliminated as a vb in ARV. In AV and ERV it represents the Heb vb. טַעַשׁ, ṭoash, “to sharpen,” “to sharpen a sword,” “to sharpen out,” “to uproot,” thence “to shear the sheep,” figuratively, “to destroy an enemy” (Mic 1 16), γαλάκτω, γαλακτω, in Piel, lit. “to make bald orround-headed” (2 S 14 26) and γαλάκτω, γαλακτω, “to cut off” (Jer 9 26; 25 23; 49 32). The Heb noun is γαλακτος, galaktos. As will be seen from the above enumeration, the Heb. vb. 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 ᵃḇbᵉzath for the children of thy delight: enlarge thy baldness as the eagle [in “vulture”]; 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 ᶻḇague] of their heads” (Ezk 44 20). The Piel form of galaktô 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 ṣe’ar, where ARV materially imi-
proves the tr by adopting the marginal version of AV (Jer 9 36; 25 23; 49 32). See Hair.

The noun (gubôlêth, lit. “head”) is tr’ “poll” in the phrase “by the poll,” “by their polls” (Nu 1 2, 18, 20, 22; 3 47; 1 Ch 23 8, 24). The expression has polygamy in the numbering of persons by their heads, in the same way in which we speak of head-tax, etc.

H. L. E. LERING

POLULLION, po-lis’shun (κόπας, gôtal, “to pollute”; ἀληγρώμα, ἀληγανία, “contamination”): In Mt 1 7, “Ye offer 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.”

POLUX, pôl’üks. See Cestor and Polux.

POLYGGAMY, pô-lîg’a-mi:
1. Meaning of the Term
2. Origin of Polygamy
3. OT and Polygamy
4. Polygamy Unnatural
5. Weakness of 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 mar-
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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, previous to Abraham's marriage. 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 hear.

The conditions of Jacob's marriages were such that it is hard to say whether his children were 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 unblishing sale, for slavery in Egypt, of one of the brothers by a polygamous father.

David was a singer of sweet and noble songs and wanted to be a righteous man with his whole heart. Yet, probably common in all the military leaders and kings of the earth of his day, he had a 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—undeniably 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 untoward 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 polygamy, it would seem that polygamy is a greater crime against Unnatural Nature than polyandry. To put out of view for a moment the wrong to a woman in denying to her the rights and privileges of monogamous marriage, the interference with the rights of many women who constituted a large up 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 the condition of woman in provinces and tongues. They have not only been servants to women in harems, but they have acquired such influence with their masters that they have sometimes even dictated the policy of government. They have been in some cases the last word in public affairs. They have sometimes held public positions and shown therein astonishing ability. Witness Nares, the brilliant general of the emperor Justinian. See EUNUCH.

Gibbon noticed the fact that nations began to decline in power when their policies were dictated by eunuchs. But that is taking a symptom for the disease. There are weaknesses behind that weakness. We have found woman 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 endowments, 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 debarred from society, permitted to look at it only through a bared lattice, or, if abroad, through a wathed face. The harem of shell or sultan has fixed the condition of woman in provinces or nation,—set 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 is such degradation is the "helpmeet" for man in all his problems? This condition is reflected back over man. What possible appeal can there be to vast 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 weighed 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 earthen 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 establishment 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, enjoyment of the latter was a bright hope for the life to come. But when they had possession of a country, and massacres 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 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 mental, that were at work in 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,
Snuffling his teeth with hooves of fire,
Neighing the joy of heroic desire.

The circling herbage of arid plains
Had touched his hooves like bands of steel:
The snow-fed waters of Zarafshan
Had nerved the might of a northern will.
The war steed grazed in the fertile meads,
Drinking the waters of indolent streams:
He rested at eve on bloom-dight beds,
Toied by with maidens in the goldening gleams.
They charmed his ear with dajiant song:
Many closed his eyes in witchery's glow;
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 flowered grass grows green:
The carrion bird hath flown—hath died—
Riseloth the war-horse? Neigheth? Hark!

The above lyric may be taken as the epitaph of any polygamous nation. The last words are significant—"Neigheth? Hark!" Would the old war steed arise? "Hark!" The Sepoy rebellion was on! We "harkened," 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" riseth and is victorious. He will then again lie down in "Beast-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 Divorce; Family; Marriage.

POMEGRANATE, pom'gran-át, pom-gran'at, pun'gran-áṭ (יוֹרָם, ṭū机动车 [tree and fruit]; the Heb name is similar to the Arab., Arum, and Ethiop.; θησος, rhos): One of the most attractive and most characteristic of the fruit trees of Syria, Palestine probably indigenous to Persia, Afghanistan and the neighborhood of the Caucasus, but introduced to 9 in very ancient times. The spies 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; this garden 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 has vanished from the sons of men.”

The pomegranate tree, Punica granatum (N.O. Granateae) 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 cardylus. On 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 (m. “sweet wine”) of my pomegranate” (Cant 5:2). 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 Sam 14:2) to have abode with his men is really a tree or a place, Rimmon, is doubtful. See Rimmon.

A large number of references to the pomegranate are to the use 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 28:33; 39:24-26; cf Exclus 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 tops of the pillars” (2 Sam 5:17; 2 Ch 3:16; 4:13). See S. W. G. Masterman.

POMMEL, pun’el (2 Ch 4:12.13): RV reads “bowl” (q.v.).

POND. See CISTERN; POOL.

PONDER, pun’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’shiy-uh, pon’ti-uh. 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 the name of geographical, not ethnical, 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 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 Phanaraeus. 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 Assyr culture at Sinope and Amias, probably as far back as the 3d 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 Termes 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 shrunk 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, swim after swim, 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 Amisos, the modern Samsoun, always an important commercial
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 region of Old Pontus, and its twin town of Strabo in the 1st cent. BC, and to the geographer Strabo, more than to any other man, is due our knowledge of Pontus in its early days. Zilde, 'built upon the mound of Semiramis,' contained the same name as Semiramis, 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. Arzibauros and Mithradates and Pharnaces are the recurring names in this dynasty of satraps which acquired independence about 333 and maintained it during the Macedonian period. The man that first made Pontus famous in history was Mithradates VI, strong-minded 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 Pergamum 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 completely. Western Asia Minor. Middle East.

The second war began in the year 74, with Lucullus as the Roman general. Lucullus took Amisus by siege, chased Mithradates to Cabira, modern Noksa, scattered his army and drove the oriental sultan out of his country. Subsequently, Lucullus cut his way from Kerasoun the first cherris known to the western world. In the third war the hero on the Rom side was the masterful Pompey, appointed in 66 BC. As a result of this war, Mithradates was completely vanquished. His dominions were finally and permanently incorporated in the territories of the Rom republic. The aged king, breathing out wrath and forming impossible plans against his lifelong enemies, died in exile in the Crimea from poison administered by his own hand. Most of Pontus was for administrative purposes united by the Romans with the province of Bithynia, though the eastern part subsisted as a separate kingdom under Polemon and his house, 36 BC to 63 AD, and the southwestern portion was incorporated with Galatia.

It was during the Rom period that Christianity entered this province. There were Jews dwelling in Pontus, devout representatives of whom were in Jerus on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2 9). Paul's associates, Aquila and Priscilla, were here (Acts 18 2). The sojourners of the Dispersion are included in the address of the first Ep. of Peter together with the people of four other provinces in Asia Minor (1 Pet 1 1). Local traditions connect the apostles Andrew and Thaddaeus with evangelistic labors in this region. They are said to have followed the great artery of travel leading from Caesarea Mazaca to Sinope. Pliny, governor of Bithynia and Pontus 111–13 AD, found Christians in the bird of Pontus, Trebizond, preparing for the year of Sossus (see BITHYNIA), and Professor Ramsay argues that Pliny's famous letters, Nos. 96 and 97, written to the emperor Trajan on the subject of the treatment of Christians under his government (see PERSECUTION,), were composed in view of conditions in Amisus (Church in Rom Empire, 224, 225).

The Rom empire in the East was gradually merged into the Byzantine, which is still known to the local inhabitants as the empire of "Room," i.e. Rome. Pontos 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, subsisted for a time, 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, pöl, POND, pond, RESERVOIR, rez'er-vwar, rez'er-vwär** (1) **מְבוֹת, brē'hêkh, "pool"); cf Arab. ܒܳܬܪܒܳܬ, birkat. "pool"; cf נְיוֹפִים. brēkhāh, "blessing," and Arab. ܒܳܬܪܒ݂, barakat, "blessing"; [2] **מָגָה, 'gaham, "pool," marsh", "reefs"; cf Arab. ܳܝܳܥܳܩܬܳܐ, 'ajam, "thicket," "jungle"; [3] **מָיְיוֹת, mikweh, "reservoir," AV "ditch" [Isa 11]; [4] **מַיְיוֹת, mikweh, "pond," AV "pool" [Ex 7 19], מַיְיוֹת, mikweh ha-mayim, AV "gathering together of the waters" [Gen 1 10]; מְיוֹחָנָה, mikweh-mayim, "a gathering of water," AV "plenty of water" [Lev 18 18]. [5] **קְוּמְבַּד, kolumbâd, "pool," lit. "a place of diving," from בֹּקָעָב, kolubâv, "kolumbâ, "to dive"); LAKES (q.v.) are very rare in Syria and Pal, but the dry climate, which is one reason for the fewness of lakes, impels the inhabit ants to make artificial pools 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 at least 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 rains 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 (אָפָה, ἐβογνός, 77, dal, ἄνι, וָפָה, ἐβόγνωσις, πληθός): 1. In the OT.—The poor have great prominence in the Bible. Indeed, there should be no poor among the Hebrews because Jeh is to bless. This was to be 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.

The words for ‘poor’ are chiefly ἐβογνός, ‘desirous,’ ἐβογνωσις, ‘needy,’ ἐβογνωσις, ‘moving,’ ‘swaying,’ hence, weak, poor, lowly (Ex 23 3, etc.; ἐβογνωσις, poverty, ‘weakness’ (2 K 12, etc.; ἐβογνωσις, perhaps, ‘to shake,’ ‘tremble,’ ‘to be poor, helpless,’ ἐβογνωσις, ‘homeless,’ etc.; ἐβογνωσις also, ‘poor,’ ‘oppressed’ from ἐβογνωσις, ‘to bend’ or ‘bow down’ (Ex 22 25, etc.; ἐβογνωσις, lowly, ἐβογνωσις, ‘weak, meek’ (Ps 10 8,14, AV; ἐβογνωσις, to make poor’ (1 S 2 7); ἐβογνωσις, ‘want’ (21 17); ἐβογνωσις, ‘a needy one’ (Ecc 4 13; 9 15,15,16). (1) Generally.—God (Jeh and Ἐλθός) is represented as having a special care for the poor,” which was illustrated in the deliverance of the nation from Egypt poverty and bondage and was never to be forgotten by them (Dt 24 22); as punishing the oppressors of the poor and rewarding those who were kind to them; God Himself was the Protector and Saviour of the poor (Ex 22 23): ‘If there be a poor man among you, and veny try to at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry; and my wrath shall wax hot, etc (Dt 16 9; 24 15; 1 S 2 8; Job 31 16; Ps 9 18; 12 5; Prov 19 17; Isa 26 4; Ecc 5 5, ‘one higher than the high regardeth, etc). (2) Liberty to the poor was especially enjoined (Dt 16 7 1), and they were to be free of self-deception and grudging in this (vs 9 10). (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’ that the poor might have them (Dt 14 28 29; 26 12); (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 16; Lev 25 5 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 they should be carried away (Dt 23 24 25); (e) in the Feast of Weeks the poor were to participate (Dt 15 9 12); (f) every seventh year there should be a release of debts (Dt 15 1); in the seventh year of servitude the Heb bond-servant should go free (Ex 21 2 3). (6) At the Jubilee, property which 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 15 15); no widow’s raiment should be taken in pledge (Dt 14 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 (vs 10 15); a poor man should be sin and their observance righteousness (Dt 24 13 15, etc; see ALMS, ALMSGIVING); (h) justice was to be done to the poor (Ex 23 6; Dt 27 19), ‘Cursed be he that wresteth the justice due to the stranger, fatherless and widow’; (i) offerings were graduated according to means (Lev 5 7 12 8). (4) Definite penalties were not always attached to those laws, and the prophets and psalmists have many complaints of the unjust treatment and oppression 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 the Heb people’). (6) The day of the Messiah, the times of the Messiah, shall bring deliverance and rejoicing to the poor (Ps 72 12 15; Isa 11 4, ‘With righteousness shall be he judge the poor,” etc; 11 30; 29 19; 61 1 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 12 22 12, Ecc 4 13). (5) Ways in which men can willfully make themselves poor are mentioned (Prov 6 11 10 4 12 24; 13 4 18; 14 23; 20 13; 21 5 17; 23 21; 28 19). The chief words given above all mean poor, literally, but its rendered also ‘afflicted,’ ‘afflicted’ also denote Israel as a nation in its 3. the afflictions and low estate, e.g. Ps 68 Godly Poor 10; Isa 41 17; 49 13; 51 21; 54 11; in Zeph 5 12, ‘is the ideal Israel of the future’ Dr. Driver remarks, the Poor, HDR) that such passages was taken ‘also its frequent parallel e’bebgon, 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 Jeh.’ The humble poor became in fact distinguished as the line in which faithfulness to Jeh was maintained and spiritual
religion developed. The less frequent word 'ēnâsē, often tr "meek," "humble," is regarded (see Driver in loc.) as having from the first a moral and religious significance. It is used of Moses (Nu 12 3) and occurs in Ps 34 6; 16 9; 33 17; etc. I Sam 3 34; 16 19; I saa 29 19; 32 7; 61 1; Am 2 7; Zeph 2 3.

II. In the NT.—In the NT pōchôs, "trembling," "poor," "beggar," is almost exclusively the word used to render "poor." It does not occur very frequently, but we see the same regard for the poor maintained as we have in the OT; besides, the new principle of love and the example of Him who "though he was rich, yet for your sakes became poor" (pōchōthē, 2 Cor 8 9) necessarily carries in them regard even more fully than in the OT. Jesus announced His mission (Lk 4 18) by quoting Isa 61 1, "to preach good tidings [AV "the gospel"] to the poor" (or meek or humble); He gave as a proof of His Messiahship the fact that "the poor have the gospel [or good news of the Kingdom] preached to them" (Mt 11 5; Lk 7 22); according to Lk 6 20, He pronounced a benediction on the pious "poor" because the kingdom of God was theirs; in Mt 6 3 it is "the poor in spirit" (the humble); we have the injunctions to care for "the poor" (pōchōthē, Mt 10 7; Lk 18 22) who are "always with you" (Mt 26 11; Mk 14 7; Jn 12 8), which does not mean that they must always be "the poor," but that, in contrast with Himself who was soon to leave them, the poor should remain and kindness could be shown to them at any time, which was His own practice (Jn 13 29); we are enjoined to call not the rich or well-to-do to our entertainments, but the poor (Lk 14 13; ef ver 21); Zacchaeus cited in his favor the fact that he gave half of his goods to the poor (Lk 19 8); special notice was taken by Jesus of the poor widow's contribution (Lk 21 3). The first church showed its regard for the poor in the distribution of goods "according as any man had need" (Acts 2 45; 4 32; 6 1); when the council at Jerusalem the Gentiles from the yoke of Judaism, they made it a condition, Paul says, "that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do" (Gal 2 10); contributions were accordingly made "for the poor among the saints" (Gal 2 10), and it was in conveying such contributions that Paul got into the circumstances that led to his arrest. God's ability and will to provide for those who give to the poor is quoted from Ps 12 9 (2 Cor 9 9); James specifies that Christians of His day for their partiality for the rich and their disfavour of the poor (Jas 2 5–9), and John asks how, in the man who "hath the world's goods, and beheldeth his brother in need, and shuttest up his compassion from him," the love of God can dwell (1 Jn 3 17, 18).

Pōchôs is tr "beggar" (Lk 16 20 22) and "beggarly" (Gal 4 9); pēnâs, "one who works for his daily bread," "a poor man," is the word in 2 Cor 9 9; the poor widow of Mk 12 42 is described in Lk 21 2 as pēnâschor, "very poor."
pine"; LXX ἱχνος, echinos, "hedgehog"; ἅπαξ, kippās [Isa 34 15], AV "great owl," ERV "arrow-snake," ARV "dart-snake;" LXX echinos; cf Arab. ١٠٣. "Cor

always 6, Dt 24; kaphadh, "to draw one's self together" or "to roll one's self up," while ἁρφ is referred to Ἴἀπ, kaphar, and Ἴἀπ, kaphar, "to draw together in order to spring." The resemblance between all these words, including the Arab. ١١٣، is obvious, and it is to be noted that LXX has echinos in all the places cited:

The Gr echinos is the hedgehog. The Arab. kunfud is used in some localities for the hedgehog and in others for the porcupine, which is also called nis. The hedgehog is also called khabbat-ush-shaḳ, or "ball of spines." 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 europeus, is one of the Insectivora; it is a small insect-eating mammal, and is about 10 in. long, covered with short, soft, brown fur, and with a hump on the back between the ears. It is found in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America; it is a very common animal in the woods of Europe and Asia; it is also found in the Woods of Mexico and Central and South America.

As to the rendering "bittern" for kippās [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 kippās, most modern authorities (cf RV) have some sort of serpent, referring to the Arab. ١٢٣, kafṣ, "to spring." (See notes above on kāḥrah and kāḥrah.) In this passage also the context is not unfavorable to a bird (cf AV "great owl"). See Bittern; Owl; Serpent.

ALFRED ELY DAY

PORPHYRY, pórfrī (in Eng. RV), has "porphyry" [AV "porphyre" for ἰλλίς, ἰλλίς, δόραμα, RV "sealskin." AV "badgers' skin"] [Ec 25 5; 26 14; 35 7; 36 19; 39 34; Nu 4 6; 10.11; 12.14.25; Ezk 16 10]: The word denotes leather used in the furnishings of the tabernacle (for shoes in Ezk 15 10), and was probably the skin of the duongog, Halocereus dougou, Arab. ٢٠٣، tukhas, which is found in the Red Sea. See Badger.

PORT, pôt, PORTER, pôr'ter: "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 1 13. Porter, as "gate-keeper," however, is still in use in Eng, and is still in use in Eng (AV has never in EV) generally means a burden-carrier. In the OT, except in 2 S 18 26; 2 Kr 7 10.11, the porter (אֹר, shōbār) 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, Ezr 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 24) were personages of some importance. For some inscrutable reason RV renders shōʿēr by "doorkeeper" in 1 Ch 15 26, but not elsewhere. See Doorkeeper.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PORTION, pór'shūn, PART: As far as a distinction between these words is possible in English, 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 (יוֹצֵל, m’nāh, is always "portion" in RV, but is "part" in AV, Ex 32 26; Lev 7 33; 8 29) or by the context, irrespective of the Heb word used. So "part" and "portion" both represent לְשָׁה, dabhar, 1 K 6 38; Neh 12 47; יָשָׁה, peh, Zea 13 8; Dt 21 17; יָשָׁה, hebel, Josh 17 5 (RV); Ezk 47 13; μέρος, méros, Lk 11 36; 13 46. And in the vast majority of cases in the OT both words represent simply some derivative of לְשָׁה, halak, normally the noun לְשָׁה, ḥekāl.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

POSIDONIUS, pos'-i-dō'-ni-us (Ποσιδώνιος, Posiđōnios, al. Ποσιδώνιος, Posidōnios and Ποσιδιάν, Possidón). One of the three envoys sent by the Syrian general Nicanor to treat with the Jews under Judas during his invasion of Judea, 161 BC (2 Mace 14 19). In 1 Mace 7 27 ff, they are proposed as sent by Nicanor to Judas, 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 Nicanor.

POSSESS, po-zaz', POSSESSION, po-zesh'um: "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 וָנָשֶׁה, which with its dative as the matter in which it is possessed of, under the noun possession, in the on the other hand, no such ambiguity exists, and attention need be called only to the following passages. InDt 11 6, AV has, "all the substance that was in their possession," Heb "all that subsisted at their feet," RV "everything living thing that flowed them." AV use "possessing" "loosely in Acts 28 7 for χρυσόν, chōrin, RV "lands," πορτοφαίους, periportelōs, from periporto, "cause to remain over," "gain," is rendered "God's own possession" in Eph 1 14 RV ("possession") and 1 Pet 2 9 (AV "peculiar goods, AVm "purchased"). "God's own" is a gloss but is implied in the context.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

POSSESSION, DEMONICAL, de-mō-nil'-a-kal (Mt 4 24; 8 16, etc). See Demon, Demonic, Demonology.
POST, post (πόστ, πόστος, “to run,” ἀπόστος, “runner”): The “runners” formed the royal guard (1 8 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 Pers service they were mounted on the swiftest horses (Est 8 10 14; cf 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 (cf Mt 5 15; Mk 15 21; “compelled”)

Used in Job 9 25 and AV Wisi 5 9 (ἀγγέλα, RV “message”) of the swift passage of time. See also Hosea, 1 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) πότα, the most common word for “pot.” It designates with the highest frequency the veloped (Gen 14 14; 51 15) probably a pot or kettle for boiling. So 2 K 4 38 ff; Ex 18 3; Jer 1 13 AV; Ezek 11 3 7 11, “caldron”; 24 3 6 AV; Mic 3 36; Zec 14 21, etc. It is also used as the name of some vessel of the same general shape (Gen 27 3), where the context shows that it was intended to hold ashes: 1 K 7 45; 2 Ch 4 16; 2 K 25 14. In Ps 60 8; 108 9, it is a pot for washing. (2) ἀράμ, πάραρ (Nu 11 8; 1 S 2 14), a vessel for boiling; in Jgs 6 19, a vessel for holding brot. (3) τέρα, ἀτερα, rendered “pot” in Ps 21 6 in AV, “basin” in RV; “pot” both AV and RV in Job 41 20. (4) γίννηθεν, γίνεθεν (Ex 16 33), the jar in which the manna was placed. This jar or pot is mentioned in He 9 4 under the name στάφύλι, στάπηνος. (5) τὸς, ἀπόθος (2 K 4 2), some kind of jar for holding oil. (6) στέρνη, στέστες (Mk 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 this root with the subsequently some 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.

POTENTATE, po'ten-tate (σωτάρτης, σωτάττσ, “mighty one,” from σωτάρι, σωτάτται, “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, po-ti-far (ποτιφήρ, pōtīphēr; cf 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 Hyskos court.

POTIPHERA, po-ti-fer-a (ποτιφηρα, pōtīphēra; Egypt Podipera, “the [one] given of the sun-god”; cf 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 XXIII Dynasty, about 950 BC. But names of the Hyskos period, and, indeed, any kind of Hyskos inscriptions, are so scarce on account of the destruction of Hyskos 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

POTSHerd, pot'shurd (πουρῆς, heres): A piece of earthenware (Job 2 8; Ps 22 15; Isa 45 9). RV renders the word in Prov 26 23, “an earthen vessel,” and in Job 41 30 substitutes “sharp potsherd” for “sharp stones.” Sir 22 7 refers to the art of “fusing a potsherd [φέρομαι, ἱδρωκεῖν] together.” See HARSith; Ostraca.

POTSHerd GATE (Jer 19 2). See Harsith Gate.

POTTAGE, po'tāj. See Food, III.

POTTER, po'tēr, POTTERY, po'tēr-i:

1. Historical Development
2. Forms
3. Methods of Production
4. Uses
5. Biblical Terms
6. Archaeological Significance

LITERATURE

(1) Prehistoric.—The making of pottery ranks among the very oldest of the crafts. On the rocky slopes of Upper Egypt, overlooking the Nile valley, are found the polished red earthenware pots of the pre-development historic Egyptians. These are buried in shallow oval graves along with the cramped-up 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 settlement probably existed 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 Ch, vol. 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 noted of the ancient Egypt crafts. 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 hand-made 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 Arab guides carried, for the bottles took the water. At the end of six days only one out of eight earthenware jars was left. One accident or some other reason befall all the others.

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 Archaeological 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 pottery here used is that adopted by Bliss and Macalister and based upon Dr. Petrie's studies.

(1) Early pre-Israelite, called also “Amorites” (before 1800 B.C.).—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 previously burnished surface are also found.

(2) Late pre-Israelite or Phoenician (1000-1800 B.C.).—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 meshes. Cypriote ware with its incised decorations was a like development of the period.

(3) Jewish (1000-300 B.C.).—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 Hebrew stamps, the exact meaning of which is uncertain.

(4) Seleucid.—Foreign influence again appears. Grey and other pottery is 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 ground and dashed into a cement-lined tank or wooden trough and covered with water. When the lumps have softened they are stirred in the water until all have disintegrated and a thin slaty mud or "slip" has 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 (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, esp. 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 representing 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 wheel-shaped objects. In a Mt. Lebanon village which is noted for its pottery the jars are still made by hand. To an extent the clay stoves are shaped by hand out of clay mixed with straw.
ANCIENT POTTERY

Selotician Period, 300 BC
Note appearance of "combing."

Cypriot Pottery
1, 2 and 3, incurved ware of pre-bronze period before 2000 BC
4 and 5, of Phoenician Period, 1200 BC

Greco-Roman Period
1, red and black figured, before 350 BC
2 and 3, Cyprian of 350 BC
4, 5 and 6, Roman pottery from Beirut
Note characteristic "combing."

Jewish Period
Blackening on 3 due to use over fire

Pre-Isrealite Period
1, hand-made throughout
2, 3 and 4, of early period or Amorite
5, 6 and 7, of late period or Phoenician
6, 8 and 9 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 (IVth 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 18:1–5). 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 20 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 fired 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
dross, 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 antecedently for storing liquids, such as wine or oil, fruits, grains, etc. The blackened bot-
POTTERY, pot'er, FIELD. See ACEDAMA.

POUND, pound (גַּם), mâneh; μᾶρ, mār; λίτρα, litra; Lat libra): Pound does not correctly represent the Heb mâneh, which was more than a pound (see Manah). The litra of Jn 12:3 and 19:39 is the Rom pound (libra) of 4,590 grains, which is less than a pound troy, being about 10 oz. In a monetary sense (its use in Lk 19:13-25) it is the ma, or mâneh, which was either of silver or gold, the former, which is probably the one referred to by Luke, being equal to £5.17, or about $33; the latter £102.10 or $510. See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Figurative: “Pound,” like “talent,” is used in the NT for intellectual gifts and spiritual endowments, as in the passage given above.

H. PORTER

POVERTY, pov'ér-ti: This word, found but once 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), is a tr of עיוור, yi'ivvārēsh, “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 [עיוור, 'irāh, “to be impoverished,” “destitute”] will use entreaties; but the rich answareth roughly.”

“Poverty” occurs 3 t. in the NT (2 Cor 8:29;
Rev 2:9) and is the tr of πτωχεύω, πτωχέα, "to be reduced to a state of beggary or pauperism."

2. NT References unless all the references to the "poor" and "beggars" are not connected in meaning. Indeed the word for "poverty" has its root in the word for "poor" (πτωχός, πτωχά, τρ, ο, or τι, dol). 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 example, by its use of two words for Degrees of "poor" sets forth this distinction. In Poverty 2 Cor 9, 9, "he hath given to the poor," the word used is πτωχός, πτωχή, 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 poor, for your's is the kingdom of heaven," a condition which is indicated 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 16:20. 21). This is not the case with the NT, where poverty is simply a condition of not being rich, and no one can be poor in the NT unless wealthy (Lk 12:15; 2 Cor 8:9). It is not because of the rich man’s wealth as such that Paul refers to the rich as "poor" (2 Cor 8:9). What he means is that the rich are care for the poor. The exhortations to relieve poverty are numerous, esp. in the Pauline, but it is in poverty that must be treated with kindness (Dtr 15:7-11), and no one can be said to be a poor in the NT unless wealthy (Lk 12:15; 2 Cor 8:9). And if one is poor, he must be helped, even if it is to make the rich feel poor too (2 Cor 8:10). Indeed, the truth or falsity of a man’s religion is to be tested, in some sense at least, by his relation to those in 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 cede over to their creditors (Lev 25:25-64; Dtr 15:1-15).
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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 Acts 28:33 (Rom), reviews the different interpretations which have been given of the word, and shows (1) that no authority is to be found for its signifying Nero's palace on the Palatine Hill; (2) that before the death of Domitian, there was no praetorium which would make it mean the praetorian barracks on the Palatine: (3) nothing is known by any authority for making it mean the praetorian camp outside the walls of Rome. In Lightfoot's words (Acts 28:33 note), "The praetorium thus fail for want of evidence." Lightfoot accordingly defends 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 regiment 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 only 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 council 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 Roman Citizen, 357). The Emperor could then call together a council of war composed of the officers and their general, which, in a city like Rome, where there were many praetorians guarding various places, might be called the praetorium, and such a praetorium was the praetorium of which Paul speaks.

Thus the correct meaning of "praetorium" enables us to fix the date of the Epistle to the Romans as being written to the close of Paul's first imprisonment. That this inference is correct is fortified by various other facts, such as his promise to visit that city, his allowance of allowances, his release, and his journey to Jerusalem. We could not conceive of Paul writing like this if Mark, Luke, and John, and especially if Luke himself, and yet we know (Col 4:7, 10, 14) that each and all of these companions of the apostle were with him when he was in Rome when he wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians. From this it is evident, along with others, been sent on missions to Asia or other parts of the empire, so that Paul was well justified in the "likeminded" when he wrote to the Philippians. 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 Epistle to the Philippians was before him. The name of the court is a corruption of the Greek word, but which formerly had the meaning of the cities or princes of 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 procurator where Jesus was brought on 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; Herod's palace). The procurator used Herod's palace. It is certain that the headquarters of the procurator were at Herod's palace. This was a building whose magnificence was hardly sufficiently appraised (Wars, i, xii, 1; v, iv, 4). It was in this palace that Florus, the procurator took refuge in his quarters, and before 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
compelled them to get as far as the citadel [Antonia]; but his attempt failed" (II, xv, 5). The term τρις "court" had, as far as is known, the same legal meaning as "court" in Mk 15:16, "the soldiers led him away within the court [aulē], which is the Praetorium." 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 southwestern hill, where at a later time it expressly states that Herod Agrippa II and his sister Bernice were living (Wars, II, xvi, 8).

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 Praetorium 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 Jerusalem 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 Praetorium must modify the traditional claims of the "Via Dolorosa," the whole course of which depends on the theory that the "Way of Sorrow" began at the Antonia, the Praetorium and late ecclesiastical tradition. See also GABATHA.

With regard to the expression ἐν βασιλείᾳ τῶν παρατηρητῶν, ἐν κόλπῳ τῆς πραιτορίου, in Phil 1:13, there is now a general consensus of opinion that "Praetorium" here means not a place, but the imperial praetorium 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 praetorian guard, and the fact that these were doubled constantly, 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, πάρανομία, πάραση, "psalm," "praise," ταχθή, ἔθνη, "confession," "thanksgiving," τίμων, σαβαών, "to praise," "glorify," τίμων, σάμαρ, τίμων, "praise," "to stretch out the hand," "confess"; αἰδούς, αἰδοῦς, ἀθραυστός, ἀπανθραυστός, ἐπάνωσος, εἰς τὸν θρόνον τῶν θεῶν, ἐπάνωσος, ἐπάνωσος, ἐπάνωσος, ἐπάνωσος, ἐπάνωσος, εἰς τὸν θρόνον τῶν θεῶν, ἐπάνωσος, εἰς τὸν θρόνον τῶν θεῶν, ἐπάνωσος, εἰς τὸν θρόνον τῶν θεῶν, ἐπάνωσος, εἰς τὸν θρό

1. Its Meaning: the word comes from the Lat. preium, price, or value, and may be defined generally as an ascription of value or worth. Praise may be bestowed upon unworthy objects or from improper motives, but true praise is the expression 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 intrinsic 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 was no inanimate object (2 Cor 11:8). Such praise, so far as being incompatible with the praise of God, is a reflection 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 existence that are uninh�iment 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 His gifts and works. But as the Amplified Bible says, "God is praised for His 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 occasioning these theocratic and humanistic operations under these 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, 103; 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 103:1; 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 61:15 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 praise is often found in a state of deepest humiliation and utterance. The man who praises 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 expression of faith. It may find expression in others 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 lyrical 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 4:15; Eph 6:19; Col 3:16; Rev 9:11; 14:3; 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 varied accompaniment of timbrels and trumpets (Ex 15:20 f; 2 S 6:15 f). In later times Israel had its sacred Psalter, its guilds of trained singers (Ezr 3:41; Neh 7:44), its skilled musicians (Psa 81:24, etc) and the psalm that waited for God in Zion was full of the solemn beauty of holiness (Ps 29:2; 96:9). In the NT the Psalter is still a manual of social praise. The
"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 tongues (1 Cor 12:18-17). 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 informs us that the Christians of Bithynia sing their morning meetings sang a hymn in alternate strains to Christ as God (Ep. x.97). See Perspec-tion.

(3) The duty of prayer. — Prayer is everywhere represented in the Bible as a duty no less than a natural impulse and a delight. The idea 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 ff.), to be forgetful of His mercies (De 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 prayer. 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 67:7; 108:1), by meditation on His works and ways (77:11 ff.), by recounting His benefits (103:2), above all, for those to whom He has spoken in His name (Pss 84:10 ff.). We may number among prayer — and thank offerings (2 Cor 9:15; cf Rom 8:31 ff; 1 Jn 3:1) — See also Wor-ship.

PRAYER, πραυρος, δεησις, προσευχη, προσευχην, προσευχην, iveruv, ενευρα, ενευρια: for an excellent discussion of the meaning of these see Thayer's Lexicon, p. 126, s.v. δεησις: the chief vbs. are ευχομαι, ευχομαι, προσευχομαι, προσευχομαι, and δεημαι, δεημαι, esp. in Lk and Acts: αυτη, υπηρς, "to ask a favor," distinguished from υπηρυστη, υπηρυστη, "to ask a ques-tion," 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 (He 11:6). But adoration and confession and thanksgiving also find a place, so that the supplicant 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 fact should be noticed that the Heb. and Gr. alike or there are 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 Jesus Christ, 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. In the patriarchal period, when men began 1. In the to call upon the name of the Lord (Gen 4:26; cf 12:8; 21:33), prayer is naive, familiar and direct. (15 2 f; 17 18; 18 23 f; 24 15). It is evidently associated with the giving of the law (12:8; 13:4; 26:25), the underlying idea probably being that the gift or offering would help to elicit the desired response. Analogous to this is Jacob's vow, itself a species of prayer, in which the granting of desired benefits becomes the condition of promised service and fidelity (28:30 ff.). In the pre-exilic history of Israel prayer still retains many of the primitive features of the patriarchal type (Ex 3:4; Nu 11:11-15; Jgs 6:13 ff; 11:30 f; 1 Sc 1; 2 Sc 15:8; Ps 66:18 f). The Law has remarkably little to say on the subject, differing here from the later Judaism (see Schürer, H.I.P, II, i, 290, index-vol. p. 93; and of Mt 6:5 ff; 23:14; Acts 3:1; 16:18); while it confines the association of prayer with sacrifices, which now appear, however, not as gifts in anticipation of benefits to follow, but as expiations of guilt (Dt 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 ff; 33:3), the intercessory service of the people (Ex 32:11-13; 1 Sc 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; 15:13, etc.)—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 new avenue to divine intercessions and devotional habits of Ezra (Ezra 7:27; 8:23), Nehemiah (Neh 2:4; 4:9, etc.) and Daniel (Dn 6:10) prove how large a place prayer came to hold in the individual life; while the utterances recorded in Ezr 9:6-15; Neh 1:5-11; 9:7-15, and Isa 63:7-64:12 serve as illustrations of the language and spirit of the prayers of the Exile, and show esp. 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 least rigid thoughts 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 narra-tives of the life and teaching of Christ and that found in the remaining books.

2. In the NT. The distinctively Christian element of our subject comes to us from the Christ of 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 dissi-
pate 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 incidental sayings (Mt 6:44; 6:5-8; 7:7-11; 9:38; 17:21; 18:19; 21:22; 24:20; 26:41 and 55), which presents prayer, not as more energizing of the religious soul that is followed by beneficent spiritual reactions, but as the request of a child to a father (6:8; 7:11), subject, indeed, to the father's unfailing answer (Jn 11:25; cf 6:10; 10:16; 20:17; 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 thus consists 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 Eph. 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 Eph. abound in references to prayer. Those of Paul in particular contain frequent allusions to his own personal practice in the matter (Rom 1:9; 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 not 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 ff, 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 MANASSE. See MANASSE, PRAYER OF.

PRAYERS, prâz, OF JESUS:

1. The Lord's Prayer
2. Christ's Doctrine of Prayer
3. Prayers Offered by Christ
4. Prayers in 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 exactness 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 relation 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 (Mt 24:36; cf Lk 18:14); its importance is indicated by the many references to it (14-16; 26:6; 27:46). The Lord's Prayer consists of:

1. The Lord's Prayer
2. Christ's Prayer (Lk 11:5-9; 18:1-8): its necessary conditions of humility, absence of selfishness, righteousness (Lk 18:9-14), of display and repetition (Mt 6:7); necessity of faith and a long-suffering 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 by thee 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. If this 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 Inner self, "thanks at the deal," 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 so essential, as we shall see, to placing Our Lord truly at a sacred meal. 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 Lord's Supper, and has made of celebration 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 exemplary style in which the evangelists of Our Lord's method of prayer. The thanksgiving in Mt 11:25 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 of 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 Calf, found under the vine branch which was the symbol of the Father in the temple, indicates a purpose in the prayer. 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 His Son, but with the supreme end of the Father's own glory. This is an entirely 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, the impossibility of the cloud of multitude, and the self-sufficiency 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 spiritual, 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's Father is glorified in the Holy, and all to be the indwelling of God's love in man by the dwelling of Christ in him.

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 and the Father are thus setting Himself 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 relates; 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 26:36-46; Mk 14:32-42; Lk 22:39-46), and is probably referred to in He 5:7. It is the most clear 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 man, 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 its threefold utterance (cf. Paul's prayer in regard to the thorn in 2 Cor 12:8).

(3) The prayers on the cross.—InMt 27:46; Mk 15:34, Christ uses the prayer of Ps 22:1. In the moment of complete desolation, the Sufferer claimed 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 recognition and trust. 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. They thus express prayer not only 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 at 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 24:30), 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 Lord's words of thanksgiving that God had heard Him (see also Jn 11:40), but Mk, as often usual in 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
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 the Gospels, 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 prayers: (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 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 suppliant and others, under the conditions of the interest of the whole Kingdom.

L. D. BAYAN

PREACHER, prēch’ér, PREACHING, prēch’ing (γαρμ, ἀσκείθη, “preacher” [Eccl 1:1], ἡ τῆς, δόξα, “to bring or tell good tidings” [Ps 40:9; Isa 61:1], καίρε, “to call,” “proclaim” [Neh 6:7; Jon 3:2], ἐκθέτε, καίρε, “cry,” “preaching” [Jon 3:2]; καίρετιν, καῖριν, “or,” “preaching” [1 Tim 2:7]; καίριfasta, “to cry or proclaim as a herald” [Mt 3:1; Rom 10:14], εὐαγγελίζε, εὐαγγελίζο, “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. The Preacher’s Message
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 recognized 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 Scriptures, for the spiritual profit of those who hear 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 aloud.” 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 an official who claims the right to teach. 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, unless he is not expected to give his own, as distinct from those opposed to the faith of the church in whose name he has been set apart to proclaim the gospel. Both the personal and the 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 commission, 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 preacher from a Divine impulse. He says with Paul, “Necessity is laid upon me; for woe 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? Woe be ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we have 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 its fullest sense. The preacher speaks the words of God. That faith is the sum of all 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 scriptures. It is an entirely natural act which has been the means of evangelization 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 spoke 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 conveys the message, 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 propagandism set forth by the prophet (Neh 6:7). In two passages (Ps 68:11, “publish, Ps 68:11) the word means “to declare good news.” In the case of Jonah’s preaching at Nineveh, the word used to
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. The New Testament Prophets which in 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 old and new dispensations the subject takes the church for granted and utters the gospel, not simply a message to a solitary believer, but of a Divinely founded society, whether it be of Jews or Christians. The prophetic books in the Old Testament have them the beginnings and some of the features of the preacher's office and the high function preaching. In them we find a special class of men set apart and separated unto that particular work, as we find in the Christian church, 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 minister of Christ. The development of the synagogue as the center of Heb worship, and its role as well as interpretation of the Law became essential.

Moses, the most commanding figure in Heb history, was the pioneer of the messages in the OT are molded imbued with power, sublimity and pathos than those under his guidance. He devoted the greater part of 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 with authority. In the time of Samuel there was a distinct advance made in the work of the prophetic office for there was a beginning of a institution. There were schools of the prophets at Bethesda, Jericho and Gilgal, the very seats of heathen idolatry. Under the 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 concern 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 2:21-33; 1 Cor 15:15). The sermons of the apostles which are reported with such fulness are both 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 Jerusalem, as to what ordinances should be imposed on gentile Christians. In the early church preachers were first of all those who had said and done, 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. such as were 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. Fundamental 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 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 the ambassador", "The word 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 steward, but even as a steward he is 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 preacher appointed ambassadorship he is to administer God's word revealed to Christian faith, not human opinions or speculations.

D. H. BAUSLIN

PRECEPT, precept: A commandment, an authoritative rule for action; in the Scriptures generally a Divine injunction in which man's obligation is set forth (Lat. præceptum, fr. præciperé, "to instruct").

Four words are so rendered in AV: (1) ἐντολή, entolé, very frequently (188 t.) "commandment," but 4 t. "precept" (in RV only Jer 35:18; Dan 9:9; 12); (2) ἐντολή, entolé, generally in AV "injunction" (65 t.), but twice "precept" (Mk 10:5; He 10:19; in both cases RV substitutes "commandment"). See COMMANDMENT.

D. MIALL EDWARDS

PRECIOUS, præcious (stand. for 17 different words, chief of which are ἐπιξύσια, epixusiá, ἔπιξυσιος, epixusiós, 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 AV), esp. of precious stones (2 S 12:30; 2 Ch 3:6; 1 Cor 3:14 AV, etc.), sometimes of great moral (non-material) value, "Precious in the sight of God, 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 aspects are both involved in the expression, "knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, . . . but with precious blood" (1 Pet 1.
PRECIOUS STONES. See STONES, Precious.

PRECIPITATION, pré-sip-i-tá'shun. See Punishments, III, (5).

PREDESTINATION, pré-des-ti-ná'shun (próthesia, próthesis, prógnosis, prógnosiás, propórimía, propórimonía):

1. Predestination as a Biblical Question
2. Importance of the Subject for Our Time
3. Nature of Predestination
4. The Doctrine in Scripture
5. Historic Rise and Development of the Doctrine
6. The Doctrine in the Middle Ages
7. Predestination in the Reformed Theology
8. Predestination in Lutheranism
9. The Arminian View
10. Wesleyanism on Predestination
11. Present Needs and Values of the Doctrine

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.

Question: It is possible to urge, and it has been urged, that the philosophical question — whether all that occurs is free or not — is never 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 meaning in 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 in the individual and of 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 effectuated in accordance with the will of God, who has called and elected him, in Christ, unto life eternal.

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 purged of the historic inconsistencies, and fatal illogibilities, with which, in its older form, it was presented, it was often infected. This, esp., in order that the doctrine may appear as grounded in reason and righteousness, not in arbitrariness 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 same parts articulated in natural and striking form. The idea recur in Eph.1, where it is finely said (v.4.5) that God hath chosen us in Christ "before the foundation of the world," having predestinated or "foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ;" and where it is said, further, that our salvation "the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure" (v.9), which He purposed in Christ. This "eternal purpose to save men through Christ" is again referred 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 impress 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.

The needful thing is to understand, so far as may be, the nature of the cooperation that takes place between the Divine and the human.

5. Historic Rise and Development of the Doctrine
6. The Doctrine in the Middle Ages
7. Predestination in the Reformed Theology
8. Predestination in Lutheranism
9. The Arminian View
10. Wesleyanism on Predestination
11. Present Needs and Values of the Doctrine

LITERATURE

Augustine, following upon the inculcation of the idea that nothing in Scripture points to any personal and inexcusable predestination to reprobation, the sense in which the personal election to salvation just spoken of. A non-election there may be, of course, but not in any sense that annuls full personal responsibility for coming short of life everlasting. The appeal of Scripture from first to last is to man, as free. Calvin's strange way of putting the matter was, "Man therefore falls, God's providence so ordaining, but he falls by his own fault." This idea of reprobation was first introduced by Gottschalk, a monk of the 9th cent., long after the predestination doctrine had received its first full and positive exposition by Augustine. Augustine, upon the inculcation by the fathers in the first three centuries of the church, made the doctrine of a special, personal, and in man himself, apart from any election, a work of God, in opposition to Pelagius. Augustine gave new prominence in his history to the absolute will of God: he made Divine grace the only ground of man's salvation; it was to him the irresistible power working faith and bringing heart to salvation, as it results. It was to him God's absolute predestination that determined who were believers. But Augustine held predestination as an inference from his conception of the Fall and of grace, rather than as a metaphysical principle.

In the Middle Ages, Anselm, Peter Lombard, and Aquinas, followed the Augustinian views only to a certain extent. Aquinas admits that predestination implies a relation to God, but that grace is not of the essence of predestination. Predestination is, to Aquinas, a part of Providence, and it presupposes election in the order of reason. Though Divine goodness in general be without election, Aquinas thinks the communication of a particular good cannot be without election. Predestination has, for him, its foundation in the goodness of God, which is its reason. Aquinas thinks predestination most surely takes effect, but not as from necessity; the effect takes place under the working of consciousness. From such views we are recalled to the idea of a rigorous predestination, by Thomas Bradwardine...
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 all the decrees 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 in election. Calvin, however, 7. Predestination simply carried the Augustinian theory to its logical and necessary conclusion, and he was the first to adopt the doctrine as the cardinal point or primum movens of a theological system. 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.—Predestination was, for Calvin, involved in election, and Divine foreknowledge and the decree of Divinity 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 be of each and every individual. For all, he maintains, are not created in the same condition; but eternal life is foreordained 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 thing akin to the teachings of St. Paul, who never speaks of predestination.

(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 Reformation, not by viewing Calvinism in our post-Reformation 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 teaching 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 over all of Divinity, righteousness, riches, 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, and in a sense, strictly regarded the predestination of Luther and Melanchthon proceeded, not from their conception of God, but rather from the doctrine of sin and grace. Melanchthon was less disposed than Luther to press the doctrine of absolute predestination, and, in his "synergistic" tendencies, laid increasing stress on human freedom, 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 presentation of the case, for, opposed at points to Augustinianism, it fell back, in the end, on election in the Augustinian spirit. Or, put the matter in another form, the "Formula of Concord" may have said to have held with Augustinianism, but to have differed by maintaining a universal call along with a particular election, and it rejected the decree of reprobation. Later Lutheranism adopted a more moderate form of the doctrine, wherein predestination was often identified with prescience. But Lutheranism ought not, in strictness, to be identified, as is sometimes done, with the Arminian theory. The Lutheran doctrine of predestination was further developed by Schleiermacher, who emphasized the efficiency of grace, while adopting its universality in the Lutheran sense.

Arminianism, in its earliest assertion, maintained simply universal grace and conditional election. But in the five Articles it formulated its opposition to Calvinism, although Arminius does not appear to have been more than moderately Calvinistic, as we would account it. Arminius gave grace supreme place, and made it, when welcome, pass into saving grace. He made election depend on faith, which latter is the condition of universal grace. Arminianism rejects the so-called common grace of the predestination theory, and its effectual grace for the elect, for, in the Arminian view, God's grace is not missed save by resistance or neglect. Arminianism holds the awakened human will to cooperate with Divine grace, in such wise that it rests with the human will whether the Divine grace is really accepted or resisted. It is the condition of free will to do more justice than Calvinism to faith and repentance, as conditions of personal salvation, and precedent thereto. The Arminian standpoint admits the foreknowledge of God, but denies foreordination, and, in this, it must see the foreknowledge of God to such a bare knowledge of the future. But it is, of course, freely to be granted that foreknowledge in God, simply as knowledge, does not carry any causal energy or efficiency with it. But it may still be doubted whether the prescience of God can be nothing more fruitful and creative than such a position implies, and whether its relation to predestination may not be a more necessary one. The theory seems to fail of giving satisfactory account of the Divine activity in its relation to human activity, in the sphere of grace. The shortcoming of Arminianism lies in its failing also to do justice to the spirit of Scripture with its emphatic assertion of the doctrine of God as the creator of all. Still, which, in its expression, is the sole originating power of the universe. See also Providence.

Wesleyanism, or Methodist Arminianism, maintains, like Calvinism, the will of God to be supreme. But it distinguishes between the desires 10. Wesley— and the determinations of God. It animism on takes Divine foreknowledge to preclude the Divine volitions. It makes predestination God's prescience purely intentional, deterministic, and foreordaining. He knew nowise necessitated by such knowledge, a conception of God which differentiates the Wesleyan type of thought from Calvinism. God is held to have left events in the moral sphere contingent, in an important sense, upon the human will. Hence human probation is based upon this position, as a man's free choice. Influence of God upon man's will is postulated, for its right guidance and direction, but not in any coercive sense, as Augustinianism seems to Wesleyanism to imply. Thus it is hoped to prevent man from justly attributing responsibility, between the Divine and the human factors in this spiritual cooperation.

When we come to the present needs and values of the predestination doctrine, we have to remark the primal need of a truly orthodox conception of God. The past few decades have witnessed...
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 sovereignty of God's will has ceased to be
needed and values of the Fourth Gospel in modern
Doctrine expressly taught that no cause or
cause,we,be unconditioned will be to be sought; but he feebly tried to save
Divine will from sheer omnipotence by saying that
God's will have[Himself] and power in the
the image of God. 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 ever have been put upon it. This question
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 in the preparation day (Friday) of the Passover week (see Andrews, Life of Our Lord, 431 f.; and most recently Zahn, Das Evangelium des Johannes, 1908, 657 f.). This method of harmonization
seems to the present writer to be forced, and it therefore seems wise to give to the words of Jn 19 14
their natural interpretation, and to maintain that,
according to the author the Passover was not
celebrated at the time of the crucifixion.
There seems to be reason to believe that the ordinary view, that the Lord's Day is in some
connection with the Passover, based upon the narrative in
Mark (14 12 f.), does not have the unanimous support of the Synoptic Gospels.

LITERATURE.—In addition to references in the body of the article on the common, compare, e.g., Bible, "St. John," Appendix A; Allen, ICC, "St.
Matthew," 279-84; Godet, Comm. on the NT: Gospel of St. John, 197 F., New York, 1906, II, 378, 379; and the significant articles on the interpretation of Lk 22 16 by

WALTER R. BETTENZE

PRESBYTERIAN,-prez'bi-t-o-n, pres'by-t-e-ri, presbytery, pres'by-t-ri-a, presbytarian, presbytarianism, presbytarianism. This latter word occurs in the
Used in the NT once (1 Tim 4 14), so rendered in the
NT both AV and RV. But the original Gr
phrase, πρεσβυτερίον, always is "elders," is often used to
indicate the same organization or court as the former, being applied earlier in the
Jewish Synagogue (Mt 27 1; 28 12; Lk 9 22; Acts
4 5 8), and later in the development of the church
to its governing body, either in general (Acts
24 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 often 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
on Syna-
gogue Plan The local church began at Jerusalem and formed on Syna-
gogue Plan the 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 local churches were formed, 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
the 6th day (Friday) of each week. So in Did., viii
and the Martyrdom of Polycarp, vii.
the phrase τον σάββατον, τον πασχαλά, "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 Creation of the
world 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 ever have been put upon it. This question
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 occurs in Lk 22 66, in RV trd
"the assembly of the elders," in AV simply "the
elders," and in Acts 22 5, trd in RV "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 occasions of the neuter sing, presbuterion, the masc. pl.
πρεσβύτεροι, always trd "elders," is often used to
indicate the same organization or court as the former, being applied earlier in the
Jewish Synagogue (Mt 27 1; 28 12; Lk 9 22; Acts
4 5 8), and later in the development of the church
to its governing body, either in general (Acts
24 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 often 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
on Syna-
gogue Plan The local church began at Jerusalem and formed on Syna-
gogue Plan the 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 local churches were formed, 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 new elders were selected; we must infer that they were elected by the membership of the churches, as under the synagogue plan; they were then installed in their office by apostles (Acts 14:23), or by apostolic helpers (Tit 1:5), or by "the prophets" (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 Thess 5:12; cf Acts 20:17; 28:1; These 5:12.13; 1 Pet 5:2).

In the NT history and epistles 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 sense 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 arguments. Moreover, the appointment 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 general administrative and judicial needs 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 4:4; 5:6; 11:17; 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 churches; and the number, twice twelve, seems to be obtained by combining the number of the patriarchs of the OT 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 minister and the ruling elders of a particular church, with the minister as moderator or presiding officer. The Presbytery is composed of the ordained ministers, or teaching elders, and one ruling elder from each session of 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 "ordinals" and "plenary" ministers. It has the full supervision of the affairs which are general to the churches in the province. It has the power of ruling, and can in all matters concerning the local churches (See Form of Gov. Presb. Church in U.S.A., ch x). 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 nave; sometimes that of the whole choir space, but ordinarily the word is more restricted in its meaning. See further, Bishop; Church; Elders; Government.

Edward Mack

PRESENCE, pres'ens: In the OT nearly always the translation of תְבִינָה, תְבִינָה, תְבִינָה, תְבִינָה, "face" (Gen 3:8; Ex 33:14ff; Ps 96:2; Isa 63:9, etc); occasionally of צִבְיָה, צִבְיָה, צִבְיָה, צִבְיָה, "eyeball" (Gen 23:11; De 26:9; Jer 25:11.11); and in 1 K 8:22; Prov 14:7, "the presence of" represents the prop. צִבְיָה, צִבְיָה, "behold"; cf also Aram. ציביה, ציביה, in Dn 27:27 AV (RV "before") In "Gr, "presence" has an exact equivalent in παρουσία, παρουσία, but this word is rendered now as administrative and judicial παρουσία rendered "coming," but always with the 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 3:10). See Parousia.

Burton Scott Easton

PRESENT, prezent'. See Gift.

PRESENTLY, prezent-li: The strict meaning is of "these "at the present moment," "immediately," and the meaning 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" (Phl 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'i-dent; צדוק; strathuk: Used only in Dn 6:2-7. Probably a Pers word derivative from av, "head," and the Aram equivalent for Heb אֲשֶׁר. The meaning is self-evident and refers to the appointment of Daniel by Darius to be one of the three princes who had rule over the satraps of the empire.

PRESS, pres: 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 Wisd 17:11, "pressed with conscience" (RV "pressed by conscience"); Prov 16:22, "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 διαος, διαος, "crowd" (so RV). For wine press see Vine; Wine.

PRESSFAT, pres'fat (Hag 2:16 AV, ERV "wine-fat," ARV "winevat"). See Wine.

PRESUME, pre-zum'; PRESUMPTUOUS, pr'zum'p-tus, PRESUMPTUOUSLY, pr'zum'p-tus-lii: "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 tr of תִּשְׁלַח, תִּשְׁלַח, תִּשְׁלַח, "to boil up" (as water), and derivatives; hence to act proudly, to speak presumptuously, etc (Dt 18:20,22, of the prophet; Ex 21:14; Dt 1:43; 17:12.13; Ps 19:3, "presumptuous sins" [ץָה, "proudly"]; cf Ps 86:14; 119:21, etc; Prov 21:24, etc). Other words are "malicious," "to fill," "to be full" (Est 7:5, "presume"); "to fill oneself," "burst oneself" (14:41; "pressed on every side") (Gr ἐκραίνω, "with a high hand") (Nu 15:30, RV "with a high hand"); in 2 Pet 2:10 ἁμαρτάνω, "bold," "daring," is tr "presumptuous," RV "daring;" in 2 Mac 3:24; 5:15 we have κατακαυσκόνω, "transcend," is rendered "presumption" in 2 Mac 6:18, RV "daring deed." W. L. Walker

PREVENT, pre-vent; צדוק; kōdham; prophēsō, prophēsō, prophēsō, phyndō, phyndō: "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 κόχλα, "to be sharp," "to be in front," "to be beforehand" (2 S 22:6,19, RV "came upon"); Job 3:12, RV "receive;" 30:27, "are come upon;" 41:11, "first given;" Ps 5:18, "are come upon;" 21:3, ARV "meetest;" 59:10, ARV "meet;" 79:8, ARV "meet;" 85:13, "come before;" 119:147.148, ARV "anticipated;" Isa 21:14, "did meet;" Am 9:10, ARV "meet." In the NT prophēsō, with same meaning, is tr pre"prevent" (Mt 17:25, "Jesus prevented him," RV "spake first to him"); phyndō (1 Thess 4:15, "shall not prevent," RV "shall in no wise precede"). "Pre-" in the above sense occurs in Wis 6:13, RV
"forestalled" (phثšnά; 16:28), "we must prevent the sun to give thee thanks," RV "rise before."  
W. L. Walker

PREY, πρῆ (πρής), ὀφθαλμός, ἑρπάτερος, ἀσαφέλας, shādālī): "Prey" is frequent in the OT, chiefly as the rt of baz, "spoil," "booty," "plunder." (Nu 31:2; Isa 10:6, etc); of ἑρπάτερος, "prey of wild beasts," "torn thing" (Gen 49:9; Nu 33:24; Job 4:11, etc); of ἀσαφέλας, "a taking" (Nu 31:11, etc; Isa 49:24; 25; of shādālī "spoil" or "booty" (Jgs 5:30; Ezk 24:25; Isa 10:2, etc). Makēsh-shādālī-bāz (RVνν "the spoil speedeth, the prey hasteth") was the symbolic 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: Ed 8:77, "for our sins." 10:11: "we were up on," for a prey (pronome); Jth 9:4; 16:5; 1 Mace 7:47; Eccles 27:10 (θηρία); Jth 5:24 (καταδρωμα). In RV shādālī is generally tr'd "spoil" (Jgs 5:30; 8:24:25; Isa 10:2, etc), while, conversely, "prey" (nomin and vb.) is occasionally substituted for "spoils," "booty" (Nu 31:32, etc). See Broker: Spoil.  
W. L. Walker

PRICE, πρᾶ: Represents various words in the OT; ῥας, τιμή, is the usual Gr word for "price" in the NT. "Price" is ἀνακόπτεα, πολύτιμον, ὕπερτιμον, in Mt 13:46, and πολυτελεία, πολυτελεία, in 1 Pet 3:4. The vb. occurs in Zec 11:13 AV and ERV as "prized." The spelling "prized" in ARV and some edd. of AV is due to a confusion with "prize." For "price of a dog" (Dt 23:18 AV) see Dog.

PRICK, πρίξ: As a noun (= any slender pointed thing, a thorn, a sting) it translates two words: (I) ἄγκον, σέκα, a "thorn" or "prickle." Only in Nu 33:55, "those that ye let remain of them be as pricks in your eyes," i.e. "shall be a source of painful trouble to you." (2) κέρατον, ἐκεὶρυ, ἐκεὶρυ, "an iron goad" for urging on oxen and other beasts of burden: "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" (AV of Acts 9:5, where RV omits the whole phrase, following the best MSS, including ΝΑΒῊΕ; AV of Acts 26:14, where RV has "goad," m "Gr goad"), i.e. to offer vain and perilous resistance. See Goad. As a vb. (= "to pierce with something sharply pointed," "to sting"), it occurs once in its literal sense: "a pricking brier" (Ezk 28:24); and twice in a figur. sense to him because it is in my heart" (Ps 13:19; 21): "They were pricked in their heart" (Acts 2:37, κατακέντρον, κατακέντρον, Vulg compassio; cf Eng. word "compassion"). D. Miall Edwards

PRIEST, πρήστας, kohen, "priest," "prince," "minister"; λεοψ, hieros, ἑραξεῖα, archierasia; for ἱεροσ μύας, hieres μεγᾶς, of He 10:21, see Thayer's Lexicon, s.v. λεοψ).  

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, who by the Holy Ghost represent the sins of the people" (Heb 5:14). The priest was not elected by the people, much less was he self-appointed. Divine selection severeth him from those for whom he doth act. Even Aaron, the high priest, Jesus Christ, came not into the world unseemly. He received His commission and His authority from the fountain of all sovereignty. At the opening of His earthly ministry He said, "He anointed me. He hath sent me" (Mt 4:18). He came bearing heavenly credentials.

It implies the principle of representation. The institution of the office was God's gracious provision for a people at a distance from God. "The high priest was to act for men in things pertaining to God, "to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb 13:17). He was the mediator who ministered for the guilty. The high priest represented the whole people. All Israelites were reckoned as being in him. The prerogative held by him belonged to the whole of them (Ex 19:6), but on this account it was transferred to Aaron and his sons (Num 18:20). Moreover, his appointed mediatorship involved the people in his guilt: "If the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people" (Lev 4:3). The LXX reads, "If the anointed priest shall sin so as to make the people sin." The anointed priest, of course, is the high priest. When he sinned, he sinned. His official act was reckoned as their action. The whole nation shared in the trespass of their representative. The converse appears to be just as true. What he did in his official capacity, as prescribed by the Law, was reckoned by the whole congregation: "Every high priest ... is appointed for men" (Heb 5:1).

It implies the offering of sacrifice. Nothing is clearer in Scripture than this priestly function. It was the chief duty of a priest to reconcile men to God by making atonement for their sins, and this
he 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 offered 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 Jeh, 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 rightfully 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 Jehovah, whom they were distinguished types. Of the two, Melchizedek was the greater. There are two reasons why they are to be considered chiefs: first, because they are respectively the type and figure of Christ, Melchizedek 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 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.

2. Priestism

Denied There were certain duties which were peculiar to the high priest. He alone could wear the "garments for glory and for beauty." To him alone it pertained to enter the Most Holy Place and to sprinkle the blood of the sin offering on the mercy-seat. To him alone it pertained to represent the congregation before the Lord as mediator, and to receive the Divine communications. He was to be ceremonially pure and holy. He must be physically perfect. Any defect or deformity disqualified a member of the priestly family from performing the duties of the office (Lev 21 17-21). The Law spoke with the utmost precision as to the domestic relations of the high priest. He could marry neither a widow, nor a divorced woman, nor one polluted, nor a harlot; only a virgin of his own people, a Hebrew of pure extraction, could become his wife (Lev 21 14-15). Nor was he to come in contact with death. He must not rend his clothes, nor defile himself, even for his father or his mother (Lev 21 10,11). His sons might defile themselves for their kin, but the
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 together with water sprinkled on him (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 turban, 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 29.10 ff.).

Up to this point in the ceremony, Aaron was the principal figure, the sons having no part save in the bathing. 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 his action should not escape the reader. The whole person and career of the priest were thus brought under power of the blood. He placed a blod-stained hand 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. Sacrificial blood, the blood of atonement, is here, everywhere else, the foundation for saints and sinners, for priests and for kings, 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 Archetype between the type and the archetype, I say 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 is offering, present, and final (He 9.25–28; 10.12). (6) His intercession is all-prevailing (He 7.25). (7) As God and man in one Person He is a perfect Mediator (He 1.1). See Christ, Offices of, V.

LITERATURE.—Smith, DB; HDB; P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture; W. Davidson, A Discourse on the Consecration of the Tabernacle; the Priestly Garments and the Priesthood; Martin, Atonement; A. B. Davidson, Hebrews; Moorehead, Mosaic Institutions.

WILLIAM G. MOOREHEAD

PRIEST, CHRIST AS. See Christ, Offices of.

PRIEST, HIGH (.unlink, ha-kohen, ἵερης, ho hiera; Ψυχος ἰερεύς, ha-kohen ha-mâshîph, ἵερης ἢ χριστὸς, ho hiera dia christos; ἱερεύς ἢ πραπόλος, ho hiera dia χριστός; ΨΥΧΟΣ ἀνθρώποι, kohen ha-rōsh, ἵερης ἐνέσφωκεν, ho hiera deágōmenos; NT ἤφωκεν, archierês;):

I. INSTITUTION OF THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD

1. The Family
2. The Consecration
3. The Dress
4. The Duties of High-Priesthood
5. Special Regulations
6. The Emoluments
7. Importance of the Office

II. HISTORY OF THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD IN ISRAEL

1. In the OT
2. In the NT

LITERATURE

I. 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 institute 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 35.11). 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 appointed priest.

The ceremonies by which he was installed in his office are recorded in Ex 29.20 ff. 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). After this the new high priest must wear the holy garments, as well as be specially appointed (Lev 21.10). Every day a bullock for a sin offering must be offered for atonement; the altar also must be cleansed, anointed for, the Priest, High Priest (Egyptian).
and anointed, the high priest offering a sacrifice or min- 
loah for himself (Lev 6 24 ff.).
Besides the highly prescribed dress of the priests, the high priest must wear the robe of the ephod, the breastplate, and the headdress (Lev 8 7–9). The robe of the ephod seems to have been a sleeveless tunic, made of fine linen and faced with alternate hel- 
pomgranates (Ex 28 31–35; 39 22–26). The ephod seemed to be a variegated dress of the four colors of the sanctuary, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine linen interwoven with gold (Ex 28 6–8; 39 2–5). This dis- 
inglished cloth of the holy garments was fastened at the shoulders by two clasps of sheshah 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 kohben suspended by a chain. Set in the breastplate were twelve precious stones, having engraved upon them the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. This breast- 
plate must have contained a pomegranate of some kind inside, 
for in it were deposited the Urim and Thummim, which 
seemed to be tangible objects of some kind (Ex 28 30; 
39 8–21). The mitre or headdress was of fine linen, the 
plate of the crown of pure gold, and inscribed upon it 
the words, "Holy to Jehovah." (Ex 28 30–38; 39 30–31).
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 must he 
wear his 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 first 
day of the new month (Lev 16 8); and must only marry 

4. 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 
people (Lev 16 20). He alone could make atonement for the 
sins of the people, the priests, and his own house (Lev 4 3 ff.; 
9 8 ff.; 16 6; Nu 15 25). He must offer the regular 
meat offering (Lev 6 14–15). He must share with 
the priest in the caching the lumps (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 Jehovah, and 
according to his decision Israel must obey (Nu 27 21).

An office so important required certain special regu- 
lations. He must be free from every bodily defect 
(Lev 21 6–24). He must not marry 

5. Special 
a virgin of Israel, not a widow, nor a 
widower, nor a slave woman (Lev 
21 14). He must not observe the external 
signs of mourning for any person, and 

not leave the sanctuary while news came of 
the death of even a father or mother (ver 10–12). He must not 
dress in the garments of the common 
people, nor go to the camp (ver 11); and 

is forbidden to let his hair grow long or 
rend his clothes as a sign of mourn- 
ing. He must not go near a corpse, 
but in the same position near the 
family 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 2 31–34). A descendant 
of that family officiated at Nob in the 
times of Saul (1 S 22 21; 22 11). His son, 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 22 20–23; 23 9; 30 7). Zadok 
seems to have had almost equal privilege (3 S 8 17; 
1 Ch 18 16; 24 6 almost certainly by enos' 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 the last 
days of his life (1 K 2 26–27). Zadok was put in 
his place (ver 35). He seems to have been a descendant of 
Eli. Under Jehoshaphat, Amariah was high 

priest (2 Ch 16 5), and was the leading 
authority in all religious matters. In the 
time of Athaliah, during the minority of Josiah and 
his entire reign Jehoada was high priest and chief adviser. 
He seems to have been the most influential man in the kingdom, 
more than half a century (2 K 11 4 ff.; 12 2–6; 2 Ch 24 16–18). 

The enmities 

6. The 

Emolu- 

ments 

and perquisites which they en- 
joyed 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 (1 lnt IV, iv, 4), but the high priest 
was probably charged with the duty of distribut- 
ing 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 sacri- 
fices and temple business.

The importance of the high priest's office 
manifest from the first. The high priest Eleazar 
is named in the first rank with Joshua, 
the prince of the tribes and successor of 
Nun (Nu 31 26). His sins were regarded as belonging to 
the people (Lev 4 22). 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 20 f). His death was a national event, 
for then the high priest was 'free to leave the City 
of Refuge (Nu 35 25,28). He had no secular 
authority, but was regarded generally as the leading 
religious authority. Later, he became also the leading 
sacred king in the Davidic dynasty (1 S 15,16).

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 
false history (20 9; 20 8–10). He 
must marry only a 

1. In the 

OT 

fact, 

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 


priesthood 

in Israel. 

appeared 

frequently. Eleazar officiated with Joshua in the 
division of the land among the twelve tribes (Josh 
14 1). The law of the 

man 

laver 

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 

remained in the family of Eli. Only one 

Regulations 

was 

a priest of 

the 

sanctuary 

as well as a head of the 
holy 

people, 

the 

sons 

of 

Levitic 

and 

the 

sons 

of 

Levitic 

were 

sanctuar 

and 

the 

sons 

of 

Levitic 

were 

sa
was discovered (2 K 22 4; 23 4; 2 Ch 34 9); Zephaniah in the time of Jeremiah (Jer 29 25,5); Serah in the days of Zedekiah, 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 subordinate, who was to take the lieu of the 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 Jozabad, who was carried away into Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar. The second traces the line from Aaron to Ahimelech, 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 a long way from independence, and since the chief power tends to center in the high-priesthood, Joshua appears to stand equal with Zerubbabel (Hag 1 12.14; 2 24; Zac 3 18; 4 14; 6 11-13).

He is distinctly known as high priest (ha-kohen ha-gadolah). He takes a leading part in establishing the ecclesiastro-civil system, particularly the building of the temple. In the vision of Zechariah (Zec 3 1-5) Satan accuses the high priest who is here the representative proper of the nation. The consummation of the Mosaic order cannot 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 says of him: "...a man of the sign," alluding to the coming Messiah uniquely the land was to be taken away to one day (Zec 3 9 f). The promise is made to Joshua that if he will walk in Jeh's ways and keep his house, he shall judge Jeh's house, i.e., Israel, keep His court and have a place to walk among those who stand before Jeh (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 indexing the coming system. The different 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, X1, viii, 5) Jaddua was priest at the time of Alexander the Great (332 BC), but it is practically certain that it was Judas Maccabaeus's 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 among the high priests. The Books of the Maccabees tell us nothing of any change of name. It is a fixed name within the family, and from Nehemiah onwards it is almost impossible to give anything other than the name which is the obvious one. 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 Hasmonaean was appointed by King Alexander, and thus the high-priesthood passed to the Hasmonaeans (Ant X 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 Hasmonaean line, and continued thus until the time of Herod the Great. The latter set up and declared a high priest at his pleasure. The Romans did thesame, 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 wearing their special robes (Schl. 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 held the critical power of the court, though the NT knows him as the servant 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 probably offered the death of a 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 minah (Lev 12 ff) which he was to offer as the result of a sin offering, 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 5 15). It is in the appointment of Caiaphas alone accented as such. Annas had probably been deposed, yet retained much of his influence among the priestly families. For particulars see ANNAS; JESUS CHRIST. These two were also the chief conspirators against the coming Messiah. When the council of Caiaphas doubtless advised them to put Jesus to death to save the nation (Jn 11 51). He was also chairman of the council which tried and condemned Jesus (Mc 15 1-5; 57-58; Mk 14 62-63; Mt 27 24; Lk 23 24-25)). 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 Jesus (Acts 9 2). He presided at the council which tried Paul (Acts 25 2; 24 13).

In the Ep. to the He 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: "Since he has been made perfect forever on the basis of the sacrifice once for all of Jesus Christ, the High Priest, he needs to offer sacrifices toward sin and the dead" (5 1). The title of high priest is first introduced in 2 17, "a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God," also in 5 1, "...the great High Priest who confers grace." Having thus fairly introduced his great theme, the writer strikes the keynote of his great argument. Having then a great high priest," etc (4 14-15). From 4 14 to 7 28 the argument deals with the high-priestly work of Jesus. The qualifications are not only those which distinguish all priesthood, but they are also unique. He is named after the order of梅 46. The qualifications are: (1) He is appointed by God to His office (5 1). (2) He is well fitted for the office by His experiences and participation in all things. He has been "made perfect forever," etc (2 46; 5 10). (3) He undergoes a Divine preparation (5 9). The statement of qualifications is: It is after the order of Melchizedek (5 10). This is an eternal one (6 20); royal or kingly (7 1-3); independent of birth or family (ver 2); it is timeless (ver 5); superior
to that of Levi (vs 4–10); new and different from that of Aaron (vs 11–13). It is also indissoluble (ver 16); immutability (ver 24); with all the general and special qualifications He is completely fitted for His work (vs 20). That work consists in offering up Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the people (ver 27); entering within the veil as a forerunner (vs 20); presenting its sacrifice in heaven (vs 25); obtaining eternal redemption (vs 12); ratifying the new covenant (vs 15–22). The result of this high-priestly work is a claim from all sin (vs 9); a possibility of full consecration to God and His service (vs 10); an ultimate plea in His name (vs 14); and full access to the throne of grace (vs 10, 21, 22)." See Christ, Officer of; Priest.

Priesthood in the NT.

Liturgy, as applied to the priesthood in general, with references to the high priest in HDB, Hug, EB, Jew's, T. Curtiss, R. Passow, S. Curtiss-Herzog, etc., no article on "High Priest," only for the History, Braund, History of Egypt; Schürer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II. 1, 207–90; Jos. Ant., XV., XVIII., XX. For works on the priesthood from the radical viewpoint, see Graf, S. I. Curtis, Jost, Graetz, Kautzsch, Budde, Baentgen, Benzinger, Büchner, Meyer, Weiss, Guttenberg. For a more moderate position see Badusian, Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestertums untersucht. For a more conservative position see A. Van Hoecke, La Eccelesie des types dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hébreux. On the high-priesthood subsequent to the return from Babylonia, see B. Pick, Lutheran Church Review 1908, 11, 379–74; 12, 13–26; 14, 656–64; and the comms. on the passages cited.

James Josiah Reeve

Priesthood, priest-hood.

1. Priesthood an Office
2. In the OT
3. Hereditary Priesthood
4. In the NT
5. Conclusions

Priesthood is an office. It is necessary to note on this fact, for the noble word "priest" has been misapplied and misspelled, so that its intrinsic import has been impaired. There is a certain literary slang indulged in by some who talk of the "ministry of art," and similar absurdities. The idea of priest-hood, if priests have not 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, possessing as it does the Divine purpose to remove it. Hugo Martin writes that he "would as soon think of misusing 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 of priest and in behalf of his household "built an altar unto Jeh, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, 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 great "sacrificial victims" when the great trial passed (Job 1 5; 42 8). In these and the like instances there was priestly action no less certainly 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 Jeh" (Gen 26 25), as did Jacob (Gen 33 20). In these cases priestly acts were performed by the patriarchs in their capacity as fathers of the families or heads of clans. From the beginning, priesthood with its acts of expiation and consecration was regarded 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 28 1–9). 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 Hebrews, 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 priesthood 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 was claimed to be of divine origin and not dependent on actions 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 "burnt offering." The entire absence of the offerings of old Egypt religion of any of the great Pentateuchal ideas of sacrifice, substitution, atonement, dedication, fellowship, and indeed of almost every essential idea of real sacrifice, as clearly established by recent very exhaustive examination of the offering scenes, makes for the element of revelation in the Mosaic system by delimiting the field of rationalistic speculation on the Egyptian side. Egypt gave nothing to that system, for it had nothing to give. So much may be said of the burning the priesthood; Israel took little or nothing of its powers and functions from Egyptian sources.

Although the office was limited to the Aaronic family, nevertheless in certain exigencies and emergencies sacrifices were made by priests without the Aaronic rights. Sacrifices to the Lord and were accepted by Him. 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 32–38). 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 personhood that the "temple" which is made by Melchizedek and Aaron was effective, and fulfilled the end for which it was appointed. The one appointed. The one accepted. The one approved. The one appointed. The one appointed. The one accepted. The one approved. This type andantitype, as prediction and fulfilment. Christ's priesthood is fulfilled and joined to us in the Ep. to the Hebrews (3 4–17; 4 14–16; 5 1–10; 7 9, 10, 11). Two fundamental truths touching His priestly functions are made very prominent in the Ep. to the Hebrews: the power of the Priest, the duty of the Priest, and the duties. By the order is meant the rank or grade of the Priest, and by the duties the various functions of His
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, ἱερεῖα, is not found with reference to the Jewish priesthood, but ἱερέας, ἱερεῖας, and ἱερευνεῖας, "high priest," frequently occur. As until the fall of Jesus the activities of the priests were carried on in careful secrecy, the information 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 archiereus are mentioned oftener than are the hiereus, the position 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 the office, and this held the 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 titles 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 term of description. In referring to the one who was the active minister of the people, 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 hiereus is of course employed in its ordinary signification on several occasions when reference to the one made 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 must be admitted 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 that he accounted for their degrees 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 inner garments of Israel in the breastplate of judgment for a memorial before Jehovah continually, far more suitably than that of the ordinary priests typified the atoning and intercessory work of Jesus (Ex 28 12.15).

 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 the superiority of the priestly function 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 proves the superiority of Melchizedek. Lev 27:28 adds still more to the priestly descendant 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; 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 untransmissible (7:24-25). This discussion of the priesthood of Christ "after the order of Melchizedek" occupies almost all of ch 7, but at ver 26 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 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; cf. 4:16; 5:2), and (3) in His saving work suggested by prophecy (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 (9:7), 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 goats and calves laid on the ground (9:14), "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 40:6); 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, half the part of Jesus' 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 would already have 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 basic 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 has actual activity of its own; and moreover, 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 earthy experience, temptation, suffering of Him who had been and is, not only the Divine Son, but also 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 teaching of the apostles. It only shows that a thought Priesthood which according to apostolic concept of believers was one of the Christian privileges, found, if not constant, yet sufficiently clear expression in this figurative fashion, has come, 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 (13:15,16). 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 holds the NT attache 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 unnecessary 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 essential to the Christian priesthood (8:22), this view is, and consequentY, 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 in the capacity of priest 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

PRIESTS AND LEVITES (772, kōhēn, "priest"); nothing is definitely known as to the origin of the word; יָדוֹ, "Levite," on which see Levii:

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 PORIONS OF THE PENTATEUCH
4. FROM ZEKE 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
2. In Abinadab's House
3. Esdras

V. Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles
1. Estimates of the Chronicler
2. His Date

VI. LEGAL PROVISIONS

LITERATURE
In some Mosaic inscriptions found at El-Ola, dating back about 1200-500 BC (Hommel in Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, 719), certain priests and priestesses of the god Wadd are designated by the term *lēwt, fem. lēwst* (op. cit., 719). It is not known whether this is due to Israelite 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 meaning of the different documents. It will therefore be best to sketch these views in rough outline, and then give the evidence of the various authorities, together with the reasons that in each case arise naturally from the consideration of that evidence.

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, and harmonicist explanations are uniformly rejected, the Pentateuch is rejected, Ezekiel is rejected, Pentateuchal, and 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. *Sanctuary (q.v.)* explain and discuss the widest 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" originally a term denoting professional skill, and only later the priest of the tribe of Levi, 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. (Wellhausen, *Israel*, 32). The whole Levitical Law was unknown and the distinction between priests and Levites unheard of. There were a few great sanctuaries and one influential priesthood, that of Shiloh (afterward at Nob). With the monarchical 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 right of all Levites, and Josiah's reform placed the sons of Zadok, who were the priests of Zadok, 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 it is the same as in the book of Leviticus, 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 undebated, as appears from the priestly version of the story of Korah's company. For all Judaism subsequent to Ezra, and for Christian tradition, the PC in this matter also has been authoritative. Instead of the Deuteronomic formula "the priests the Levites, the Levites, the Levites," the PC changes it to "the priests the Levite, the Levite, 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 that of literal history, correctly representing the true meaning of the completed law. See Chronic.

There have been various attempts to construct less thoroughgoing 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 all 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 verisonal evidence as to the state of the texts. Subject to this it accepts the Mosaic authenticity of all the Pentateuchal legislation and the clear and consentient 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 desert, and of the tribe of Levi a body of sacred priests 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 location. The whole time of 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 person of Zadok 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 insure the better application of the Mosaic principle of the distinction between holy and profane to greatly altered circumstances. Taking his inspiration from the wilderness period, he instituted 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 Pent.

1. The Levites forward by any other 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 to us, and appoints the Levites to the tabernacle of the testimony, and over all the furniture thereof" (Nu 30). It is necessary to consider whether such expressions are to be read in a wide or a narrow sense. We learn from 18 3 that death would be the result of a Levite's sin against 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 (1 50) written in a sentence of which none was to be added, and which none were to bear that "they shall not touch the sanctuary, lest they die" (4 15). This shows that the service in question is strictly limited to a service of portage after the articles have been wrapped up by Aaron and his sons. 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. It was expected that "the Levites shall bear the charge of the tabernacle [dwelling] of the testimony." This concludes the first material passage (Nu 1 50–53). The other passages of Nu only amplify these directions; they never change them, though some phrases are used which must be more particularly considered.

(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 5f is an admirable instance. Six wagons are there assigned to the Levites for this service, two to the Gershonites and four to the Merarites. But unto the sons of Kohath he assigns 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. 4 25f. If we look to see what this was, we find that it consisted of transporting portions of a 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 "in" aloud, 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. 4 25f. If we look to see what this was, we find that it consisted of transporting portions of a 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 "in" aloud, because the service of the sanctuary belonged unto them; they bare it upon their shoulders. Here service is transport and nothing else.

(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 (Ex 29); if they sinned they were to be removed. They were taken in place of the firstborn (Nu 3). The age for beginning service is given in ch 4 as 30 years, but in 8 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 superfuzz 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 the reason led Lev 18 35). 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 porters.

(3) Contrast with Ezek and Ch.—The impression as to the meaning of P which may be gathered from an examination of its statements is powerfully reinforced when they are tested by reference to Ezek and Ch. For 16 40 Wellhausen says: "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 7 f 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, regards the slaying of the burnt offering and sacrifice as the duty of the individual sacrificant (Lev 1, 4), and—if, as Wellhausen thinks, it points to the temple which had been visited with death a Levite who was present in the places in which Ezek requires him to minister. Similarly for the Chronicler. For instance, he speaks of the Levites being 'for the service of the house . . . and in the courts and about 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 portage. 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 themselves (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 held 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 wanderings and never thereafter. As soon as the desert age was over, we as a 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 in fact it might well be regarded as a hypothesis not applicable to his own or any future day, there was no line in it that could conceivably be put into practice? If any theorist can be conceived as acting in this way, how are we to suppose that his work could meet with acceptance? Only. Thirdly, P neither embodies the views of Ezk 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 who proposed the death penalty for certain acts performed by Levites because they flayed 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 Pentateuch and His MT, is ever original; the Massoretic expression is nowhere supported by all the authorities. The phrase "the sons of Aaron the priest" is entirely unknown to P. Where the high priest met with rejection, he only qualified Aaron's 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 may be noted: the machinery of the staff to post-conquest conditions and the signs of date. For example, the leprosy laws (Lev 13 j) postulate the presence of priests to inspect and isolate the patient. "Remembering that on the critical theory P assumes the capital at Jerus 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 leprosous garments (Lev 13 f)? Was a man to make the pilgrimage from Babylonia to Jerusalem to 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 performed by a "non-priest"? If this is the case it 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. It may be the idea of ritual sacrifice 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 62)? 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 Ezk 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 consistently Mosaic, 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 multiplied and included 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 bare and unguarded. Moreover, if he had done so, Joshua could not have been in charge of the ark, seeing that he was in that tent while the ark (ex hypothesis) remained in the camp. Nor had Aaron the ark yet; he only qualified as a fact a priest or the guardian of the ark in Ex: (1) in the Book of Josh 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 (cf. above, p. 97); (3) in Ex 33 7-11 the Levites (Ex 10 6) 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. P gives the 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," rendered "Moses, the Levite" by the LXX. If 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 20-29 foreshadows the sacred character of Levi, andDt 10 6 (E) knows the hereditary Aaronic priesthood. In D the most important passage isDt 18 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 leprosy regulations. In Deut 33 8-10 (E), 'they rendered men kind to Jacob and thy 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 priestly caste, and providing the necessary staff for administering the legislation.
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 that subject. 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 P'S. It only remains to notice that the Chronicler's data on the Levitical priesthood do not, with any absolute constancy, confirm the Levitical location, "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 observances of 18 6-8. 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 attributes this to a priestly redactor, though such a writer should have expressed his jealousy of the priestly writers as the Levite refused to withhold 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 bare the ark." The priestly writers, on the other hand, in the Wellhausen theory, 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 this provision of the Pentateuch by those who found 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 sacrifices in this and the following books are explained under Sanctuary; 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 story, but there is 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. passim, esp. "in thee will Israel be blessed;" 49 3; Num. 6). It is true that in these cases 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 5 18 the MT makes David's sons "priests," but this reading was unknown to the LXX, Symmachus and Theodotion (Field, ed loc.). The LXX has "amanites" 1st chamberlains. That this represents a different Hebrew word is proved by the Septuagint text of 1 26-60 (on the extant in Heb), where we read that Benaiah, son of Jehoiada, was "over the armor" and over the brick-making. It cannot be suggested that this represents an original Heb "over the priesthood and over the brick-making" and that we have the existence of some secular court office which was rendered by this Gr phrase. Hoftag and Cheyne conjecture that אָבִיאֵיתָא, 1st refers to a priestly task, and that אָבִיאֵיתָא, 1st refers to a priestly place. This word gives the sense required (see 1sa 25 19, R.Vm "steward"). In 1 5 20 we read that Abiathar was a priestbred. Here is supported by Lucian and 23 38 reads אָבִיאֵיתָא, 1st as "the son of Eleazar, who was a priest." In 1 K. Nathan's son is described as "priest friend of the king;" but LXX reads only "friend of the king" (of esp. 1 Ch 24 2), and another period Nathan's son held the kindred secular office of king's counsellor (1 14), which is that which is elsewhere unfavourable to the view that he ever held priestly office. There can therefore be no doubt that the word "priest," אֵיתָא, אָבִיאֵיתָא, קָבּוֹהַ, אָבִיאֵיתָא, has arisen through diachrony of the preceding word נַתַּן, 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 (cf the Chronicler) not in 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 1 24). In 1 4 5 also he is used as the "door-cloak (1 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 during the door-temple of the value at Shiloh (1 3 15).

(1) The custody of the ark.—When the ark was captured by the Philis, 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 7 2).

It must be remembered that whatever may have happened during this period of great national confusion, the practice of all the rest of history has been to treat the Ark for 700 years, is uniform and would far outweigh any irregularities during so short and troubled a period. (2) On the destruction of the Ark. The difficulty arises on 1 6 14. In the second of these verses the Ark is depicted as lying on its side or as having been destroyed, and, in Wellhausen's words, "as it is nothing had happened, lift the ark from the now no longer existent cart, and set it upon the cart; the sacrifice is already burning" (Prolegomena, 128). It is therefore suggested that verse 15 is a gloss. But there is difficulty in verse 14 which tells of the breaking up of the cart, etc., without explaining what happened to the ark. We are told by a note of the 15th century that "the ark was put on the cart, and it was broken, and" the word of the cart, etc., followed by 100. This makes perfect sense.

(3) In Abinadab's house.—The second difficulty is made by 1 17 7 where we are told 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; 6 9). There it enjoyed considerable importance, for Poel is unquestionably right in identifying the Gibeah of God (1 10 6) with the Gibeah (hill) of the ark. Thus there was a high place there and a Philis garrison of 1 13 3, where LXX and Te have "Gibeah." There remains the difficulty caused by the guardianship of Eleazar. Poels may be right in reading "כְּסָעַר הָנֵצֵא, בְּעֵרֶב, 'אֵתחָדָר, 'אֵתחָדָר" (a priest on the cart), and Eleazar his son; but in the entire absence of information, alike as to Eleazar and as to Eleazar the son, no definite can be said. The narratives of the slaughter among the Beth-shemites and the fate of Uzzah make it certain that the ark's custody was a matter of no respectable distance from it. When David brought the ark he placed it in Abinadab's house. The Ark was then carried to Jerusalem by the Levites (1 13 15) presumably of Levitical descent. No further irregularities in the account are known.

More important is the change of priesthood; 1 27 36 clearly threatens Eh, 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 Hooaen and many others, who take this to be a literal sense. According to Ezk he was a Levite (40 46). It is noteworthy that the prophetic books we always hear the Levitical priesthood, not the Aaronic (esp. 1 K 13 10; Jer 33 18-22; Mal 2), and the "father's house" of 1 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 emoluments. This post was 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 (ubi supra, and 2 K 12 10) and 'elders of the priests' (2 Ch 13 19; 18 20), 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 this period and the whole Old Testament. 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. Another view is that Ezekiel is 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 reuniting 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 sordid 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 misdeeds 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 reported? This point 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 POF, 292-99. (3) Is the theory of the late composition of P psychologically and morally probable? On this see Pentateuch and POF, 292-99. (4) Is the theory of the late composition of P psychologically and morally probable? On this see Pentateuch and POF, 292-99.

The existence of institutions of P that are held by Wellhausen and his followers to be late—e.g. more national offerings than the critics allow? On this see EPC, 200 ff., and passion; POF, 395-15, and passion; SBL and OP passion, and art. Pentateuch. (4) Does Ezekiel himself show acquaintance with P (e.g. in 22 26), or not? On this too see SBL, 96; PS, 281 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 either supplementing and refining the older law, or introducing new legislation. 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 18). But in addition to these there had 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 the account of the earlier history of the priests and Levites that we have, there is general agreement that in these books a distinction between priests and Levites is established (see e.g. Neh 10 37 f. 38 f.; 12 1 f.). We also find singers and porters (Neh 13 6, etc). Nethinim and the sons of Solomon's servants (Ex 21 1 ff.; Neh 12 4 ff.; 12 28 [29]; 11 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 (cf Neh 12 42).

Ch presents an account of the earlier history of the priests and Levites that is in many respects 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 evidence to show that the view expressed in Ch is not to be 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 a more critical and impartial spirit, and 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 fff.; 16 4 f.; 25). The Le-
Priests, Levites

Levites, and Leviticals were also the things baken 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 and upward, of whom 24,000 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 Jersu 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 flay burnt offerings (vs 17). 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 consecrated") 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 8,284-86).

In Ex 2 10 the number of Israel which returned with Zerah-babel is given as 74, as against 973 priests (ver 36), 128 singers (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). 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 (Exz 2 61 ff.; Neh 7 63 ff). In Ex 6 19 ff the Levites are represented as killing the Gibeonites of Gibeon.

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, others again that he reproduces trustworthy prexilic information. The student has only an assorted view of arguments from which to choose. The bedrock fact is that the statements depicted seem the natural meaning, convey 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 f prescribes their garments and consecration (seepriest;BREASTPLATE;EMPH;ROBE;COAT;MITRE;GIRDLE;URIM AND THUMMIM), and the account of the latter may be read in Lev 8 ff. 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 1-7). The most important 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 maintain 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 unfit from performing certain functions; those who were, for any reason unclean from approaching the holy things. See further STRANGER. They performed several semi-judicial functions (Nu 5 5, f ff, etc; see JUDGE). They also blessed the people (Nu 6 25; cf Dt 10 8, etc. See Blessing. On their ducses see SACRIFICE;TITHES;FIRSTFRUITS;LEVITICAL CITIES;AGRARIAN LAWS;further CHEMARIM;NETHINIM;SONS OF SOLOMON'S SERVANTS; SINGERS;DOORKEEPERS;SERVING-WOMEN; JUDGE.

LITERATURE.—Wellhausen, Proporomena, ch iv, for the Otah-Wellhausen view; Wiener, PS, 230-89, for the view taken above; S. L. Curtis, Levitical Priests, for the conservative view. This writer afterward changed to the critical view. James Orr, POT, A. V. An Mooracker, Le Levitique, 1907, for a discourse linguistic. See also "The Levites and Leviticals" in HDB, IV, for mediating views. The best account in modern of the details of the quite novel rite is contained in Baedel's art., where a further bibliography will be found.

Harold M. Wiener

PRIMOGENITURE, pri-mo-jen-tur (πρωτογενής), b'kk'hōrāh, from b'kk'hōr, "firstborn," from bakkhar, "to act early," πρωτογενής, προ- tókia). The right of the first-born to inherit the headship of the family, and 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 first-born and the other son (Gen 10 15; 22 21; 25 13; 35 23; 36 15). It is probable that parental blessings in patriarchal times great importance was attached to preferring the first-born (Gen 28 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 first-born's blessing by the younger brother. Joseph was displeased when, in his blessing, Jacob seemed to prefer Ephraim to Manasseh, his first-born. 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 first-born 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 (Bikkhō, 46a, 47b, 61a, 51b; Bōbdhā Bathrā 122a, 122b, 123a, 124a, 142b) accepts and elaborates on this right of the first-born son. Thus, it applies to the oldest born and not the eldest surviving son; it does not apply to daughters; it has reference only to the paternal born and not to the inheritance left by a mother or other relative, nor to improvements or possessions 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 re-}

ried 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 might, and the beginning of his strength (re’shith ’bn, Gen 49:3; cf Dn 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 br’khor 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; I 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 every man thy sons shall be slain, that sitteth by him in his tent” or “the captive that was in the dungeon.” Apparently 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 regarded in this light, whether it appears among the Moabites, the Phoenicians or the Hebrews themselves (Jer 32:35; Ezk 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 (Br’khor, vanguage, 46a; cf: peter renen, whatsoever openeth the womb, Ex 13:2). In a polygenous society such as that of prepossession, if in 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, prin’: 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 given to human beings in a few instances it is applied to God and Christ, the angels and the devil.

In Mt 2:6 the word rendered “princes” might be ti’ “princely classes”; at least, this seems to be implied. Here the term r’khor, r’khor, “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 ἀρχις, ἀρχις, “a potentate,” “a person in authority,” “a magistrate” is rendered “princes” (Acts 19:10; 23:24, 25 [RV “rulers”]; Mk 3:22; Jn 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; I Cor 2:6.8 AV; Eph 2:2; Rev 1:5 [RV “rulers”]). In most of these instances the term “prince” refers to the devil.

In Acts 3:15; 5:31, the word ἄρχις, ἄρχις, “leader,” is employed referring to Christ as the author of life and salvation (cf He 12:2, where the term archēgos is rendered “author” [RV] or “captain” [RvM]).

The OT contains a number of different words mostly rendered “prince” or “princes” in the RV. (1) בּוֹם, sar: In Josh 5:14 the mysterious armed stranger seen by Joshua near Jericho calls himself the “prince of the host of Jehovah”; 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 peaceful sway of the Messianic king; the highest human title in its most ideal sense. Dn 8:11: here, again, as in Josh 6:14, 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 most frequently applied to God’s people in the sight of God, a royal title suggesting high power and alliance with God in the benefits secured for them by Him and the powers of darkness. Dn 12:1: here Michael is called “the great prince” who standeth for the children of Israel; supplementing Dn 10:21. In Dn 1:13: “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”; Is 32:1: “A 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,” or “so, (cf Jgs 8:14; I 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”); 1 Ch 29:29: “the princes of the provinces”; Est 1:3.14: “the seven princes”; the chief of the eunuches (Dan 6:14: “master” (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 (יִרְעְיָה יְשָׁר, sar melibah, “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 Is 41:1: “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 Jerus”; Neh 13:31: “the princes of Judah.” Of course, they were all subject to the authority of the high priest. (c) To the priesthood: 1 Ch 24:5: “princes of the sanctuary, and princes of God” (cf Is 43:28). (d) On account of great achievements: 2 S 8:38: “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”).
Prince

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

(2) **nāḇē**; nōšā: usually derived from **nēḇā**; nōḇā, "to lift," hence "exalted"; otherwise: a 'speaker.'

(a) An honorary title (of Gen 23:6: "Thou art a prince of God among us"). The distinction is conferred upon Abraham by the children of Hetz.

(b) A name given to the heads of the Israelitic tribes, from the head's place in the camp: "the prince of the fathers' house of the Gershonites" (of vs. 30: 35); 32: "Eleazar...shall be prince of the princes of the Levites, and have the oversight of them that keep the charge of the sanctuary"; Nu 4:34: "the prince of the congregation." They were 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 22:1); 1 Ch 4:38). (c) Equivalent to chief or king: Gen 17:20: "Twelve princes shall he beget" (cf. 25:16); Gen 34:2: "Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land"; Nu 25:15: "Coffin 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 interest in this use of word nāḇē is 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 princes 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 Sheshbazzar (Est 1:8).

(3) **bātā**; nāḇiḥiḥ: 1 S 2:8: "To make them sit with princes" (cf. Ps 113:8). The original meaning of the term is the ruling 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" (mid) or noble-minded; a gentleman, a nobleman, a person of rank, a prince. JOB 12:11: "He poureth contempt upon princes" (cf. Ps 107:40); Job 21:28: "Where is the house of the prince in whose hand is the power of life and death?" 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) **bātā**; nāḇāḥiḥ: According to Gesenius, this term properly means either a high-born person (cf. the preceding word, nāḇiḥiḥ) or a speaker, a spokesman; then, a prince, a king. 1 S 13:14: "Jeh hath appointed him to be prince over his people" (cf. 2 S 5:2: "Thou shalt be prince [RVm '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?); 11:16: "the prince of the covenant" (either a high priest or some Egyptian king, Ptolemaeus Philometor?).

(5), (6) **bātā**; rāḏōn, and **bātā**; rōḇān, "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" (rāḏōn); Jgs 5:3: "Hear, O ye kings; give ear, O ye princes (rōḇān); Prov 8:15: "By me kings reign, and princes (rōḇān) decrees judge justly." (cf. 31:4; Hab 1:10); Isa 40:20: "That bringeth persons down to nothing; that maketh the judges of the earth as vanity." (7) **tāqā**; nāḇāk, derived from **tāqā**; nāḇāh, "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." RVm "princes among men." Dn 11:8: RV "molten images." RVm "princes."
fiance to God. While Paul clearly recognized a hierarchy of such powers (Col 1 16, “thrones or dominions or principalities or powers”), it is not certain that he had elaborated a system of αἰώνια to specify the rules of the world in terms of Gnostic ethics, such as appears among the Gnostics, although they evidently believed they were developing their thought. In 1 Cor 2 6 he repudiates the wisdom of this world (aἰόνια) and of the rulers of this world (aῖνοι), and declares (Eph 6 12) that the Christian has to contend with “the world-rulers of this darkness,” and proclaims the triumph of Christ over “the principalities and the powers” in the forgiveness of sins (Col 2 15). The same personification of such agencies or powers appears also in another passage, where the rendering of RV obscures it (Eph 1 20–21: “when he raised him [Christ] from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all [read ‘every’] rule [RV ‘principle’], AV, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world [aἰόνια], but also in that which is to come”). Not the least interesting passage is Eph 3 10, where the church is said to be the means of “rendering” of the “principalities and the powers in the heavenly places.”

The word πρίντιπάς 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, 205), or wholesale writing.

The art of making original records is a writing, this, however, is a slow process. It involves tracing letters and parts 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 was led by 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 thought of as the color is laid on by drawing or by the “pintader.” The “pintaderas” 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 deposits all over the Neolithic to the Iron Age (in 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” (Moseo, The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization, 254–61, with many illustrations, and Frobenius, Childhood of Man, fig. 31, “Dayak block for painting the body”).

The injurious practice of rev. 19 28, which is termed “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, w. speaks of printing upon the heads or soles of the feet, has been quite widely in RV, and, if the idea is one of printing at all, it refers rather to branding than stamning with color.

The use of the inkbhorn in setting the mark upon the forehead of the beast in Rev 14 1 and on the forehead of the beast in Rev 16 19 and 20, more likely refer to branding, as the Gr word pointēma and the Heb words may be connected. 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 (Iss 3 24; perhaps Ex 21 26; a branding on the forehead, CH § 12; a branding of a slave §§ 226, 227). 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 discoveries.

Both stamp and seal were used throughout the Middle Ages, the latter abundantly, and the stamp at least occasionally, for stamping the capital letters in Bib. 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 Bib. 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 Bib. 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 Brit., at the end of the first part of the art. on “Typography,” is full and good. Compare also Books on Engraving and related topics, esp. Hortzschansky, supplementing the bibliography of Enc Brit.

E. C. Richardson

PRISCA, pris’ka, PRISCILLA, pris’il’a. See Aquila.
PRISON, pris’in, PRISONER, pris’n-er (there are various Heb words which are rendered “prison” in AV, among them: 1. Hebrew Words [1] רֶפֶאָה, qōbar, “round house,” *fortress* [8 t in Gen], [2] סַבָּה, kōlē, “restraint,” “confine ment” [12 t: in historic books, Isa, Jer, with “house”], [3] מַטָּרָדָה, matṭārādā, “guard,” “sentry” [13 t in Jer and Neh], [4] סַפִּיקָה, safīqā, “distorting,” i.e. stocks or pillory [4 t], [5] אַסְרָה, ‘eser, “bond,” “fetters” [Ecc 4 14; Jer 37 15]; “ward” in AV is usually the rendering for סַבָּה, mishmār]: 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. qōbar, 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 great 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) Joseph the offending members of the royal household, viz. the royal butler and the royal baker, were placed “in ward” with the “captain of the guards” 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 for whom 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 42 23). Shimei was forbidden to pass beyond the boundary of Jerusalem (1 K 2 36); the person who caught sitting on the Sabbath was put in “ward” pending his trial (Nu 15 34). In the monarchical period, prisoners were kept in pillories or were placed in prison, e.g. Micaiah by Ahab (1 K 22 27), Hanani by Asa (2 Ch 16 10). Hosea, 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 Judah in the later monarchical period. The prophet was put “in prison” three times.

5. Under the house that were in the upper gate of Benjamin, which was in the house of the Monarchy of Jeh (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 pillory. During the siege of Judah 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 sentry who guarded the royal palace. According to the narrative (Jer 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. Treatment which led to incarceration. Samson of Prisoners during the period of his imprisonment was compelled to work at the stonework (Jgs 16 21). Grinding 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. His case is an old practice in Assyria (2 K 25 7). The thumbs and great toes of Adonibezek 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 RV). In Jer 29 26 for “prison,” we should render “stocks” (so RV) or “pillory,” and for “stocks,” “collar” (as in RV). AV renders a different Heb word by “stocks” in Job (13 27; 33 11). There was a special pillory (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 Pe 11 27, the word which is tr. “prison” means “precarious existence,” and is derived from a root which denotes, for instance, the isolation of the leper (Lev 13 5; cf Isa 34 22; 49 7). In Isa 58 8 “oppression” as “prison” is the correct tr., while in Isa 61 1 it denotes “opening of the eyes,” rather than “opening of the prison.”

Prisoners are promised “light after darkness, gloom after gleam.”

6. The Hebrew Words 7. Other Hebrew Words

8. In the NT “prison” generally occurs for the Gr ψυλλακτής, phulakē, which corresponds to the Heb word רֶפֶאָה, mishmār, referred 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 each case. RV renders “ward” as the rendering in AV (Acts 12 10). In connection with the imprisonment of John the term is used by ἐν αἰεν ἐν καταβολαῖς, “place of bonds” or “fetters” (Mt 11 2); the same word is used in the LP of Peter and John in prison, Lk 22 5, and of Paul and Silas (Acts 16 26). 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. φυλακή, τίτυλος, “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 “lockup.” See also Punishments.

T. Lewis

PRISON GARMENTS. See preceding article.

PRISON, SPIRITS IN: The phrase occurs in the much-disputed passage 1 Pet 3 18–20, where the apostle, exhorting Christians to endure 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 set forth 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, whereas, in few, that is, eight souls, were saved through
PRIVY, priv'•i, PRIVILY, priv'-li: These words are obsolete in modern Eng. and are replaced by “secret,” “secrecy,” rather than by the cognates “private,” “privately.” RV usually has not altered AV’s use of the word, but in Ps 11 2 has substituted “in darkness” and in Jgs 9 31 uses “craftily,” in “in Tormah” (see TORMAHI). In Ezek 21 14, AV “entereth into their privy chambers,” “privy” is a gloss, omitted in RV, “to enter.” In 2 Tim 1 13 (“the charge is”) AV 5 2 is simply “to know it; in 8 4, RV has changed the phrase into “be initiated into.”

PRIZE, priz••: Two Gr words are so rendered in EV: (1) ἵππαρσος, brabelon, the award to the victor in the Gr games, consisting of a garland of bay, olive, or pine; so called because it was given by the ἰππαρθείς, braboulos, the adjudicator who assigned the prize at the games (Vulg bruatum, from Lati bruma mus, a gift). The termination -os, -as, would lead us to expect the active sense: “an act of grasping,” “plundering” (AV “robbery”), which would imply that Christ did not deem it an act of usurpation to claim equality with God, for such equality was His inherent right. But the context demands a reference “not to the right which He claimed, but to the dignity which He renounced” (Lightfoot); hence the majority of modern expositors take the word in a passive sense (= ἵππαρσος, brablemos): “a thing to be seized, prized, retained at all costs as a booty” (ERV “a prize,” ARV “a thing to be grasped”), implying that Christ did not regard equality with God as a thing to be clutched greedily, but waived His rights (see Lightfoot on Phil 2 6). The vb. “to prize” occurs only in Zeus 13.11; See Greek Word Index of CHRIST; KENOSIS. D. Miall Edwards

PROBATION, pro•bă•shun, SECOND, sek•ə•n. See EScATology of the NT.

PROCHORUS, pro•kör•us (Πρόχορος, Próchoros): One of “the seven” chosen by the Christian community in Jerusalem to superintend the dispensing of charity to the widows and other poor (Acts 6 5). The name has Gr, and History has “a Hellenist.” According to tradition he became bishop of Neo-media and died a martyr at Antioch.

PROCOUNSUL, pro•kōn•sul (ἀντιθεότατος, aná Asphaltos [Acts 13 7; 18 12]; AV deputy). See Province.

PROCURATOR, pro•kür•a•t•ər (ὑπηρέτης, epι• tropos): This word signifies in a general sense a steward or bailiff of a private estate, or a financial agent with special function. The coinage of the special usage of the word to denote an imperial functionary or official is characteristic of the origin of many departments of administration under the Roman Empire which sprang from the emperor’s household. At the time of Augustus, when the domestic quality of these offices had not been entirely lost, the procurators were mostly imperial freedmen. But after the systematic organization of the administration in the 2d cent., the title of procurator was reserved for functionaries of the equestrian class. In fact, the term is so intimately connected with the sphere of official activity of the Rom knights that the expressions “procuratorial career” and “equestrian career” are used synonymously (cf Hirschfeld, Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungs- beamten bis auf Diokletian, 410-65).

During the last century of the Republic, the class of knights (equestes) embraced in general all citizens of wealth who were not magistrates or members of the senate. The Roman Law (67 BC) established 400,000 sesterces (about $18,000 or £5,300) as the minimum census rating for membership in this class. The gold ring, tunic with narrow purple border, and privilege of sitting in the first 14 rows at the theater were the tokens of knighthood. Augustus added to these the public horse which was conferred henceforth by the emperor and recalled the original military significance of the order. From the time of Augustus the first three decuriae of jurors (judicis), each containing 1,000 persons, were filled with knights.
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 were anxious to lose the loss of opportunity by infringing 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 prefectures, and the guard of the prefect, 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 influence (Friedländer, "Staatsgeschichte der Rom", 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 (præfectus) 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 military or civil functions, yet the designation procurator became at an early date the term of common usage to designate them (Hirschfeld, 382).

Mauretania, Rhætia, Noricum, Thrace, Cappadocia, Judaea and some smaller districts were all, for a time at least, governed by procurators (Tacitus Hist. 1.11; Dio Cassius lvi.17).

The question concerning the original title of the Roman governors of Judaea has arisen because the N T uses the noun ἡγεμόν (Mt. 27.2; 11.14-15; 21.27; 25.14; Lk 3.1; 20.20; Acts 23.24; 24.1; 26.30), which corresponds with the Lat term praeses, which might be considered synonymous with either procurator or præfectus (Hirschfeld, 354). The phrase "an inscriptional reference 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 (Anna. xiv.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 epítropos (procurator) for the time of Claudius, and it is convenient to follow common usage and assume that this title was current from the first.

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. xxvii; Tacitus Hist. v.9). This remained, however, an isolated instance in the annals of Pal (Hirschfeld, 380), and it, however, 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 ('Römische Staatsverwaltung', I, 409, 412) and Schürer ('Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes', I, 455-485):
monly applied to Jn 1 1–18. See Ecclesiasticus;
John, Gospel of.

PROLONG, prô-long' (תָּנָך, 'arakh, הָאמֶר, māšakāh): “Prolong, prolonged” are the tr. of ‘arakh, “to stretch long,” and frequently, “prolong days”; 4 40, etc; Job 6 11 AV; Prov 28 16; Ecc 7 15; 8 13; Isa 53 10; of māšakāh, “to draw out” (Isa 13 22; Ezek 12 25; AVr “to stretch out”), of yādēph, “to add,” “to increase” (Ps 61 6; Prov 10 27); of nābhāh, “to stretch out,” etc. (Job 30 29); neither shall he prolong the perfection thereof upon the earth. ARV “neither shall their possessions be extended on the earth,” in “their produce bend to the earth”; ERV reverses text and margin; of 'arabhāh (Aram.) (Dnl 7 12). Yet their lives were prolonged.” AV “A prolonging in life was given them.” “Prolong” occurs in Exdcs 29 5, “prolong the time” (parakūthēs); 38 14, “prolong life,” RV “maintenance of life” (embōlān); 30 22, “prolongeth his days,” RV “length of days” (mākōrōμερεια). 37 31, RV “shall prolong” (prosāthē). W. L. Walker

PROMISE, prom’is (most frequently in the OT דַּבָּר, dābbar, “speaking,” “speech,” and בַּדָּר, dābbar, “to speak,” also דָּבָר, dāmar, “to say,” once in Ps 77 8, “țemer,” “speech”; in the NT ἐγγίζω, ἐπιγίζω, and the RVs, ἐγγίζων, ἐπιγίζων, 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 exceeding great promises” (2 Pet 1 4), although the word “promise” is not always used in connection with it (see below). 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; 9 1–17); (3) most influential, the promise to Abraham to make of him a great nation in whom all families of the earth should 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 25; Dt 1 8 11; 6 8; 9 28, etc); (4) the promise to David to make his house like the 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; 5 6 5; 66 13; Jer 31 3; 67 22; 23 5 6; 31 11f; 39 25f, 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 6; Rom 1 2; 4 3; 10 9; 15 4). Paul argues that the promise to Abraham that he should be "heir of the world" to whom he has committed, is not confined to Israel, but is open to all who are children of Abraham by faith (Rom 4 13; 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 Jn 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 3 5), Christ's "coming" (2 Pet 3 9, etc), "new heavens and a new earth" (2 Pet 3 13, etc). "Pronounced" and "promised" in AV, RV has frequently other terms, as "word" (Ps 105 42); "spoken," "spoken" (Dt 10 9; Jos 9 21; 22 4; 23 5 15, etc), "consented" (Lk 22 6, etc). References to the promises occur repeatedly in the Apocalypse (Bar 2 34; 2 Mace 2 18; Wisd 12 21; cf 2 Esd 3 15; 5 29). W. L. Walker

PROPER, prop’er; For AV, “proper” (child), in 1 He 11 25, RV substitutes “favourably”, in 1 Chr 29 3; 1 Cor 7 7, RV “own” is employed, and for the too emphatic “their proper tongue” in Acts 1 19 “their language” is written. But none of the AV forms are really obsolete.

PROPER NAMES. See Names, Proper.

PROPERTY, prop’er-i; See Agrarian Laws; Jubilee; Poor; Portion; Primogeniture; Wealth.

PROPHECY, prof’ē-si, prof’ē-si; PROPHETS, prop’ē-tas.

I. THE IDEA OF BIBLICAL PROPHECY.

The Seer and Seer of God. Prophecies are of two sorts: (1) In the OT and (2) in the NT. The Seer may be any man who is enabled by the power of prophecy to see the future. In the OT the Seer is usually a prophet, a man who has been called and furnished with a message from God. In the NT the Seer is usually a Christian who has the gift of prophecy. The Seer of God is a man who has been called and furnished with a message from God. The Seer of God is a man who has the gift of prophecy. The Seer of God is a man who has the gift of prophecy. The Seer of God is a man who has the gift of prophecy.
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 (nāḇīṯ'), 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 roaring nearby (Amos 3 5). 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 expression, inspiration, or phrenetical inspiration. It is said that the spirit of God has come over someone (Nu 24 2); or has fallen upon him (Ezek 1 5); or has 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 Ezekiel is the revealer of the Spirit, which has descended 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 assails 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 any individuality or 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 in which he speaks, who afterwards assimilates the character, but is not bound to a narrow and mechanical meter. It is, however, also possible that prophetical utterances find their expression in plain prose. The individual peculiarity of the prophet is also in this respect of which revelation comes to him. In the one prophet he finds 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 put in their appearance without being controlled by consciousness and reason.

3. The Dream

On the other hand, prophecy differs specifically from dreams, first, because the genuine prophetic 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 than the truth of a dream. Second, the spirit is present in the prophet as a prophetic vision, which is the nearest approach to a prophetic dream. In Jer 23 25ff 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 prophetic 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

4. Freedom

confined to any priestly class or organi-

In the case of spiration times that a prophet gathered dis-
ciples around himself, who could themselves in turn also be seized by his spirit, although the transmission of this spirit was a diffi-
cult matter. Yet we must suppose that at times this spiration continued to be at all times a free gift of the sover-
eign 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 prophetic 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 cer-
tainly did not belong. Further, age made no difference in the call to the prophetic office. Even in his earliest youth Samuel was called to be a prophet (1 Samuel 3 1 f), and it did not avail Jeremiah anything when he excused himself because of his youth. Yet he was simultaneously seized by this Spirit. From time to time prophet-
esses appeared, although the female sex is by no means so prominent here as it is in the sorcery of the heathen. See Prophecy. As an exceptional case the Holy Spirit has been impressed on even a person who inwardly was entirely estranged from Him and could make an utterance through him (cf Saul, 1 Samuel 10 11; 19 24; Balaam, Nu 22 28; Canophus, Jn 11 51). As a rule, however, God has selected such persons or prophets, and they are called and dedicated for this purpose by Him through a special act (cf Moses Ex 3 1 f; 1 K 19 16, 19ff; Isa 6; Jer 1; Ezek 1). This moment was decisive for their whole lives and con-
sstituted their authorization as far as they them-
selves and others were concerned. Yet for each prophetic appearance these men receive a special enlightenment. The prophet does not at all times speak in an inspired state; cf Nathan (2 Sam 7 3 ff), who afterwards was not prophetically called to take back to David the words which he had spoken on his own authority. Character-
istic data on the mental state of the prophets in the reception and in the declaration of the Divine word are found in Jer 15 16 f; 20 7ff. Origin-
ally Jeremiah finds in whom it is the Holy Spirit who spoke to him (cf Ezek 3 3), but then he loses all pleasure in and would have preferred not to have uttered this word, but he could not do as he desired.

The attempt has often been made to explain prophecy as a natural product of purely human factors. Rationalistic theologians regarded the prophets as enthusiastic teachers of religion and morals, as warm patriots and politicians, to whom they ascribed nothing but a certain 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. Those 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 natural and religious reflections, arrive at the conviction that Zedekiah of Judah 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 the 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 unthinkable in the case of so conscientious a preacher of morality. But such cases are frequently met with. Jeremiah predicts to Hanannah that he would die during the year (28 16), but it is not only such matters of detail that presuppose 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 presupposition his conduct would have been reprehensible cowardice. The case of Isaiah is exactly the same. We read that when the word of God as a guarantee 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 retreat without having accomplished their purpose (22 15), these things were so much in contradiction to all the probabilities 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 establish this doctrine, which established 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 Elijah, the prediction of the long drought (1 K 17 1); in the case of Elisha, the undertakings of the enemies (2 K 6 12), and in other cases. It is indeed true that the contents of the prophetic discourses are not 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 mouth of the prophet. But His determinations with reference to the future as a rule are connected with prophetic utterances of the latter kind. The prophets are watchmen, guardians of the people, who foretell to the nation 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 grasshopper 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 inner unity, notwithstanding the great differences of times and surrounding circumstances. It is prophecy which the Hebr people must thank for their higher conception of history. This people know of a Highest Author of all things and of a power, who, with 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. conceptions, the fulfillment constitutes an integral part. This 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" (1 S 3 19) if it is not "raised up" ydp Sim, akîman, tiollû, for which we more rarely find סָּדֵּה, mílô, but regularly in the NT ἀνομοίωσας, πλεονεκρασθαι, "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 NT case it 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 fulfillment can be judged by the contemporaries: in the sense of an extraordinary Divine realization the fulfillment refers to the near future and when special emphasis is laid on external events. In these cases the prediction of certain events assumes the significance of a "sign" (cf Jer 28 16; Isa 6 1 f; 37 30, and elsewhere). In other cases it is only later generations who can judge of the correctness of a prediction or of a threat. In this way in Zec 6 the fulfillment of a threat is declared, and in the NT often the fulfillment of a promise is after a long time pointed out. But it is only as a genuine prophecy must be fulfilled like an edict of fate. Such prophecy is not an inevitable decree of fate, but is a word of the living God to mankind, and therefore conditioned ethically, and God can, if repentance has followed, withholds a threat (Jer 18 2 f; case of Jonah), or the punishment can be mitigated (1 K 21 29). A prediction, too, Jeh can recall if the people prove unworthy (Jer 18 9 f). A favorable or an unfavorable prediction can also be postponed, as far as its realization is concerned, to later times. If it belongs to the ultimate counsels of God, as e.g. the final judgment and deliverance on the last day. This counsel also may be realized successively. In this case the prophet already collects into one picture what is realized gradually in a longer historical development. The prophet in general spoke to his hearts in such a way as could be understood by them and could be impressed on them. It is therefore not correct to demand a fulfillment pedantically exact in the form of the historical event of the prophecy. This is what the Divine thought contained in the prophecy be entirely and completely realized. But not frequently the finger of God can be seen in the entire literal fulfillment of certain prophecies. This is the case, e.g. the case when in the NT the appearance of the Son of Man, in whom all the rays of OT prophecy have found their common center.

II. Historical Development of the Prophetic Office.—It is a characteristic peculiarity of the religion of the OT that its very elementary beginnings are of a prophetical nature. The fathers, above all Abraham, but also Isaac and Jacob, are the recipients of visions and of Divine revelations. Eps. is this true of Abraham, who appeared to the foreigners, to whom he was neither kith nor kin, to be indeed a prophet (nâhîki) (Gen 20 7; cf Ps 105 15), although in his case the command to preach the word was yet absent. Above all, the creative founder of the Israelitish national religion, Moses, is a prophet in the eminent sense of the word. His influence among the people is owing neither to his official position, nor to any military prowess, but solely and alone from the one circumstance, that since his call at the burning bush God has spoken to him. This intercourse between God and Moses was ever of a particularly intimate character. While other men of God received certain individual messages only from time to time and through the mediation of dreams and visions, God spoke directly and "face
to face” with Moses (Nu 12:6ff; 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. He also directed them. 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 prophetess, directed 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 in the action of Samuel, while yet a boy received Divine revelations (1 S 3:1ff). He was by the whole people regarded as a “seer” whose prophecies were always fulfilled (3:19f). The passage 9:6ff shows that the people expected of the prophet that he should also as a clairvoyant come to the assistance of the people in the troubles of life. Such a professional clairvoyant, indeed, Samuel was not, as he was devoted entirely to the service of his God and of his people and obeyed the Divine Spirit, even in those cases when he was compelled to act contrary to his personal inclinations, as was the case when the kingdom was established in Israel (8:6ff).

Since the days of Samuel we hear of schools of prophets, or “sons of prophets.” These associations probably originated in this way.

4. Schools

that an experienced prophet attracted of Prophets to himself bands of youths, who sought to receive a measure of his spirit. These disciples, the prophets of families, lived in colonies along the master. Possibly Samuel was the first who founded such a school of prophets. For in or near the city of Ramah we first find nāzāyāh, or colonies of such disciples (1 S 19:18f; 20:1). Among these pupils is found a much greater extent than among the teachers a certain ecstatic feature. They arouse their feelings through music and induce a frantic condition which also affects others in the same way, in which state they “prophesy” and throw off their garments, fall to the ground. In later times too we find traces of such ecstatic phenomena. Thus e.g. in Zec 13:6; 1 K 20:37,38, the “wounds” on the breast or on the forehead recall the self-mutilation of the priests of Baal (1 K 18:21). The deeds of what the dervishes of our own day do, probably were phenomena quite similar to the action of the prophets of the surrounding tribes. But that prophecy in Israel was not, as is now not infrequently claimed, merely a less crude form of the heathen prophetism, is proved by the fact that Moses and Samuel, who even in their times represent something much higher. Also in the colonies of prophets there was assuredly not to be found merely an enthusiasm without the Spirit of God. Proof for this is Samuel, the spiritual father of this colony, as Elijah was for the later colonies of this kind. These places were rather the centers of a religious life, where communion with God was sought by prayer and meditation, and where the recollection of the great deeds of God in the reception of new revelations. From such centers of theocratic ideas and ideas without a doubt there came forth also corresponding influences that affected the people. Perhaps not only was sacred music cultivated at these places but also sacred traditions, which were handed down orally and in writing. Certain it is that at these colonies the religion of Jeh prevailed.

During the period of the kings prophetically inspired men frequently appeared, who demanded even of the kings that they should submit to their Divinely inspired the Kings word. Saul, who refused such submission, perished as the result of this conflict. David owed much to the support of the prophets Samuel, Nathan, Gad (1 S 14:1ff; 2 S 7; 2 Ch 29:25, and elsewhere). But David also bowed in submission when these prophets rebuked him because of his transgression of the Divine commands (2 S 12,24). His son Solomon was educated by the prophet Haggai, and this kingdom was predicted by the prophet Abijah, the Shilonite (1 K 11:29ff). Since Jeh, as the supreme Sovereign, has the right to enthrone or to dethrone kings, this is often done through the prophets (cf 1 K 14:1ff). After the division of the kingdom we find Shemaiah forbidding Rehoboam to begin a war with his brethren of Israel (1 K 12:21; cf 2 Ch 11:2f; of another mission of the same prophet, 2 Ch 12:5ff). On the reign of God that the prophetic word is soon turned against the untheocratic rule of Jeroboam (1 K 13,14). It is in this very same Northern Kingdom that the prophets unfolded their full activity and generally in opposition to the secular rulers, although there was no lack of accommodating “prophets,” who were willing to sanction everything that the king wanted. The opposition of the true prophets to these false representatives of prophecy is illustrated in the story of Micaiah, the son of Imlah (1 K 22).

But a still higher type of prophecy above the ordinary is found in Elijah, whose historic mission it was to fight to the finish the battle between the followers of Jeh and the worship of the Tyrian Baal. He was entirely unique in every respect, and his kingdom is a deed on a grand scale (of concerning Elijah and Elisha the art, Religion of Israel). His successor Elisha inherited from him not only his mantle, but also a double measure of his spiritual gifts. He exhibits the prophetic office more from its loving side. He is accustomed to visit the schools of prophets found scattered throughout the land, calls the faithful together around himself on the Sabbaths and the new moons (2 K 4,33), and in this way establishes centers of a more spiritual culture than was common elsewhere among the people. We read that first-fruit was brought to him as to the priests (2 K 4:42). But while the activity of Elijah was entirely in antagonism to the ruling house in the kingdom, this feature is not entirely lacking in the work of Elisha also. He has even been charged with wicked conspiracies against the dynasty of Omri and the king of Syria (2 K 8,9). His conduct in connection with these events can be excused only on the ground that he was really acting in the name of a prophet. And the destruction was possible for Elisha, after the radical change in public sentiment that had followed upon the work of Elijah, in later time to assume a more friendly attitude toward the government and the people. He often assisted the king in his various contests with the Syrians (cf 6:5ff; 13:14ff). His deeds
are generally of a benevolent character. In connection with these he exhibits to a remarkable degree the gift of prophetic foresight (2 K 4 16; 5 26; 6 8 ff.; 7 1 f.; 13 19). Jonah, too, the son of Amittai, had at that time a favorable message for the Northern Kingdom (2 K 14 25).

However, the flourishing condition of the kingdom under Jehosaphat 11 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 their prophecies and utterances into 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 was already in the days of Amos common and current (5 18 ff.). As the writing of individual prophecies (Isa 8 1; 50 5; Hab 2 2f) had for its purpose this intensification of these words in the permanent authentic form and later to convince the reader of their wonderful fulfillment, thus too the writing down of larger collections of prophecies had for its purpose to intensify the power of the prophetic word and to secure this as a permanent possession of the people (Jer 30 2; 35 1 f.). 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 early versions of the 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 as such 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 rhythmical yet connotative 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 injustice on 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 Hanami 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 prophetic 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 prophets Isaiah had great influence in Jerusalem (2 K 22 14). Much more important under this king was the prophet Jeremiah, who was called by God for a great mission. This prophet during the siege and destruction of Jerusalem and after that time spoke as an unyielding yet deeply feeling exponent of the prophetic utterance on behalf of the nation, 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 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 this condition, an unfolding of the prophecies of a prophet 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), spoken during the Babylonian captivity, was prepared, 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 2d cent. BC.

After the return from Babylonia the Jews were exorted by Haggai 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 prophet of Babulon. In contrast to these, Malachi is at all times in accord with the canonical prophecies, 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 as late as MI, even to a period as late as the Gr. But this is refuted by the fact mentioned in Eccles (beginning of the 2d cent. BC) that in the writer's time the prophetical Canon appeared already as a closed collection. Dtn is not found in this collection, but the Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets in. 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 the study of the prophetic writings, and 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 he could directly point to Him who in the NT completed the old covenant and fulfilled 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; XV, x, 5, among the Essenes, or in the case of Hyrcanus, op. cit., XIII, 20). But to this time we have not the prophetic gifts at times (cf Bj, III, viii, 9). He is thinking in this connection chiefly of the prediction of some details. Such "prophets" and "prophetesses" are reported also in the NT. In Jesus Christ Himself the prophetic 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 ψάφη, ψάφης, ψάφητα, ψαφήτης, ψάφητα, ψαφήτων, ψαφήτων, signify speaking under the extraordinary influence of the Holy Ghost. Thus in Acts 11:27 ff (prophecy of a fanatic by Agabus); 21:10 if (prediction of the sufferings of Paul); 13:1 if (exhortation to mission work); 21:9 if (prophecies of the daughters of Philip). Paul himself also had this gift (Acts 16:5). He sees how all Israel is 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 reign of the Messiah the country by the Gentiles a Son of David shall be born in a miraculous manner and attain supremacy (Isa 7:14; 9:2 ff; 11:1 ff), and who speaks constantly of that Divine establishment on Zion (of the quiet waters of Shiloah, 8:6), the foundation stone that has been laid by Jeh (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 glorious King of Peace from Bethlehem (5:1ff). Possibly even a contemporary 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 contemporaries were acquainted with this idea.

In recent times scholars have pointed to the fact that in the old Orient, among the Egyptians, the Babylonians and elsewhere, the expectation of a miraculously born King of the future, who was to provide for his own people and to all nations salvation and peace, was entertained at an early period. Yet so much is certain, that Isaiah and Micah did not base their hopes on the vague dreams of the gentle world, but
upon the prophetic establishment of a Divine sanctuary and kingdom of Zion. The personal figure of the Son of God is not so much in the foreground in the other prophets as in Isaiah, the author to whom the exilic situation is most closely related. These prophets mention only casually the Good Shepherd, as 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. 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 (Isa 1 18 ff.; 40 2 ff.). 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 proper basis and condition of rescue and peace (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 to be a kind of esoteric book of consolation. His battle cry for the future is "Jeh 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 the tears must fall on them after this destruction 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 (ch 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 Bab 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 esp. through his innocent sufferings and his viceroy deeds, converts Israel, the Lord's people, to the Servant, 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 mythical figure of a death and resurrection of a Bab god (mammuz-Adish). Since the unjust persecutions of Joseph and David they were acquainted with the sufferings of the just, and Jeremiah'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 excelled 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. He brings to a completion the kingdom of God through His sufferings which the earth (the exiles) must suffer before it 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 sense by Haggai, and still more by Zechariah and Zechariah. The picture 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 f.). Then the judgment of the world will take place and indulge also each human being, who before this 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 picture 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 unity is in the first place evident in the character of the views and ideas of the time of utterance.

Prophesy. The prophets were compelled to speak so that their hearers could understand them. Only gradually these limitations and forms 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 of the individual utterances and prophetic pictures. One picture must be supplemented by the others, in order not to be misunderstood.

Character of prophecy. The prophets were compelled to speak so that their hearers could understand them. Only gradually these limitations and forms 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 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 of Babylon is a different figure of a death and resurrection of a Bab god (mammuz-Adish). Since this prophetic picture is that of Joseph and David they were acquainted with the sufferings of the just, and Jeremiah'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 excelled all these types
these characteristics of prophecy, its contemporaneous and perspectival and at times symbolical features, are not disregarded. The firm prophetic word is intended to give the congregation certain directive lines and distinctive outlines. But an adequate idea of what is to come the Christian church will become compelled to form for itself, when the fulfilment and completion shall have taken place.

IV. Analogous Phenomena among Gentiles.—The uniqueness of Bible prophecy is grasped fully only when we try to find analogies among the gentle peoples. Here we find everywhere indeed the art of soothsaying, the headquarters for which was Babylon. But with this art the prophecy of the OT stands out in bold contrast (cf the prohibitions in Lev 19:26; 31:20; Deut. 18:10f., prohibitions that refer to necromancy for the purpose of discovering the future). This art was practised through a medium, a person who had an 'abba (Bab. 'aba), i.e. a spirit that brought forth the dead in order to question them. These were thought to speak in murmurings or piping sounds (Isa 8:19), which could be imitated by the medium (visionist). And this was the line which forbade this under penalty of death, Saul had tried to destroy those who practised incantations, who generally were women (1 Sam 8:29). This practice, however, continued to flourish. In addition, theשמה (seham) were an animal and this was also a developed art of interpretation in order to find omens for the future. Even was the examination of intestines practised by them. The liver of sacrificial animals particularly was carefully examined and, from this, good or bad omens were inferred (cf Ezek. 21:21). See Divination. This art passed over from the Babylonians to the seafaring Etruscans, and through 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 miscarriages by human beings and animals, the actions of hens, 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 them falsely would convert into a 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 Delos it was the voice of a woman in Nature, who appeared to read in the rustling of the trees and the murmurings of the water. How uncertain these sources were was well known to heathen antiquity. The ancients complain of the enigmatic character of the Sibylline oracles and the double 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 mere was 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 "prophetical texts" from ancient Egypt (Grashmann, Texte und Bilder, 1:188) may, indeed show some 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.


C. von Orelli

PROPHETY, GIFT OF. See Spiritual Gifts.

PROPHESYINGS, prof'esi-nings, FALSE: The distinction between the true and the false prophecy and prophets is very difficult to state. Broadly speaking, the false prophesyings related itself to the national ideal independently of any spiritual equity, while the true prophesyings ever kept uppermost the spiritual conception of the national life. Among those given to false prophesyings were the ones who spoke after "the deceit of their own heart" (Jer 14:13). Those who were fulfilled prophesyings borrowed a message and assumed the speech of prophecy (Jer 23:25). Those who sought the prophet's rôle in order to gain the material gifts which came from the people to their prophets (Mic 3:5). These who saw themselves worthy of punishment and even death. There were, however, false prophesyings from men who honestly believed themselves to have a message from Jeh. These prophesyings 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 prophesyings that the true prophets had to contend. The only test here was the spiritual character of the utterance, and this test demanded that worthy of punishment and even death. Consequently, in times of moral darkness the false prophets, predicting smooth things for the nation, independent of repentance, consolation and forgiveness, were favored above the true prophets who emphasized the moral greatness of Jeh and the necessity of righteousness for the nation. In NT times false prophesyings did much injury in the church. See Prophecy.

PROPHET, THE OLD. See OLD PROPHET, THE.

PROPHETESS, prof'et-ess (προφητής, profēthēs, prophēthēs): Women were not excluded from the prophetic office in the OT, and were honored with the right of prophetic utterance in the
NT. It should be noted, however, that women like Miriam (Ex 15 20), Deborah (Jgs 4 4) and Huldah (2 K 22 LXX) were not credited with the seer's insight into the future, but were called "prophetesses" because of the poetical inspiration of their speech. Among others mentioned as having the prophetic gift we find Hannah (1 S 2 1), Abigail (1 S 29 30) and the four daughters of Philip (Acts 21 8-9). See Prophet. C. E. Sckenk.

1. Terms and Meaning

PROPITIATION, pro-pish-ə-tā′-shon: The word is Lat and brings into its Eng. use the atmosphere of high priestly rites for winning the favor, or averting the anger, of the gods. 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 Dαυς, kiales-, (like, kile), and καταλαγ-, 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 NT passages cited in the NT, esp. in the newer VSS. In H 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 (17:13, "God [Heb. קבוצת, q.v. "propitiated"] in [m 'he propitiated'] to me the sinner" [AVm]); H 8 12 (quoted from LXX); and Mt 16 22 (an idiomatc asseration as Eng, "mercy on us") will help in getting at the usage in the NT. In LXX hilastērion is the 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 H 9 5, where later VSS have in m "the propitiatory." Elsewhere in the NT this form is found only in Rom 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 person or thing had to be provided for securing friendly meeting with the Deity, offended by man's sin. In Hc particularly, as elsewhere generally, Jesus Christ is presented as priest and sacrifice. Many modern writers (cf Sanday and Headlam), therefore, object that to take Him the "mercy-seat" here complicates the figure still further, and so would understand hilastērion 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. He was found in the NT only in 1 Jn 2 2; 4 10. Here the idea is active grace, or mercy, or friendliness. The teaching corresponds exactly with that in Rom. "Jesus Christ the righteous" is our "Advocate [in 'Helper'] with the Father," because He is active mercy concerning (σωτέρ, peri) our sins and those of the whole world. Or (4 10), God "loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins [αφιερούμενον σωτηρίου σκέπασμα] our sins." This last passage is parallel with Rom 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 concrete expression. The basal word of the 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 friendliness hence their adoption would be natural; hence graciousness.

2. Theological Implication

Naturelly, therefore, the idea of expiation entered into the concept. It is esp. to be noted that all provisions for this friendly relationship, four kinds 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 unworthy conceptions are removed from the Christian notion of propitiation by the fact that God Himself proposed, or 'set forth' the God and the God and the man. man. This is 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 uniform kindness to men deserving harshness. Cf also as to reconciliation, as in Rom 5 1-11; 2 Cor 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: Workerman, At Oneness, or Reconciliatiol with God; Moherly, in Foundations, Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought. William Owen Carver.

PROPORTION, pró-pôr-shən; Occurs once in the sense of "space" as the tr of ἄκρα (1 K 7 36, AV "the breadth or open space"); once in the obsolete sense of "form" as the tr of ἀρχή, "array," or "row" (Job 41 12, RV "frame"); and once in the sense of "measure" as the tr of ἀναλογία, "proportion," or "equality" (Rom 12 6, "the proportion of faith"): the "proportion of our faith." "Proportionally" occurs in Wind 13 5, ἀναλόγος, RV "in like proportion," m "correspondently."
The stranger within the gate was free to eat meat which was prohibited to the Israelite (Dt 14:21). If, however, the stranger wished to take part in the Passover, Gentile law prohibited him; 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 gēr 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 Molech (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 Jew such a law might have forced sacrifices; and it was probably for this class that tablets of warning in the temple were inscribed in Gr and Lat.

Another class kept practically all the Jewish laws and customs, but were not circumcised. Some again, though not circumcised, had their children circumcised (Juvenal Sat. xiv.96 ff). Such Jewish customs as fasting, cleansings, abstaining from pork, lighting the candles on Friday evening, and keeping the Sabbath (Jos, Cap, II, 29, etc) were observed by these "gentile sympathizers." Schürer holds that there were congregations of Greeks and Romans in Asia Minor, and probably in Rome, which, though they had no connection with the synagogue, formed themselves into gatherings after the pattern of the synagogue, with the officers of the synagogue.

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 Jews, or to enjoy the rights and privileges granted to Jews by Syriac 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 is another instance of the same process. From this it is evident that Jewish teachers of the gentle 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 refers to the proselyzing zeal of the Pharisees, and 3 times 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 phoibōmenoi tón theón, "fearing God" (10:22,35; 13:16,26), and as sebōmenoi tón theón, "reverencing God," or simply sebōmenoi (13:50; 18:14; 17:4,17,19). These (as against Berithoi and EIr) have been sympathizers with Judaism, who attended the worship of the synagogue, but were not circumcised. It was among this class that the gospel made its first impression in the world of Hellenism. These (as well as the fully circumcised) were probably the 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 the whole burden of the Mosaic and traditional Law. The rabbinic distinction between ġēr tōshābāb, "a settler," and ġēr ḍēkedēb, "a proselyte of righteousness," is, according to Schürer, only theoretical, and arose at a later date (Babba' Mardi 6 3; Naphta' 3 1, et al.).

While the ġēr ḍēkedēb (for ġēr hōlē, "proselyte of the covenant") was considered as being in every respect a "perfect Israelite," the ġēr tōshābāb (or ġēr sha'ār, "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 Noachic precepts, abstaining, ideally, from idolatry, 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 (B'rur. 47b; Y'bbam. 45b, 46a, 45b, 76a; 'Abbōh 87a, 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 (EII, 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 uncircumcised, 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 instruction in some of the "light" and "heavy" commandments, the rules concerning cleansing and tithes, and the penalties attached to the breach of the laws. 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. If 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" (Y'bbam. 22a, 47b, 49b, 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 Y'bbam. 22a; Sanh. 58a).

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 (Kidd. 4 3; Shabatāk 10 9, et al.). Rabbi Chelbo said: "Proselytes are an abomination as a scab" (Y'bbam. 47b; Kidd. 70b; cf Phil 3 5). See also STRANGER.


PAUL LEYERTOFF

PROSEUCHE, prós-ú-kē', PROSEUCHA, prós-ú-kē-á; prós-ú-ki'ka (proseukhē, proseuchē): "A place in the open air where the Jews were wont to pray, outside of those cities where they had no synagogue," Acts 16 13 16 (Thayer, Lexicon of the NT). See Phillips.

PROSTITUTION, pros-ti-tú'shun. See CHIMIES; HARLOT; PUNISHMENTS.

PROSTRATION, pros-trás-á'shun. See ATTITUDES.

PROTEVANGELIUM, pro-tē-van-ja-lē-um, OF JAMES. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, I, (2).

PROVE, próv (הִשָּׂאָה, báhān, נָגָה; סְכַּנְאָתָ, dokimāzō, πιείραζω, peirazo): 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 the Scripture. If in the OT it is the word most frequently rendered "tempt" or "try" in the NT it is rendered "prove" (sometimes "try") is dokimāzo (Lk 14 19; Rom 12 2; 2 Cor 8 5, 23; 13 5; Eph 5 10; 1 Thess 5 21). Peirazo, "to tempt," "to prove," used in both a good and a bad sense, frequently trí "tempt" (q.v.), is rendered "prove" in Jn 6 6, "This he said to prove him." Both Gr words occur frequently in Apoc (Wis and Ecclus). RV has "prove" for "tempt" (Gen 22 1); for "make" (Job 24 25; Gal 2 18) for "manifest" (Ecc 3 18); "for a witness" (Cor 11 29); for "try" (1 Cor 1 13; 1 Jn 4 1), etc.

W. J. WALKER

PROVENDER, prov'ender [I] (נְשֹׁכְפַּה, mispēb), from obs. חָסָפָה, gaphā, "to feed," fodder for cattle in general [Gen 24 35 32; 42 27; Jgs 19 19 21]; [II] חָסָפָה, brīlh, from חָסָפָה, hādl, "to mix": "Lowneth the ox over his fodder" [Jdg 6 5]; [III] חָסָפַה, bāltā hamēnic: "The young ass that till the ground shall eat savour [Heb "salted"] provender" [Isa 30 19]; this is fodder mixed with salt or aromatic herbs; the ordinary provender in Pal, besides fresh pasturage, is ṭebru, i.e. straw broken on the threshing floor, kuresneh (Vetch, Victoria erositia), given esp. to camels and mule cows; bran, for fattening and esp. in cold weather; and, occasionally, hay made from the dried mixed grass and herbs which sprang up luxuriously after the rains. The Circassian colonists E. of the Jordan are teaching their neighbors the value of this food, so long neglected.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

PROVERB, prov'erb (חָסָפַה, mispēb, חָסָפַה, mishāl; נְשֶׁפַּה, parabolē, parabol; [I] 4 23, paro'mia, paroimia; [II] 16 25 29):

I. Folk Meaning and Use
1. The Primitive Sense
2. The Religious Sense
3. The Historical Origin
4. The Analogical Origin

5. The Anecdotal Origin

6. The Allegorical Origin

7. The Apocryphal Origin
II. Literary Development of the Proverbs

A. Literary Value

2. The Differentiation

III. As Unit of a Strand of Literature

1. Provenance of Proverbs

2. The Conception of Wisdom

3. In Late Times

By this term mainly, but sometimes by the term "parable" (e.g. Nu 23 7.18; 24 3.15; Job 27 1; 29 1), is tr the Heb word mashal (משל), which designates the formal unit or vehicle of didactic discourse. The mashal was an enunciation of truth, self-evident and self-illustrative, in some pointed or concentrated form adapted to arrest attention and preserve thought, and remain fixed in memory. Its scope was broader than that of our word "proverb," taking in subject-matter as well as form. The mashal broadened indeed in the course of its history, until it became the characteristic idiom of Hebrew philosophy, as distinguished from the dialectic method of the Greeks. The Heb mind was not inductive but intuitive; it saw and asserted; and the word mashal is the generic term for the form in which its assertion was embodied.

1. The Primitive Sense

The mashal, nearly in our sense of proverb, traces back to the heart and life of the common folk; it is a native form reflecting in a peculiarly intimate way the distinctive genius of the Heb people. As to the primitive sense of the word, it is usually traced to a root meaning "likeness," or "comparison," as if the first sense of it were of the principle of analogy underlying it; but this derivation is a guess. The word is just as likely to be connected with the vb. mashal, "to rule" or "master"; so by a natural secondary meaning to denote that statement which gives the decisive or final verdict, says the master word. The idea of how the thing is said, or by what phrasing, would be a later differentiation, coming in with literary refinement.

The earliest cited proverb (Is 10 12, repeated with varied occasion, 1 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 itself. As with the prophetic "yad" became a proverb, is Saul also among the prophets? A few years later David, explaining his elegance in sparing the life of the king who has become his deadly foe, quotes from a folk fund of proverbs: 1 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; but that same thing which shineth shall mashal against thee, 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 as a taunt, or a dart, or a 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 parable [mashal, AV. "proverb"] against the king of Babylon." Answering to this prevailing animus of mashal was a growing susceptibility to their sting and rancile; 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 that. This should be the nation's fate was held as a threat over them by lawyer and prophet (Dt 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).

1. Discovery of Proverbs

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 19 24), or for temporary literary value (note 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 literary 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 time 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 about them. The king himself was "large hearted" (1 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, 1 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 classical 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 that instead of the mere assertion of the popular proverb, as it appears in 1 S 10 12; 24 13, these composers of literary proverbs borrowed the poetic parallelism, or couplet, which in two lines sets two statements over against each other: antithesis or repetition, and cultivated this to its highest and most expressive epigrammatic construction. Thus the mashal took
2. The Diff-

erentiation
to identify it with satire, and with less thought of the elements of its life and power. With the refinement of form, however, came a recognition of its awkwardness. Under the generic term mashal, certain elements were differentiated; not, however, as we are wont to distinguish—parable, fable, apologue, allegory—these remained 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 tr4 "figure" (תְּרֵ֣י, 'rē) is rather "interpretation," and seems to refer to the illuminative element of the mashal, and this was mainly analogical. Natural 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 mashālim. The word tr4 "dark sayings" (תְּרֹ֣עֲמָ֑ה, 'rō'māmāh) is the word elsewhere tr4 "riddle" (Samson's riddle, for instance, was a khdāḥ, 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 is required 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 is evident.

III. As Unit of a Strain of Literature.—Until it reached its classic perfection of phrasing, say during the time from Solomon to Hezekiah, the formal development of Detachment the proverb was concentricative; the the proverb the subject craved further elucidation, and so a group of several coupled was sometimes necessary to present a case (cf. 4:9 g. about 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. The field of this 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 (חָכְיָתַ֣ה, ḫokhnāh). Wisdom, deduced thus from a fund of maxims and analogies, became the Heb equivalent for philosophic. With the further history of it this article is not concerned, except to note that the mashal or proverb form held itself as a genre free from fixed phrase, except in the 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 Ezk 17:1-10, where the prophet is hidden to "put forth a riddle, and speak a parable (lit. mashal, a mashal) 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 which has not disappeared.

3. In Later Time of speech which was held in special esteem. From the use of practical 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 Pirkē Ḥabīlāh, which gives the impression that the utteranceParable is classically represented in the Solomonic proverbs has 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 nosis in His parables, employed that the multifaceted "may see and yet not see" (Mk 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, 1, 6.
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The Scripture book which in both the Heb and the Gr arrangement of its contents, it immediately succeeds the Ps. In the Heb Canon it stands second in the final or supplementary division called khdākhim (LXX Ἰαπουλικαὶ, Paronomatik), "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 sages on life, character, conduct; and as such embodies the distinctively educative 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 Judah." It seemed good to the compiler, however, to retain an older heading, "The Proverbs of Solomon" at ch 10, as if in some special sense the collection there beginning deserved it; and at ch 25 still another heading occurs: "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the gazeh (13) 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 book is a collection of proverbs written at different times; confessedly, also, to a considerable extent at least, the work of a number, perhaps a whole guild, of writers.

It is hazardous to argue either for or against a specific authorship; nor is it my intention to do so. The question naturally arises, however, in what sense this book, with its composite structure so outspoken, can lay claim to being the work of Solomon. The title referred to actual personal names and the names of authors is more usual in the New Testament, but the Bible is as old as its assumed name, which, however, personates Solomon. The title indicates that in the compilation of the books an unusual degree of literary finish and self-consciousness, a sense on the part of writers or compilers that the literature so far was not quite up to its claims on them. But subject-matter of the books, too, bears this out; they are, relatively speaking, the secular books of the Bible and do not assume Divine origin, do law and prophecy. For the original impulse to such literary culture the history directs us to the reign of King Solomon: see 1 K 4:29-34, where is portrayed, on the part of king and court, an intense intellectual activity for its own sake, the like of which occurs nowhere else in Scripture. The form is in any case impressed upon the literature were the mashal (Proverbs), and in the older, both mashal and the versatile young king was proficient; of 1 K 4:32. For the cultivation of this art, that of these men of verse, so long avoided them, they gave to it a literary mold and finish which would then beator lasting, or as the Solomonic mashal (see Proverbs). This then was the literary form in which from the time of Solomon onward the sages of the nation put their counsels of life, character, conduct: it became as distinctively the mold for this didactic strain in the age of Dryden and Pope.

It is reasonable therefore to understand this title of the Book of Prov as designating rather a literary species than a personal authorship; it names this anthology of Wisdom in its classically determined personal, large and spacious enough to cover the centuries of its currency. Perhaps also the proverb of this type was by the term "of Solomon" differentiated from mashals of other types, as for instance those of Balam and Job and Ruth.

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 subdivision is marked and perhaps, for some kind of development of a theme, or even as a unity; whatever unity it has was an afterthought. That is, perhaps, 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, of cm 1:1-11, is distinguished from all others by its 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 prefatory, giving the purpose and use of the whole book. Then verse 7 lays down the initial point, or spiritual bedrock of Wisdom, the fear of Jehov, a principle repeated toward the end of this introductory section (9,10), and evidently regarded as very vital to the whole Wisdom system; of Job 28:25; 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 commanding 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 sons of men, how her spirit, which, as the Heb mind came to set upon the human endowment 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 Wisd.

The section 10:1-11:16, with the repeated heading "The proverbs of Solomon," seems to have been the original nucleus of the whole collection. Like all the proverbs, it is written in the form of a thought-circuit, which, in the second line gives either some contrast to or some amplification of the first. This was doubtless the classic art norm of the Solomonic mashal.

The section seems to contain the product of that period of poetic culture during which the prophetic 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 this section is as far as possible the primary sort of compilation are represented. In chs 10-15 the prevailing couplet is ethico-literal, with an obvious 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 16-22, 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 antithetical; and these contain contrasts of a more subtle and hidden suggestion. As subject-matter, the whole section is miscellaneous; in the first half, however, where the antithetico-poetic, are the most elemental distinctions of life, wisdom and folly, righteousness and wickedness, industry and laziness, wise speech and folly, and the like. It reflects a decided tendency to go further afield for subtler and less obvious distinctions, to reflect a growing and refined literary development, the gradual shaping and accumulation of materials for a philosophy of life, so as yet, however, not articulated or reduced to unity of principle.

In the short section 22:17-24, the proverb 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. A Body of Solicited and Unsolicited Counsel 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 33 1–3), who, as they are to deal officially with men and affairs, need the presence, 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 (33 29–35), runs to 17 lines. In tone, it is decidedly a wise. They refer to wise intercourse and ordered industry.

4. Some 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 in and before it is composed.

The long section (chs 25–29) is headed, “These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out.”

5. The Hebrew Collection

The collection claims to be only a collection. If, as already suggested, we understand the term “proverbs of Solomon” as equivalent to “Solomonic proverbs,” referring rather to species than personal authorship, the compilation may have been made not merely from antiquity, but from the archives of the Wisdom guilds. If so, we have a clue to the state of the Wisdom literature in Hezekiah’s time. The collection as a whole, unlike secs. 3 and 4, returns predominantly to the classic form of the couplet, but with a less degree of compression and epigram. There is a tendency to group numbers of proverbs on like subjects; note for instance the group on the king (30 2–7). The most striking feature of the collection is the prevalence of simile and analogy, and in general the strong figurative coloring, esp. in secs. 26–27. It reads like a new species of proverb when we note that in all the earlier Solomonic sections there are only two clearly defined similes (10 26; 11 22).

In chs 26–27 are several proverbs of three, four, or five lines, and the end (27 28) is a charming little poem of ten lines on husbandry. Chs 28, 29 are entirely of couplets, and the antithetic proverb reappears in a considerable number. As to subject-matter, the thought of this section makes a rather greater demand on the reader’s culture and thinking powers, the analogies being less obvious, more subtle. It is decidedly the reflection of a more literary age than that of sec. 2.

Ch 30 is taken up with “the words of Agur the son of Jakeh,” a person otherwise unknown, who disclaims expert knowledge of Wisdom. Agur’s manner of speech is the same as that of the humanistic and the supposed findings of human wisdom, and as such supply a useful lightweight to the mounting pride of the scholar. Yet over this peculiar plea is placed the word “Massa” (נמא, ha-masâ), “burden” or “oracle,” the term used for prophetic disclosures; and the word for “said” ("the man said," ניב נב, n’um ha-gabber) is the word else-

where used for mystic or Divine utterance. This seems to mark a stage in the self-consciousness of Wisdom when it was felt that its utterances could be ranked by the side of prophecy as a revelation of truth (cf 1 7–8; 22 18), and could claim the authoritative term “oracle.” For the rest, apart from the humble reverence with which they are imbued, these words of Agur do not rise to a high level of spiritual thinking; they tend rather to the riddling element, or “dark sayings” (cf 1 6). The form of his proverbs is peculiar, verging indeed on the artificial; he deals mostly in the so-called numerical proverb (“three things ... yea, four”), a style of utterance paralleled elsewhere only in 6 16–19, but something of a favorite in the later cryptic sayings of the scribes, as may be seen in Pirke ’Abhîth.

31 1–9 (possibly the whole chapter should be included) is headed, “The words of king Lemuel; the oracle which his mother taught him.” Here occurs again the mystical word “oracle,” which would seem to be open to the same interpretation as the one given in the previous paragraph, though some would make this otherwise unknown monarch a king of a tribe other than the Judahite, 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 Acrostic of Lemuel taught her son) the last 22 verses of Woman 8 of the Book of Lam. (31 10–31) constitute a single prayer in praise of marriage, extending 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 119, 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 in 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-acceptance 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 the direct contact with the will and word of Jehovah, 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 authen-

tic 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 and not the result of logical reasoning. 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 mature things in the books of Job and Eccl. Some of its salient stages may here be traced.

We may first note it, or the literary preparation for it, in the opening part, the māshāl, or prophetic poem, having added elements of illustration, explanation, amplitude, a development that becomes more pronounced in the second section (the classic nucleus, sec. 2) at about ch. 16. The prophetic or riddling antithetical axiom is, as it were, two aspects of truth in such a way as to set the case closed; there was nothing for it but to go on with this had-had effect of setting over against each other the great elemental antitheses, righteousness and wickedness, obedience and lawlessness, teachableness and perversity, industry and laziness, prudence and presumption, reticence 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 māshāl 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, the larger signs of cause and effect. This is increased as we go on, esp. by the greater call upon the imagination in the figurative tissue of the Hezdenian section, and the decided greater tendency to the riddling and paradox element. The māshāl increases in length as the book advances, both by the growth of similar subjects and by the enlargement from the one quatrain and the developed poem. All this, while not yet in a self-conscious philosophy, is a step on the way thereto.

One solid presupposition of the sages, like an axiom, was never called into question: namely, that righteousness and wisdom are identical, that wickedness of any sort is folly, and the goodness of wisdom profit nothing; but 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 not one law on earth that supplies the third strand in the threefold cord of instruction (of Jer 18 18). From this basal presumption other principles, scarcely less axiomatic, come in view: that the fruit and spring of wise living is reverence, the fear of Jehovah; that the ensnaring frame 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 folly, 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 ideal of rewards on the one hand—wealth, honor, long life, family (of Prov 11 1)—and on the other end 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 put forth itself in men's reasoning 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 maxim or parable, gaind its possessor, whether man or woman, the natural leadership power of the local communities (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 Conception such estimate of men's intellectual powers, from the recognition of mental magnetism, from the application to the practical issues of life (of Prov 1 1-5), that the conception of Wisdom in its larger sense arose. As, however, the cultivation of such sagacity of utterance passed beyond the time of Solomon's court (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. 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 work toward a center and system of doctrine which could claim the distinction of an artificed philosophy of mankind, and which might 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 (see above), with its appendix (4; 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 tashīyāth (תֹּשִׂיָּה), a puzzle to the translators, variously rendered "sound wisdom," "effectual prudence," "wise saying;" and called by the lexicographers 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 tashīyāth. 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 prophecies that speak thus to the people 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 composed a passage (vs 23—29) in the manner to which he appeals, the inspired thesaurus of insight of Jehovah. Evidently there came a time in the culture of Wisdom when its utterances attained in men's estimate a parity with utterances direct from the unseen; perhaps this explains why Agur's and Lemuel's words could be boldly 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 30 31), is ascribed to Wisdom (bokhānah, בּוֹכָנָה, 13 7) in the introductory section; "counsel is mine," said Wisdom is made to say. (And tashīyāth, 13 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 ones, topical.

IV. Considerations of Age and Literary Kinship.—To get at the history of the Book of Prov, several inquiries must be raised. When were the proverbs composed? The book, like the Book of Ps, is confessional literature, to a more extent in the cases of accumulations, and both by style and maturing thought bearing the marks of different ages. When were the successive compilations made? And,
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finally, when did the strain of literature here represented reach that point of self-conscious unity and coördination which justified its being reckoned with as a strain by itself and choosing the comprehensive name Wisdom? What makes these inquiries hard to settle is the fact that the wisdom or proverbs and 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, with studious rank and file of the nation was nourished. There where no vision, the people let loose," says a Hezekian proverb (Prov 29:15); but so they are also when there is no abiding tone 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-direction and self-reliance, without supine dependence on ruler or public sentiment (cf Prov 25:26). When and how was this same and wholesome communal fiber developed?

When Solomon and his court made the māshâl an elegant fad, they built it better than they knew. They made of the proverb and parable, as reduced to the Kings epigrammatic mold and polish, the éclat of a popular literature. This was done only 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 unwieldily cuneiform to the use of papyrus and a more flexible alphabet, which probably was the formative step in the monarchy. At any rate, here was the medium for a practical didactic literature, applied to the matters of daily life and intercourse to which in Solomon's time the nation was enthusiastically awake. There is no valid reason for denying to Solomon, or at least to his time, the initiation of the Solomonic māshâl; and if, as has been suggested, the name "proverbs of Solomon" designates rather literary species than personal authorship, the title of (1 K 4:32-33), as well as the headings of sections (10:1; 25:1), may be given in entire good faith, whatever the specific time or personal authorship of the utterances. Nor is there anything either in recorded history or the likelihood of the case to make it probable that the activity of 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- solnic Lot" as well as the ending 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 accumula- tion and addition of the whole 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, growing like grasses in the 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 incommensurably 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 text 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 depredations of the wars.

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" (Ym 25; gam elah) in their heading imply it (see Hezekiah, The Men of).

I apprehend the order and nature of their work some- how thus: Before the form of the final acrostic (see above, II. 2), which may have come to them in two subsections (chs 10-15; 25-29), they put together as the proverbs most closely associated with Solomon, without much attempt at systematizing, subs- tantially as these had accumulated through the ages in the rough order of their developing form and thought; they recorded the search for truth, and then, perhaps, in the past, the body of educational literature which lay nearest at hand, a body adapted especially, though not exclusively, as a kind of instruction manual. This done, there next came to their knowledge a remarkable body of "words of the wise" (22:17-24; 23:12-20), which had evidently been collected in some form suitable for use as a rule for life by the "wise" or "sages" (mosekim) for some persons in responsible position, and which were prefaced 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 sec- tion naturally goes the little appendix of "sayings of the wise" (24:23-34), added perhaps at about the same time. These two sections, which seem to open the collection to matter beyond the distinctive Solomonic māshâl, are, beyond the rest of the book, in the tone of the introductory section (chs 1-9), which latter, along with the Hezekiah appendix (chs 25-29), largely forms partly as a new composition, partly as incorporating some additional findings (cf for instance the composition 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 with the initial proposition (1:1-67), and launched with such hortatory material as had already, on a smaller scale, been introduced that the "men of Hezekiah" had added. It 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 tsāhīyāh (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 (Yhwh, edhāk, 3:32). 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 early Second Kings. Lament, with the final acrostic poem, may be later additions; but their difference in tone and workmanship is just as likely to be due to the fact that they are admitted, in the liberal spirit of the compilers, from foreign stores of wisdom. For spiritual clarity and intensity they do not rise to the height of the native Heb consciousness; and they incline to an artificial structure which suggests that the writer's interest is divided between sincere tsāhīyāh and literary skill. For the rest of the matter of 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-
3. Its Stage of Progression—The strain of life, and not assuming the ordinaryWisdom reason. As such, it has a vocabulary and range of ideas of its own, which distinguishes it from other strands of literature. This is seen in those passages outside of the Book of Prov 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 (ver 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 tashqiyh' (ver 29)—teaching them thus in their own vaunted idiom. In Mic 6:9-15, similarly, calling in tashqiyh to explain the prophecy ("in voice of Jeh," הַר יָהָ¹, יָהָ¹ הָרֶפֶת הָרֶפֶת, וּתָשְׁקִי ה, 6:9), the prophet speaks of the natural disasters that men ought to deduce 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, and both 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 Isa 28:16; 29:15); and it is noteworthy that this is the venture of Wisdom urged by the editors of Prov 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 fatuity and bound for destruction—is eternally sound; but it must make itself good in a world where so many of the enterprises of life seem to come out the other way, and where there is so little appreciation of spiritual values. Nor is the time of testing and rigid testing long in coming. Two psalms of this period (as I apprehend) (Ps 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 مَعْذَب style of utterance (Ps 49:5.4), 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 Socratic refutation; and this in the Book of Job, followed later 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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I. **Providence Defined.**—The word "provide" (from Lat. providere) means etymologically "to foresee." The corresponding Hebrew, פְּרוֹדָה, prōnāh, means "foresight." Foresight and foresight 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 foresight. As, therefore, it is characteristic of rational beings to make preparation for every event of its forestalled, 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

**LITERATURE:**

I. Providence Defined. —The word "provident" (from Lat. providere) means etymologically "to foresee." The corresponding Hebrew, פְּרוֹדָה, prōnāh, means "foresight." Foresight and foresight 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 foresight. As, therefore, it is characteristic of rational beings to make preparation for every event of its forestalled, 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

**PROVIDENCE, prov'i-dens:**

I. Providence Defined —The word "provide" (from Lat. providere) means etymologically "to foresee." The corresponding Hebrew, פְּרוֹדָה, prōnāh, means "foresight." Foresight and foresight 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 foresight. As, therefore, it is characteristic of rational beings to make preparation for every event of its forestalled, 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 commanding brightness and darkness. It penetrates and fills the whole compass of the relations of man, and makes the unseen with the visible creation, and the visible creation with the work of redemption, and redemption with personal salvation, and personal salvation with the life of all things. It carries our thoughts back to the supreme purpose which was in the beginning with God, and forward to the foreseen end and consummation of all things, while it includes between these the whole infinite variety of the dealings of Providence as it is set forth by Christ and the apostles.

II. Different Spheres of Providential Activity Distinguished.—The created universe may be conveniently divided, with reference to Divine providence, into three departments: first, the inanimate or physical universe, which is considered 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 wills. This wise paternal 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, rendered by the Gr. θησαυρός, and it refers, not to God, but to the treasures or riches of man, in which sense it is now seldom used. (See also Rom 13 14, where the same Gr word is tr4 "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 plan for the future. The ancient 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 an opening of the eyes of the Gentile world. 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 overriding providence of God and the 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 in the coming of the Messias 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 in the coming of the Messiah 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 in the coming of the Messiah and responsibility of man (Ant, XIII, v, 9; XVIII, i, 3; BJ, II, viii, 14). See PHARISEES.
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 greatness there is given 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, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all 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 as to God's interest 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.

(3) 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 note of God's providence as seen in the Ps 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 is not to fail in being, in the words of the poet: "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 blessings undiminished in Ps 104, 86, 112, 152. 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 connective side of 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 accomplishments 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 moral creation 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 is directed this way and that by Jeh" (16 9): "The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of Jeh" (16 33): "A man's goings are of Jeh" (20 24): "The king's heart is in the hand of Jeh as the watercourses: he turneth it whithersoever he will" (21 1): "The horse is prepared against the day of battle: but safety is of Jeh" (3 21-26; 12 2.21). The conception of providence that is presented in the Book of Eccl 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 creation's 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 presence overpower 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 3 11). 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, is the gift of God" (vs 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 Eccl 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-hewn 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 doctrine of Divine providence. The perplexities of a thoughtless 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 great inspired drama. The first of the father of all men's history and marvelous hero, Job. 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 this world. Job is a parable of God and His grace, and a parable of man's sin. 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 ATTRIBUTION). It is hard enough for the innocent to suffer. To add to their suffering by teaching them that it is all their own sinners, even though their hearts assure them 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 theology is that it is 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: "The prophets that cannot find the hand of Jehovah, who hath wrought this, in whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind?" (Job 12:10); "Who hast given him a charge over the earth? or who hast disposed the whole world? He shall break in pieces mighty men without number, and set others in their stead" (34:13-24 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: If 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 and might of Israel's God in the moral arena, and the free agents that 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 clear 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 frightful plainness and power of the ill-spoken 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 inspired 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 more 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 also the students, critics, and teachers of the moral philosophy of history for all time, seers, men of vision, who interpreted all events in the light of their bearing on this moral and providential order, in which Divine order the Israelitish nation had no small part, and over which Israel's God was sovereign, doing "according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of earth." While each prophetic message takes its coloring from the political, social and moral conditions that called it forth, and therefore differs from every other message, the prophets are all one in their insistence upon the supremacy and Divine authority of this moral order, and in their looking forward to the coming of the Messiah and the setting up of the Messianic kingdom as the providential consummation of the moral order. They all describe in varying degrees of light and shade a coming time when One born of their own oppression and down-trodden race should come in power and glory, and set up a kingdom of righteousness and love, over the earth, into which all kings and all nations shall be ultimately gathered; and of His kingdom there shall be no end. God's providential government of the nation was always and everywhere directed toward this Messianic goal. The language which an inspired writer puts into the mouth of Nebuchadnezzar, the heathen king, is an expression, not so much of the gentle conception of God and His government, as it is of the faith of a Hebrew prophet in the nearness and nearness of Divine government and the future of His people, and of His favoritism, but are inseparably connected with righteous conduct and holy character. The blessings promised are mainly spiritual, but whether spiritual or material, they are always conditioned on righteousness. The Book of Isa is esp. rich in passages that emphasize the place of moral conduct and character in God's providential government of the world, the supreme purpose and end of which are to establish a kingdom of righteousness in the earth (Isa 34:13-16; 35:1-8; 43:2; 46:4; 54:14-17). Divine providence is both personal and national, and of each it is declared in varying terms of assurance that "Jehovah will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your rearward" (Exod. 16:7). The major and minor prophets confirm and reinforce the teachings of this greatest and most truly representative of all the OT prophets.

(1) The Synoptic Gospels.—The Synoptic Gospels furnish the richest possible materials for a study of the doctrine of Divine providence. 2. Divine They recognize in the advent of Christ—Divine providence the fulfillment of a long line of Messianic prophecies and the culmination of providential purposes and prophecies that had been in the Divine mind from the beginning and awaited the fulness of time for their revelation in the Incarnation (Mt 1:22; 2:15; 3:3). In His private and personal life of service and prayer Christ is a model of filial trust in the providence of the heavenly Father (Mt 11:25; 26:39; Mk 1:35; 6:46; Lk 3:21; 11:1). His private and public utterances abound in declarations concerning God's ever-watchful and loving care for all His creatures, but above all for those creatures who bear His image: "You are the children of the King of the universe!" Wherein the King- providence 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, comes a day of final purpose and reward, 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 parables concerning the Kingdom: Mt 13:24-40; Mk 4:24-41; Lk 14:16ff; also Mt 24 and 25). The many familiar utterances of Our Lord, found in the Synoptic Gospels, contain the most essential and precious of all the NT revelations concerning the providence of the heavenly Father (Mt 6:5-18; 26:35-40; 10:29-31; Lk 21:16-18).

(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 greatest possible emphasis on the moral side of filial trust, the latter rising in many places to the point of positive assurance. The Book of Rev is a prophetical 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 New Heaven and a New Earth 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 there are in the human race, among whom are "sons 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 influenceful as the end of the age draws near. That Divine 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 is becoming Christian history. This is 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-present providence of an all-wise God. His doctrine of predestination and forordination 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 by Him 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 good of those concerned. Paul's teaching concerning Divine providence, if it concerns individuals, is contained in the Epistles 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 statement. The great theme 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 Ep. of Peter, James, and Jude, and the Ep. 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 Messiah 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 1:18-21). 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 them that do evil, And who is he that will harm 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 Ep. of Jas are always ethical: as conduct and character are the end and crown of Christian effort, so they are the end and crown in which Divine providence is wrought out by men to make them perfect (Jas 1:7; 2:5; 5:7). The apologetic value of the Ep. to the Hebrews grows out of the strong proof it presents that Christ is the fulfillment, not only of the Messianic prophecies and expectations of Israel, but of the providential purposes and plans of that God who at sundry times and in divers manners had spoken in times past unto the fathers by a long line of prophets (He 1:1-2; 11:7-40; 13:20). It would be difficult to cite a book that presents 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 Ep. 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 particulars 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 as a 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 the invisible and the invisible God 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.
The place of Christ and the Holy Spirit in providence—The doctrine of providence in the NT is connected with the person of Christ and the administration of the church same in a manner that distinguishes it from the OT presentation of the work of the Lord. One God was there revealed in the simple unity of His prayer, to be answered at it be the case as some theologians have taught, that “God the Father plans, God the Son executes, and God the Holy Ghost directs.” The evidence is that the work exclusively of Christ and the Holy Spirit: but this thought is so strong that it can not be accepted as an accurate statement of Bib. doctrine with reference to Divine providence. Christ constantly refers creating and providing to the Father. But also, “My Father worketh even until now, and I work” (John 5:19). Both the NT and OT, the work both of creation and providence. Thus Paul: “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are on 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 government 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 Christ’s mediatorial work can be realized. The saving and perfecting of men is the supreme purpose of providence, if it be viewed from the NT standpoint, which is both mediatorial and mediatorial in every way.

1. Different views of providence—The NT not only subordinates the material and temporal aspects of providence to the spiritual and eternal more does the OT, but Christ and the apostles, to an extent that finds no parallel in the OT, place the emphasis of 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 NT, the heavenly Father and His children ceaselessly work. 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 universe: (1) Theistic or Divine providence, (2) Pantheistic or general providence, (3) Atheistic, or materialism, and (4) Pantheistic or theistic Bib. view. See also God, I. 4. The named views are stated only when stated in contrast and comparison 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, 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 physical universe is “the living garment of God”—God is the soul of the world, the universe His eternal form. Man is an image of God who can express His existence in terms of self-consciousness—J. Thou. H. Providence, according to pantheism, is simply the expression to the personal self differ from materialism only in the name which it gives to the infinite substance from which all things flow. Furthermore, it is taught that God created, and that He created the world, but created things do not need His presence and the mediation of His personal power in order to exist and fulfill their functions. The material universe is placed under immutable law, while man, the rational agent, is left free as he will. God sustains, according to deism, very much the same relation to the universe that the universe has to the maker, does not intervene and correct, and wound it up, he does not interfere with it, and the longer it can run without the maker’s intervention the greater the evidences of wisdom, and skill on the part of the maker. God is an instrument through which the will of a supernatural revelation to man. The only religion that is possible to man is natural religion; he may reason from the physical universe up to the Deity, from God’s existence and its subjective influence; it helps us to answer our own problems, to explain the universe as it is. If the Divine Being is a prayer-seeking, He is at least not a prayer-answering God. The laws of Nature are a test of 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 transcendent a Being to concern Himself with the details of creation.

3. Theistic or Biblical conception of providence is not only the Creator but the Preserver of the universe, and that the direct manifestation 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 imperative, 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 expressions of the uniform, 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 real cause except that by which the Divine will or created wills? If this be true, then it is inconsistent to say that God has committed the government of the physical universe “secondary causes”—that is, to the laws of Nature—and that these laws are not in the dependent on Him for their efficiency. The omnipresent 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 the universe (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.”

4. The Divine Immanence.—This idea of God’s essential relation to the continuation of all things in existence is perhaps best expressed by the term “immanence.” Creation emphasizes God’s transcendence, while providence emphasizes His immanence. Pantheism affirms God’s immanence, but denies His transcendence. Deism affirms His transcendence, but denies His immanence. Bib. theism teaches that God is both transcendent and immanent. By the term ‘transcendence,’ when applied to God, is meant that God is not dependent on any person, separate and distinct from Nature and above Nature—“Nature” being used here in its largest signification as including all created things. By the Divine Immanence is meant that God is in Nature as well as over Nature, and that the continuance of Nature is not only and immediately dependent upon Him as the origin of Nature—but, by some, God’s preservation of
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 in which He is 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 work? In so far as this question is an inquiry into the Divine providence, verse, and what the final cause and purpose of God's Providence is—this is a question of supreme 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 objects of His care. For Him the creature is the image of the living creature, an 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 decreasing the probability 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 Notice: 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 their own, and their own happiness is not what means first, 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 as 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 God's 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 tithing, both small and great, which are designed to secure their increasing holiness and usefulness. God's general providence is and does take care of the particular—to the minute details of creaturely existence—and is always everywhere effective. 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. God has not the whole man's eyes. The following Scriptures set forth in unmistakable terms the doctrine of a special providence exercised by the heavenly Father over His children: "A man's going is established of Jeh; and he delighteth in his way" (Prov 16:9); "I will guide thee with my eye, even in the paths of the just, to keep thee in the way of thy going, even when ye walk upon every step of it" (Ps 119:19); "My son, attend to my words; incline thine ear unto my sayings. Let them not depart from thine eyes; keep them and they shall be thy life" (Prov 4:20); "For that which is meet for the soul, God shall provide; wherefore shall I fear? For he is my helper" (Ps 22:28); "Be not ye afraid of the terror of the earth, neither of the destruction of the son of man, of a son of the Highest" (Isa 41:10); "For ye are sons of the Highest, whose name is glorious in the earth; because of the multitude of his horses he hath providence for them" (Jer 51:18); "With her seed shall the king rejoice, and with the children of the valley shall she be gloriﬁed" (Mic 6:14).

The following excerpts seem to be plainly involved in any statement of the doctrine of special providence thus far given, and are a few of the passages from 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 temporary 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 good, that is spiritual, good, and not financial, or social, or intellectual, or temporal good, except a special, ultimate spiritual good. Indeed, God's special providence may take away wealth and bring poverty in its stead in order to impaire the matter of temporal good. fortress is not the world's only hopes and ambitions; may make living sickness rather than health, and even death instead of life—for sometimes a Christian is more exemplified by sickness or death than by health or continued life—and when that is the case, his suffering is to be interpreted as a special providence. Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Many of the OT 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 as not in this world, but in the kingdom to come. 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, who are of more value than many sparrows, cannot drift beyond His love and care, He is interpreting us 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 by whom to whom He thus pledges His love and care shall be persecuted and separated for His sake, and how in the end He will be put to death; and yet His promise was true. God was with them in their physical suffering, and did not leave the 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, "accidents." Such are called "casual and occasional occurrences which involve more than ordinary danger to one doing his duty;" or "special providence associates it with a happy escape from visible dangers and serious injury, as 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 encounters a contagious disease or the terrorizing pestilence that walketh in darkness. A happy escape from injury or from death is popularly designated as a "special providence," and this regardless of whether the individual thus escaping is a saint or a sinner, strongly emphasizes the fact that God's special providence is not a capricious, occasional, and irregular intervention of His love and power in behalf of His children. It involves ceaseless, yet infrequent, thought and care for those that love Him, everywhere and in every experience of life.

(3) Special providence as related to pittance and prayer.—

God's special providence is conditioned upon pittance and prayer. It does not happen that we are to receive special provisions without providing for our temporal and physical wants by the loving heavenly Father. Therefore take no thought saying, Wherewithal shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal 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.

"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 His care, and remember us, 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, and all these things shall be added unto you." As the prayer problem emphasizes the main object and provision for all our temporal and physical wants by the loving heavenly Father, so the poem has written:

(4) Special providence as related to human cooperation.—

"The work of God to be done by</p>

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, those creatures who are capable of voluntary action. The problem of divine providence presents itself as a question of the relation of God's rulings to the free wills of men. 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 doest thou?" (Dn 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 ensure 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 in the course of physical law, much more would it seem, will it involve a similar intervention with His children, so realm and 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 volitions. It is impossible without free agency. While many of man's thoughts, emotions and volitions are self-determined in their origin, being due to his indwelling Deity's divine life, soul and heart and will, yet there are also thoughts,
emotions and volitions that are Divinely produced. Even a single act of sin has its origins in rights and emotions that are produced by the Holy Ghost. Much more abundant is that which is produced through thought and feeling, and if Divinely produced thoughts and feelings, there may be, in like manner, it would seem, Divinely produced volitions. Is it Divinely produced thought and feeling with the fact of moral free agency? We think not; it is too much subversive of our system to have a man influenced by the thought and volitions of another human being. The element of necessity and compulsion would destroy all true freedom in, and moral accountability for, any prac- tices done, or that which is voluntary in virtue or vicious. But—and here is the crucial point—when a man, by an act of his own will, freely commits the ordaining of his life to God, and ascribes it as best, working in him both to will and to do, that act of self-commitment to God involves the very essence of moral freedom, and is the highest exercise of free agency. "Our wills are ours to make them Thine, the poet has truly said. In other words, the highest moral act of man's will is the surrender of itself to the Divine will, and whatever example of man's will God's part results from and follows the free act of self- surrender is entirely consistent with perfect moral freedom, even though it should involve Divinely produced volitions. Does a perplexed child cease to be free when his parents decide for him what he shall do and tell him father to decide a matter for him, and be his guide in attaining that desired end? Surely not; and this bondage with guidance and wisdom is not the effective if it should work, as far as possible, through the mind and will of the child, and thereby follow the law of nature to be entirely passive. So God works effectually through the mind and will of every soul who unreservedly commits himself to the Divine will—commits himself not simply, but continually. God cannot under the Divinely assumed law of grace work that which is not through the inner "both to will and to do," because the sinner's will is bent on evil, and hence opposed to the Divine will. God fulfill men's wills, as, God does; a man's will, and a sinner will; and if it should work and necessitate his volitions, that is true freedom. But, if it should work in and through an obedient and acquiescent will that is seeking Divine guidance, that would be an accomplishment in no way incompatible with the true moral freedom of men. Such is the influence, a Divine cause of the Divine upon the human will, in prov- ince. God's providence works effectually only through willing wills.

(2) Divine providence as related to sinful will—
But God's providence encounters as opposing as well wills. Not every unconverted man, however, need be an example of what is called "moral un- cept degrees of opposition. That God's gracious and special providence in behalf of an individual often antedates his foreseeing sin and his acceptance of Christ as a personal Saviour is manifest to every student of Christian history. Many of the best known and most famous among the "chosen vessel" ever receives for his life-work turns out to be the result of personal discipline and preparation with which he was receiving under a Father's guidance before he con- sciously consecrated himself to the Divine Master. "I knew not what I was doing," said God's Apostle, Paul, of his conversion; and on this text Horace Bushnell preached one of his sermons on Divine providence taking as his theme, "Every man's life a plan of God." If this be true of a Christian man, that even before his conversion the Holy Spirit was seeking him, and even preparing him, as far as was then possible, for fulfilling the "plan of God" in his life, it is not in all probability equally true that the Holy Spirit and the good provid- ence of God were working in behalf of other sinners who professed and believed in Christ. Such is the power of moral free agency with which God has en- debled men that the created free agent can detract the plan of Infinite Love concerning his life, and frustrate the workings of providence in his behalf (Jer 15). Voluntary wills may be due to God's providence, or even providential plans to be wrought out for him or, not de- cided upon by him, and yet God influenced. It is said of the Divine Christ that He could not do many mighty works in a certain city because of their unbelief and opposition. In other words, God's providence is conditioned and limited by a sinful free will.

That the Bible writers do not regard the existence of evil as a valid objection to Divine providence is evident to every student of the Scriptures. Indeed, it is in working good out of what the world accounts as evil that Divine providence accomplishes many of its results. "We are more than conquerors through him who loved us" (Rom 8:37), and "all things work together for good to them that love God, and are called according to his purpose" (Rom 8:28). The natural or physical evil (poverty, sickness, suffering, etc.) is one of the mightiest agencies in the hands of God for restraining and correcting moral evil and for working out moral and spiritual good to fallen and sinful man as it can. For the existence of the actual world of moral evil (sin), man, the moral free agent, is wholly responsible. God could prevent moral evil by preventing sinners from sinning by not placing them under the moral law and the curse of it. But the latter method of controlling them would virtually destroy their real and true freedom; and if this were done, then man's voluntary viciousness and vices as attributes of free beings would be thereby rendered impossible in men; for only such beings can put forth free holy volitions as can be 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 if God did not want 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 rather, the principle and secondary source 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" (John 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" (John 15:2). The saintly and eminently useful men and women of history have, as a rule, had to undergo a severe testing in life and been tried and tried, 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 befal the children of God are directly due to the sins of other men. That good men, even the very best of man, suffer many things at the hands of wicked men admits of no question; and yet 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 internal power in sin to work good to those against whom it is maliciously directed; it can only be due to God's grace after God has wrought it. The good of the innocent, "As for you," said Joseph, "ye meant evil against me; but God meant it for good" (Gen 50:20). The thing which seemed evil to the child, said Paul, "have fallen out; rather unto the progress of the gospel" (Phi 1:12). God, though foreknowing that evil that wicked men are planning to work against His children, may not prevent it; and this because He can and will overrule it for His glory and for their good, if they abide faithful. But, suppose a good man is not simply injured, but, as the result of the wickedness of the martyrs that died at the stake—does the principle still hold good? It does, we answer; the saint who dies in the discharge of duty and his sacrifice is not only assured, by all the promises of revelation, of a happy immortality in being with the good of the martyrs the seed of the church? But we need
here again to remark that it is not material and temporal sacrifices, or spiritual gifts, that God has guaranteed to His holy, loving and faithful children. If sin had an intrinsic power to work good, they would be right who maintain that "the facts" and principles are, and once may do evil when good will come of it" (Rom 3:8); and also right who maintain in God's providence, that the author of evil, seeing that evil is, on that supposition, only disguised good—propositions which are thoroughly vindicated and established by all that is good in man or God. The Scriptures, rightly interpreted, nowhere lend themselves to establish the doctrine of universalism (Rev 4:5).

7. Interpreting Providence

To what extent may we, having studied God's providential methods as revealed in the Scriptures, in Nature, in History, and in personal experience, venture to interpret providence as applicable to our own lives and the lives of others? Experience and observation will warn us both against haste and against too great confidence in our interpretations of providence. Hasty interpretations of providence in its present passing events frequently become fruitful sources of distraction for the future. Some people are much given to interpreting providence. Certain ills or fortunes come to a bad man; they are quick to assent that it is a Divine judgment sent upon him in view of his sin. Certain blessings come to a good man; they are quick to bless the heavenly sender—sent in view of his extraordinary pietie. 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 swept away by a fire; who now is the providence? The "oracles" fail to explain; and cause much perplexity in every capable soul: as, for example, when two men, a saint and a sinner, are prostrated on beds of sickness. The former, in spite of prayer and medicine, is restored to good health; the latter, worse, and much longer, dies. Who, then, the other, without prayer or prayer, is restored to health. God has not furnished us with means of applying His providence, except for ourselves; and even much of that which we sincerely believe comes to us in a graciously providential manner we can well afford to believe as a sacred secret between ourselves and our God, seeing that God has not furnished us with any means of absolutely proving that what has happened to us might not have happened, under similar circumstances, even to sinful men. Many a Christian who at first saw that his providence has happened to him—because of the property, the terrible sick of sickness, and the like things that, at first sight, 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 17).

"Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan His work in vain;
And He will make it plain."

There are, however, many evident truths "written" large on the pages of history; and the Father of Jesus Christ, who has learned the lessons of the world, and the Father of Faith, who will duly consider all the facts and lessons of life, in himself and others, in individual, and in collective life, will correctly interpret 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's right will come together for the good of the children of those who love God and who prove their love for Him by serving their fellow-men."

We conclude, then, that there is, according to the Scriptures, an ever-watching 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 all embracing providence of God, which includes within its loving care every human being except such as are cut off through their own wilful and persistent sinning. 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 the way that they are: 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 perfect kingdom of righteousness in the whole earth, that kingdom of God, to inaugurate which, in its Messianic form, Our Lord became incarnate, to consummate which, in its final and perfect form, He reigns from heaven and will continue to reign until, having put all enemies 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. TILLEY

PROVINCE, prov'ins (πρωνής, mādīnā, "jurisdiction"); ἱστορία, eparchia [EV province] [Acts 23:34; 25:11].

1. Meaning of the Term
2. Roman Provincial Administration
   1. First Period
   2. Second Period
   3. Third Period
3. Division of Provinces
4. Revenue
5. Literature

Province (provincia) did not originally denote a territorial circumscription of the Roman state, but rather what was much more.

1. Meaning more ancient than any of the core of the term contexts of the Romans outside of Italy.

In the most comprehensive official sense it signified a magistrate'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 hencetherein 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 definitive sense commences in 227 BC, when four praetors were elected for the first time, of whom two were assigned to the government of
The provinces. Three periods may be distinguished in the history of the system of provincial administration: (1) from 227 BC to Sulla, (2) from Sulla to Augustus, and (3) the Provincial Empire.

2. Roman Provincial Administration

(1) First period.—During the first period, that is, from the time of Ptolemy, that is, the government of the provinces by means of special praetors, or, in exceptional circumstances, by consuls, during their term of office. Accordingly, the number of praetors was increased from four in 227 BC to eight at the time of Sulla.

(2) Second period.—In accordance with the reforms of Sulla all the consuls and praetors remained at Rome during their year of office, and were instructed with the administration of provinces a subsequent year with the title procurator (pro consule) or procurator (pro praetore). The provinces 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 increased 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 praefecti 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 procurators generally, whether they were of consular or praetorian rank; but Africa and Asia alone were reserved for ex-consuls, the eight remaining senatorial provinces being attributed to ex-praetors. 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 3. Division districts corresponded generally with the provinces of the urban communities which had been organized on the basis of sovereignty 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) Coloniæ: Rom or Lat colonies established after the model of the Italian commonwealth.
(2) Civitates foederates: Communities whose independence had been guaranteed by a formal treaty with Rome.
(3) Civitates liberae: Those independent the Romans respected, although not bound to do so by a formal obligation.
(4) Civitates stipulatores: Communities which had surrendered to the discretion of the Romans and to which limited powers of local government were granted by the conquerors as a matter of convenience.

4. Province of Judæa

The provincial régime was re-established in 6 AD, and was broken only during the years 41–44 AD, when Herod Agrippa was granted royal authority over the land (Jos, Ant. XIX, viii, 2). The Rom administration was in the hands of the procurators (see procuratores) who resided at Caesarea (Jos, BJ, II, xxv, 6; Acts 23 23,33; 25 1) in the palace of Herod the Great (Acts 23–35). The procurators of Judæa were subject to the authority of the imperial governors of Syria, as well as by the authority of the procurator at Palæstina. By Vitellius (Jos, Ant, XVIII, iv, 2; Tac. Ann. vi, 32). The procurator was competent to exercise criminal jurisdiction over the provincials in cases involving a capital sentence (Jos, BJ, II, xvii, 1). But in such cases it was bound to be ratified by the Roman citizens 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 Jerusalem 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 $2,400,000, or £500,000; cf Jos, Ant, XIX, viii, 2).

5. Revenue It must be remembered that 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 publicans gained their living.

LITERATURE.—The reader may be directed to Marquart, Romische Staatsverwaltung, 1, 497–502, 517–57, for a general discussion of the Rom system of provincial administration, and to the same volume, pp. 495–513, for the provincial government of Pal.

GEORGE H. ALLEN

PROVOCATION, prov-ō-kā'shun, PROVOKE, prō-vōk; "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 Pel, or הים. The phrase "provokes you," "provoked," "was provoked" (Nu 14 11; Dt 31 20; "rebel against" (Ps 78 40); for "provoked." "despised" (Nu 14 23; 16 30; Isa 1 4); "provoked" (Dt 32 16; 1 Ch 21 1); "rebellious against" (Ps 78 56), were rebellious (106 33,45); for: provoking (Ps 78 17); "to rebel against"; for "provoked" (2 Cor 9 2); stirred up; "provoked within" for "stirred in" (Acts 17 10); "provoked" for "limited" (Ps 78 41); limited; "provoked" for "emboldeneth" (Job 16 3); instead of "Provok not your children to anger" (Col 3 21). "Provoke not your children.

W. L. WALKER

PRUDENCE, prō'den's, PRUDENT, prō'dent; in the OT "prudence" is the tr of מָרָד (Prov 8 12); also in Av of מָרָד, sekel (2 Ch 2 12, RV "discretion"); and "prudent" is the tr of מָרָד, drūm, "sensible" (Prov 12 16,23; 13 16, etc.; cf Gen 3 1; Job 5 12); and in other restyles of Rv of "sensible" (Prov 8, RVm "skilful"; Prov 16 21; 18 15; Isa 5 21; 10 13, ARV "understanding," etc), with other words. In the NT "prudence" occurs once as the tr of φρόνεσις, φρονήσεως (Eph 1 8); "prudent" is in AV of the tr of φρόνεσις, changed in RV to "understanding" (Eph 11 25; Acts 13 13). In 1 Cor 1 19, ARV has "the discerning," ERV retains "prudent." In its etymological sense, ERV beforehand (contraction of "providence"), "prudence"
does not occur in the NT. As forethought, foresight, prudent 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.

W. L. Walker

PRUNING-HOOK, proun'ing-hook. See Hook, (3); Vine.

PSALMS, sāms, BOOK OF (בְּשֵׁמֶשׁ), thalithim, "praises," יָדָהָן יָדָהָן, sēpher thalithim, "book of praises"; פָּסַלְמָיו, Psalmoi, פָּסַלְמִיאוֹן, Psaltrimon):

I. INTRODUCTORY TOPICS

1. Title
2. Place in the Canon
3. Numbers
4. Titles in the Hebrew Text

II. AUTHORSHIP AND AGE OF THE PSS

1. David as a Psalmist
2. Psalmsody after David

III. GROWTH OF THE PSALTER

1. Division into Five Books
2. Smaller Groups of Pss

IV. BOOKS OF THE PSALTER

V. THE SPEAKER IN THE PSS

VI. GOSPEL IN THE PSALTER

1. The Soul's Conversation with God
2. The Messiah
3. Praises from Sin
4. Wrestling with Doubts
5. Out of the Depths
6. Ethical Ideals
7. Praying against the Wicked
8. The Future Life

LITERATURE

I. Introductory Topics.—The Heb title for the Psalter is sēpher thalithim, "book of praises." When we consider the fact that more than one title has been given with the keynotes, 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 prayer—a Hallelujah to 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 Psaltrimia, whence come our Eng. titles "Psalms," and "Psalter." The Gr word psalmoi, as well as the Heb mizmor, both of which are used in the superscriptions prefixed to many of the separate pses, indicates a poem sung to the accompaniment of stringed instruments. The title mizmor is found before 57 pss. The Psalter was the hymnal of the Jewish nation. To individual pss other titles are sometimes prefixed, such as skîr, "song"; thalith, "praise"; t'hillah, "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 Ps were placed in the kethâbîm or "Writings," the third group of the Heb Scriptures. As the chief book of the kethâbîm, the Psalter appears first in the great majority of German MSS. Through the Spanish MSS place Ps after Ch, and the Talmut puts 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 among Christians than by the Jews. If Christians were permitted to retain only one book in the OT, they would almost certainly choose Ps. By 190 A.D. 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 Psalter. The Gr version has 3 more additional pses besides the 150, in which David describes his victory over Goliath; but this is expressly said to be "outside the number." The LXX, following the "Number," divided Ps into a single ps. On the other hand, they divide Ps 116 and 147 each into two poems.

Thus for the greater part of the Psalter the hebrew enumeration is one number in advance of that in the Gr and Lat Versions.

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). Ps 89, though 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 were composed of two different poems. We may cite as examples Ps 19 1-6, 7-14; 54 1-6, 7-16; 57 6-7, 11-14; 66 1-27, 28-48. It is evident that such combinations of two different poems into one may have taken place, for we have an example in Ps 48, which is composed of portions of two other pss (57 7-11; 60 5-12).

(1) Value of the superscriptions.—It is the fashion among ancient critics to waive the titles of the ps out of court as wholly worthless and misleading. This method is as though the Hebrew 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 many of the musical and liturgical titles, the best learning of Jews and Christian scholars 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 prefixed to individual pss. 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 them came from the pen of the writers of the Ps, but only from editors and compilers of exilic or post-exilic 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 even a bad copy by the time of the composition of the ps gave them an advantage over the modern scholar. If it be said by objectors that these ancient scribes formed their conclusions by the study of the life of David as portrayed in the history said to be "outside the psalms," the reply is ready that several historical notices in the titles cannot be thus explained. Who was Cush? Who was Abimelech? (Pss 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 preexilic 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, the LXX adding many to ps that were anonymous in the Heb. The view expressed nearly 50 years ago by Perowne 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 dimmer and more uncertain traditions. In short, the inscriptions of the Ps are like the subscriptions to the Epp. of the NT. They are not of any necessary authority, and their
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Psalms, Book of

value must be weighed and tested by the usual
critical processes."
Thirlle's theory.

(2)

—

J.

W. TMrtle

{The

Titles of the

Pss. 1904) advances the hypothesis that both superscriptions and subscriptions were incorporated in the
Psalter, and that in tlie process ot copying the Pss by
hand, the distinction between the superscription of a
given ps and the subscription of the one immediately
preceding it was finally lost. When at length the different pss were separated from one another, as in printed
edd, the subscriptions and superscriptions were all set
Thus it came about that the
forth as superscriptions.
musical subscription of a given ps was prefixed to the
literary superscription of the ps immediately following
The prayer of Habakkuk (Hab 3) was taken by
it.
Thirtle as a model or normal ps and in this instance the
A prayer of Habakkuk the
superscription was literary.
;

'

'

prophet upon Shigionoth," while the subscription is
musical, " For the Chief Musician, on my stringed instruments." The poem of Hezekiah in celebration of his
recovery (Isa 38 9-20) seems to support Thirtle's thesis,
the superscription stating the authorship and the occasion that gave birth to the ps, while ver 20 hints at the
musical instruments with which the ps was to be accompanied in public worship. If now the musical notes be
separated from the notes of authorship and date that
follow them, the musical notes being appended as subscriptions, while the literary notes are kept as real superscriptions, the outcome of the separation is in many instances a more intelligible nexus between title and poem.
Thus the subscript to Ps 55, "The dove of the distant
terebinths," becomes a pictorial title of vs 6-8 of the ps.
The appHcation of the rule that the expression for the
Chief Musician" is always a subscript removes the
The superscription of
difficulty in the title of Ps 88.
'

'

Ps 88, on Thirtle's hypothesis, becomes "Maschil of
Heraan the Ezrahite." Ps 87 thus has a subscript that
repeats the statement of its superscription, but with an
addition which harmonizes vdth the content of the poem.
"MahalathLeannoth," with a slight correction in vocalization, probably means " Dancings with Shoutings," and
ver 7 of Ps 87 s'peaks of both singing and dancing. The
tone of Ps 87 is exceedingly cheerful; but Ps 88 is the
saddest in the entire Psalter. The application of
Thirtle's hypothesis also leaves Ps 88 with a consistent
literary title, whereas the usual title ascribes the ps first
to the sons of Korah and then to Heman the Ezrahite.
Scholars have not
(3) Meaning of the Hebrew titles.
been able to come to agreement as to the meaning and
application of a goodly number of words and phrases
found in the titles of the Pss. We append an alphabetical list, together with hints as to the probable meaning
Ayelelh ha-Shahar (Ps 22) means "the hind of
(a)
the morning," or possibly "the help of the morning."
Many think that the words were the opening line of some
familiar song.
The common
(b) ',.1/amoi/i (Ps 46) nieans "maidens."
view is that the ps was to be sung by soprano voices.
Some speak of a female choir and compare 1 Ch 15 20:
Ps 68 11.24 f. According to Thirtle, the title is a subscript to Ps 45, which describes the marriage of a princess, a function at which it would be quite appropriate
to have a female choir.
Al-tashheth (Pss 57-59; 75) means " destroy not,
(c)
and is quite suitable as a subscript to Pss 56-58 and
74 (cf Dt 9 26). Many think this the first word of a
vintage song (cf Isa 65 8).
(d) "Ascents, Song of" (Pss 120-134): RV translates
the title to 15 pss "A Song of Ascents," where AV has "A
The most probable explanation of the
Song of Degrees.
meaning of the expression is that these 1.5 pss were sung
by bands of pilgrims on their wav to the yearly feasts in
Pss 121-23, 125, 127, 128 and 132.lerus (Ps 122 4).
34 are well suited for use on such occasions (see, how-

—

'

'

'

'

ever.

Expos

T,

XII, 62).

(e) "For the Chief Musician":
55 pss are dedicated
to the precentor or choir leader of the temple.
"To

the Chief Musician" might mean that the precentor
was the author of certain pss, or that there was a collection of hymns compiled by him for use in temple worship, or that certain pss were placed in his hands, with
suggestions as to the character of the poems and the
music which was to accompany them. It is quite likely
that there was an official collection of pss for public
worship in the custody of the choir master of the temple.
(Ps 30): The title
(/) "Dedication of the House"
probably refers to the dedication of Jeh's house: whether
the days of David, in connection with the removal
of the ark to Jerus, or In the days of Zerubbabel, or in
the time of Judas Maccabaeus, it is impossiljle to say
positively.
If Ps 30 was used on any one of these widely
separated occasions, that fact might account for the
Insertion of the caption, " a Song at the Dedication of the

m

House."
(g) "Degrees": see "Ascents'* above.
(k)

Gittitk (Pss 8,

81, 84)

is

commonly suppased to

an instrmnent invented in Gath or to a tune that
Thirtle emends slightly to
was used in the Phili city.
gittoth. "wine presses." and connects Pss 7, 80 and 83
refer to

with the Feast of Tabernacles.
This word is not strictly a
(i) HigguyCin:

title,

but

2488

occurs in connection with Selah in Ps 9 16. RV translates
the word in Ps 92 3, "a solemn sound," and in Ps 19
It is probably a musical note equiva14, "meditation."
lent to largo.
U) Y'dhuthun: In the title of Ps 39, Jeduthun might
In Pss 62
well be identical with the Chief Musician.
and 7'f RV renders "after the manner of Jeduthun."
We know from 1 Ch 16 41; 25 3 that Jeduthun (q.v.)
was a choir leader in the days of David. He perhaps
Introduced a method of conducting the service of song
which ever afterward was associated with his name.
Yonath 'elem r'hokim (Ps 56): We have already
(/t)
called attention to the fact that as a subscript to Ps 55
"the dove of the distant terebinths," or "the silent dove
of them that are afar off," would have a point of contact
with Ps 55 6-8.
(0 Mahdlath (Ps 53), Malfilath V'annoth (Ps 88):
Perhaps Thirtle's vocalization of the Heb consonants
As a subscript to
as meholoth, "dancings," is correct.
Ps 87, m'holoth may refer to David's joy at the bringing
of the ark to Zion (2 S 6 14.15).
(m) Maskil (Pss 32, 42-45, 52-55, 74, 78, 88, 89,
142): The exact meaning of this common term is not
Briggs suggests "a meditation," Thirtle and
clear.
others "a ps of instruction," Kirkpatrick "a cunning
ps."
Some of the 13 pss bearing this title are plainly
didactic, while others are scarcely to be classed as pss
of instruction.
(n) Mikhtdm (Pss 16,56-60): Following the rabbinical
guess, some translate "a golden poem."
The exact

meaning is unknown.
(o) Math lahben:
The

title is

generally supposed to

refer to a composition entitled "Death of the Son."
Possibly the melody to which this composition was sung
was the tune to which Ps 9 (or 8) was to be sung.
Thirtle translates "The Death of the Champion," and
regards it as a subscription to Ps 8, in celebration of the

victory over Goliath.
(p)

and

On''N'ghindth"

occms&t

(Pss 4, 6, 54, 55, 67, 76),

means "with stringed instruments."

N^ghlnath
a slightly defective writing for N'ghindth.
Perhaps stringed instruments alone were used with pss
having this title. According to Thirtle's hypothesis,
the title was originally a subscript to Pss 3, 5, 63, 54,
(Ps 61)

may be

60, 66, 75.
(g) N'^hUoth (Ps 5). possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is
supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments,"

possibly flutes.
(r) yjielah, though not strictly a title, may well be discussed in connection with the superscriptions. It occurs
71 t in the Pss and 3 t in Hab. It is almost certainly a
technical term whose meaning was well known to the
precentor and the choir in the temple. The
always,
Symmachus and Theodotion generally, render didpsalma, which probably denotes an instrumental interlude.
The Tg Aquila and some other ancient VSS render "forever." Jerome, following Aquila, translates it " always."
Many moderns derive §eldh from a root meaning "to
raise," and suppose it to be a sign to the musicians to
strike up with a louder accompaniment.
Possibly the
singing ceased for a moment.
A few think it is a hturgical direction to the congregation to "lift up" their
voices in benediction.
It is unwise to dogmatize as to
the meaning of this very common word. See Selah.
(s) Sh'minith
(Pss 6, 12), meaning "the eighth,"
probably denotes the male choir, as distinguished from
Alamoth, the maidens' choir. That both terms are musical notes is evident from 1 Ch 15 19-21.
(Ps 7) is probably a musical note.
(/) ShiggdySn.
Some think it denotes " a dithyrambic poem in wild
ecstatic wandering rhythms, with corresponding music."
SAosftan/iim (Pss 45, 69) means "lilies."
Shoshan_ (u)
'edhuth (Ps 80) means "lilies, a testimony."
Shushan 'edhuth (Ps 60) may be rendered "the lily of testimony." Thirtle represents these titles as subscripts to
Pss 44, 69, 68, 79, and associates them with the spring
festival, Passover.
Others regard them as indicating
the melody to which the various pss were to be sung.
(») "Song ot Loves" (Ps 45) is appropriate as a literary title to a marriage song.
(4) Testimony of the titles as to authorship.
(a) Ps 90
is ascribed to Moses,
(b) To David 73 pss are ascribed,
chiefly in Books I and II.
(c) Two are assigned to
Solomon (Pss 72, 127). (d) 12 are ascribed to Asaph
(Pss 50, 73-83).
(e)
11 are assigned to the sons of
Korah (Pss 42-49, 84, 85, 87). (/) Ps 88 is attributed
to Heman the Ezrahite.
{g) Ps 89 bears the name of
Ethan the Ezrahite. In most cases it is plain that the
editors meant to indicate the authors or writers of the
pss.
It is possible that the phrase "to David" may
sometimes have been prefixed to certain pss, merely to
indicate that they were found in a collection which contained Davidic pss.
It is also possible that the titles
"to Asaph" and "to the sons of Korah" may have
originally meant that the pss thus designated belonged
to a collection in the custody of these temple singers.
Ps 72 may also be a prayer for Solomon rather than a ps
by Solomon.
At the same time, we must acknowledge,
in the light of the titles describing the occasion of composition, that the most natural interpretation of the
various superscriptions is that they indicate the supposed authors of the various poems to which they are

LXX

'

mm
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II. The Authorship and Age of the Ps.-Ps. 90 is ascribed to Moses. It is the fashion now to deny that Moses wrote anything. A careful study of Ps. 90 has brought to light nothing inconsistent with Mosaic authorship. The dignity, majesty and pathos of the poem are worthy of the great lawgiver.

1. David as a new sense of national unity, and king, as the first of religious patriotism. (a) The political and religious reforms of Samuel created a new sense of national unity, and kingship as a symbol of religious duty. (b) Music had a large place in the life of the prophetical guilds or schools of the prophets, and was used in public religious exercises (Is. 5 1). (c) The victories of David and the internal expansion of the life of Israel would inevitably stimulate a new instinct of national unity. The negative poems of the Elizabethan age and the Victorian era in English 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. 16, 18, 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 the thought and teaching attributed to Samuel. This leaves David "a rude knave," or, as Cowper says, "a self-sufficient condottiere, chieftain, and king." It would seem more reasonable to accept as trustworthy the united tradition of Israel as to the great leaders, Moses, Samuel, and David, and not to divest Israel's history of the tiny fragments of historical material that are accepted by sceptical 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. 332).

(2) David's qualifications for composing psalms.—(a) He was a skillful 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 greater part of the poetry of the Psalms (2 S. 1 19-27) is commonly accepted; also his lament over Abner (3 31-37). 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 good judge of men 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 presses 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 mere poet and moralist, or even a shrewd politician. But the man who could compose with the power of a 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 imaginings of late chronicles. Robertson well says: "This habit of refusing to admit complexity in the capacities of Biblical characters is characteristic of the late in- saine, when history is so full of instances of the combination in one person of qualities the most diverse. We only think that David, with the partiality of one string, but we have religious leaders who have united the most diverse and opposite qualities in one person, in the manner of a developed, or the practice of any questionable policy. A critic, if he has not a single measure of large enough capacity for the historical character, would like to see himself at liberty to measure him out in two half-quotations, making one man of each; or he might apply another quotation of the Ps. (332). Among kings, Charlemagne and Constantine the Great have been likened to David; and among poets, Robert Burns. The two traits of religious enthusiasm and the best elements in the moral characters of all these gifted men. Of Constantine it has been said that he was "the doleful believer and the cruel despot, devotee and murderer, patron saint and avenging demon." David was a many-sided man, with a character often at war, so that he may be himself, a man with conflicting impulses, the flesh lusting 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, or his mighty, fervent, and dread "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 religion, an exaltation 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 Gilpin," and the "Charge of the Light Brigade" did not exhaust their genius; nor did the eulogy over Saul and Jonathan and the lament over Abner relieve David's soul of the poetry that clamped 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 gift 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 do not know precisely that such and such a psalm was composed at such and such a time and place, yet we may feel sure that here is a man who has passed through certain experiences and borne himself in such wise that we are not surprised to see that he is troubled over one thing and the other psalm. It is very doubtful whether we should be able to lay down any rules as to the psalms, and we may say that the poet being like a painter, who, having found a fit 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 incorporated with the tenor of his 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. 343).

The Bib. writers, both early and late, agree in affirming that the Spirit of Jehovah rested upon David, empowering him for service of the highest order (1 S. 18 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 ascription of psalms.—(a) In the NT David is named as the author of certain psalms. Thus Ps. 110 is ascribed to David by Jesus in His debate with the Pharisees in the Temple (Mt. 22 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...
We come next to two statements that would settle the question of David's ps. If critics would only accept them as the work 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's life and not an agreement as to the exact date of the composition of these chapters. The author of these chapters commits the same error 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 poem, he is only ascribing it to a different date, as he did to Asaph. Happily, we live in a free country, every man having a right to hold and to express 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 related the story of David in such a masterly fashion. Even if these chapters were added by a later editor as an allusion to David's efficient reason for putting this writer so late at the exit. His statements cannot be set aside as unreliable, simply because they run counter to the current theory as to the date of the Ps. 2 S 22 purports to give the words of a song which David spoke to Jeh, when he had been delivered from Saul and from all his enemies. Ps 13 is evidently a different recension of the same poem. The differences in the various edd. of "Rock of Ages." Only the most critical is called "Davidic." 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 formulation must be the worthy of the brilliant royal bard. 6. The titles of the Ps are external evidence of dating values. 7. The date and authorship of the Ps, and these ascribe 73 to David. A sweeping denial of all the forms of external evidence for Davidic authorship is impossible, by convincing arguments from internal evidence. Unverified conjectures will not answer.

(4) Internal evidence for Davidic ps.—The fact that many of the ps which ascribed to David correspond in tone and manner and in length and theme to incidents in his life, while not in itself convincing proof that David wrote them, certainly reinforces the external evidence in favor of Davidic ps. We must refer the reader to the commentaries of Delitzesch, Kirkpatrick, Perowne and others for the evidence discovered in individual ps. In many ps the evidence is strongly in favor of the superscriptions, in which David is named as the writer. See esp. Ps 15, 23, 2d, 3.

(5) Number of Davidic ps.—Opinion varies among conservative scholars all the way from 3 to 4 or 44 or 45. It has come to pass that a critic who acknowledges even 2 S 21-24 to be the work of the David's is called "Davidic." In fact, the more radical critics regard a scholar as conservative if he assigns even a small group of ps to the period before the exile. We must not allow ourselves to be misled from ascribing to David any ps that seems to us, on the basis of both internal and external evidence, not of his pen. Delitzesch and Kirkpatrick are safer guides than Chyenne and Duhm. McClaren also has made a case and symmetrical with the view which is not accepted by the critical school. W. T. Davidson (HBB, pp. 66-68) speaks out plainly and strongly for Davidic authorship of Ps 7, 11, 17, 18, 19 (three half), 24 and a few other ps or parts of ps, though he makes large concessions to the present tendency to bring down the dates of these ps to a later date. He stands firmly for a large body of prophetic ps, Ps 145 assigned to David, Ps 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 18, 19, 24, 29, 33, 101; also 60 8-11 and 68 14-19. Hitzig ascribed to David Ps 3-19, with the exception of 3, 26 and 14. It is not difficult to follow Delitzesch in attributing 4s or 45 ps to David.

(1) Ps of Asaph (73-83, also 50).—The prophetic spirit thrives in most of the ps which ascribed to Asaph. God is pictured as a righteous Judge. He is also pictured as 2. Psal- memony after the period of the exile, Israel. Ps 73 holds firm to God's righteousness, but in spite of the prosperity of the wicked. Ps 50, which is assigned by many to the time of Jehovah, because of its powerful prophetic message, may well have come from Asaph, the contemporary of David's son Nathan. Some 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 the Ps (2 Ch 35 15; Neh 7 44). inspired poets were raised up from age to age in the Asaph guild.
Psalm 42-49, 84, 85, 87. This family of singers was prominent in the temple-worship in the days of David and afterward. Some of the most beautiful poems in the Psalms are ascribed to members of this guild (see Psalms 42, 43, 44, 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 poet had an individual author, who was willing to sink his personality in the one he was composing. The privileges and blessings of social worship in the sanctuary are greatly magnified in this group of psalms.

Psalm 73—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 condition of inquiry. Delitzsch well says: "Under Solomon psalmody already began to decline; all the productions of this period bear the stamp of thoughtful contemplation rather than of direct feeling, for restless yearning for higher things had given place to sensuous enjoyment, national concentration to cosmopolitan expansion." The era of Jehoshaphat. Delitzsch and others regard the period of Jehoshaphat as one of literary prosperity. Psalm 73-76 belong to the golden age of patriotic verse. The deliverance from the great eastern invasion toward the close of Jehoshaphat's reign is the great deliverance from Sennacherib's invasion is celebrated in Psalms 46 and 48.

The period of Jeremiah. —Ehren and other scholars are inclined to attribute to Jeremiah a considerable number of psalms. Among those which have been ascribed to this prophet may be named Psalms 31, 35, 38, 40, 55, 69, 71. Those who deny the Davidic authorship of Psalms 22 also assign this great poem to Jeremiah. Whether we are able to name definitely any psalms of Jeremiah, it seems thoroughly reasonable that he should have been the author of certain of the plaintive poems in the Psalter.

During the exile.—Psalm 102 seems to have been composed during the exile. The poet pours out his complaint over the present distress, and his desire that Yahweh would have pity upon them. Psalms 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.

Post-exilic psalms. —As specimens of the joyous hymns composed after the return from exile, we may name Psalms 85 and 126. Many of the liturgical hymns in the Psalms 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 to erect forth thanksgiving and praise to Jehovah's God. Ewald taught that the latest psalms in our collection were composed at this time.

Are there Maccabean psalms? —Calvin assigned Psalms 44, 74, 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 psalms in the earlier half of the Psalter. Among moderns, Leggins puts practically the whole Psalter in the period from 170 to 150. Ewald, Hitzig, and Dillmann, of the four great names in OT criticism, oppose the view that the Psalter contains Maccabean psalms. Most recently, however, there has been an effort to complain of the Maccabean period. 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 Psalms are grouped into five books, as follows: Book I, Psalms 1-41; Book II, Psalms 42-72; Book III, Psalms 73-89; Book IV, Psalms 90-106; Book V, Psalms 107-150.

1. Division into Five Books

It is possible that this division into five books was made by the Chronicler, who compiles the history of Judah (1 Chr 16:36 with Psalms 106:48). At the end of the book there appears a parallel which is significant in the history of the Psalter. It is said in Psalms 106:20: "The singers of Asaph were 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. Psalms 71:1-20, however, seems to be the last, to which no reference is made of which is attributed to David. Psalms 71 is anonymous, and Psalms 72 might possibly be considered a prayer for Solomon. The division is further evidenced by the fact that the Second Book of Psalms 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 Psalms 73-83. With these removed, it would be possible to unite Psalms 51-70 with Book I. Then the subscript to Psalms 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 (Psalms 120-134), the Asaph group (Psalms 73-83), the sons of Korah group (Psalms 42-49, 84-87), a psalm excepted (Psalm 88), the Psalms 56-60, a group praising Jeh for his character and deeds (Psalms 93-100), to which Psalms 90-92 form a fitting introduction. Psalms 103-107 constitute another group of praise psalms, and Psalms 146-150 make a closing Hallelujah group.

The Psalter has had a long and varied history. No doubt the precursor 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 homes. 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 Mikhlihm psalms, 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 we find four well known varieties of Hebrew hexameter: yod, lamed, tet, and mem. Of these heptameters are most frequent and are called asiph, or as will be seen, verses which have the letter of the Heb alphabet occurs 8 t in succession as the initial letter of the verses in its section. As to strophical or stratum formation, there is evidence in certain psalms of such organization of the poems. The refrains with which strophes
often close form an easy guide to the strophical divisions in certain ps, as Ps 42, 43, 46, 107. Among Eng. commentators, Briggs pays most attention to strophical division, and adduces 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 Ps.—Smend, in ZATW, 1888, has endeavored to establish the thesis that the speaker in the Ps is not an individual, but a personification of the Jewish nation or church. At first he was 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 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 writers have shown that the theory is wholly untenable.

Perhaps the best monograph on the subject, for the Ger. student, is one by Emil Balla, Das Ich der Psalmen. Balla's thesis is that the "I" ps, 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 it is necessary for the realization of the plan of the whole work. Of 100 ps in which "I" occurs, Balla interprets 90 as collective. In the remaining 10 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," "my," and "me," 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; but I will set them for the counsel of God's stones." A shrewd and 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, as 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 err in the relatively small place that 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 Ps.—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.—Ich is infinitely holy (Ps 99. 3). Ps 95-100 are models of adoration and worship.

1. The Soul's

(2) Thirsting for God.—Ps 42 and Converse 43, which were originally one ps, voice with God the longing of the individual soul for God. As no other human composition has been able to express it. Ps 63 is a worthy companion ps of yearning after God.

(3) Praising God.—More than 20 ps have for their keynote praise to God. See esp. Ps 8 1:9; 57 7-11; 74 22-24; 95 1-7. The first three vs of Ps 33, 34, 40, 85 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 received a more striking expression than is found in Ps 137 5 f.

(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 104, Hymn of Creation; Ps 29, Jehovah, the God of the Heavens, etc. 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 Livingston at family worship on the morning when he left home to go out to Africa as a missionary.

(9) God our refuge.—The psalmists were fond of the figure of "taking refuge in God." Jehovah 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. Here might and external danger do not overwhelm the inspired singers, but become a theme of devout and joyful contemplation.

Our Lord Jesus found in the Ps prophetic con- 

(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 trustful 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—53 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 harp 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 contend...
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 which the Holy Spirit allocates to men when men talk of "psychological impossibilities," that may be too big a term, for of whom can we understand fully the psychological experiences of men while receiving revelations from God? The real author of the Psalms is the Spirit of God. It is this meaning that which the reverent interpreter most delights to find; and we have evidence that the OT writers did not fully comprehend their own prophecies concerning the Christ (1 Pet 1:10-12). We ought not to be surprised that the writers should fail 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 Christ. 

(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, 96-100 and 110 (with which Ps 73 may be compared) glorify the glorious missionary outreach 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 goodness and promise. We shall finally go down before a God worthy of men's reverences 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 used by the authors as voluntary or inculcations, and the grace of the Spirit made the Psalter a young tree 

3. The Problem of Sin 

Ps 3 (32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143). Besides these poems of penitence and confession, there are many passages elsewhere in the Psalter where 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 (73:3-9; 17:1-5; 18:20-24; 35:11-17; 44:17-22). The psalmists do not mean to affirm that they are sinless before God. On the contrary, that 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, are notable examples 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 the redemption from sin. The pious devotion of which the psalmist is included is a birth 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." Victory over sin is sure in the end.

The ancient Hebrew seems to have had no temptation to atheism or pantheism. The author of

4. Wrestling with the Depths 

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 the throngs of thy children, who sing the praises of thy Name, thou wilt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues." Ps 77 is a stairway out of the depths of suspense and anxiety. The experience of the author well illustrates Maclaren'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 body of flesh from which he has saved him. Ps 58 is unique, because it is sad and plaintive from beginning to end. The song 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 cry to God. The Book of Psalms was a sorial test 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 Psalms 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 Psalms acclaim 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 ethics known to man. Ps 131 makes humility a prime quality for real goodness. Ps 133 is the highest ideal of brotherly love. The social virtues had a large place in the psalmist's 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
compund of ethics in a single sentence.

(2) The ethics of speech.—Even a casual reading of the Pss must impress one with the fact that the psalmist, with keen sense of the shallowoastings of the wicked. Stirred with righteous
indignation, they call upon God to awake and con-
front the blatant foes of truth and righteousness
(see esp. Ps 12, 52 and 120).

(3) Isaiah—Davidic.—Bible readers are
familiar with the ideal of the good man in Job 29
12–16; 31:13–22. Ps 82 is a plea for justice.
Vehal judges are one day to confront the great
Judge. Men need fair play first. Perhaps there
will then be no occasion for the exercise of alms-
giving. Ps 41 is a plea for kindness. The Christian
reader is reminded of the words of Jesus, "Blessed
are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." The
Ideal Ruler is both just and beneficent (Ps 72
2,12–14).

To be a good lover one must know how to hate.
The excitement of battle throbs in many of the Pss.
The enemies of righteousness are vic-
torious and defiant. Their taunts are
an impotent boasting against the wicked.
Hate is a sin, and prayer. Jeh's honour is a
stroke to the pride. But when the Christian
reader turns the page he finds the praises
pronounced against the wicked are startling and painful. Many
are led to wonder how such imprecations ever found a
place in the Bible. The most severe curses are
found in Ps 33, 67 and 69. Mcharen's words are
well worth reading as an introduction to Ps
109: "For no private injuries, or for those only in
so far as the suffering singer is a member of the com-
munity which represents God's cause, does he ask
the descent of God's vengeance, but for the insult
and tears inflicted on righteousness. The form of
these malversations belongs to a lower stage of
revelation; the substance of them, considered as
passionate desires for the destruction of evil, burn-
ing zeal for the triumph of truth, which is God's
cause, and unquenchable faith that He is just, is a
part of Christian perfection." Two remarks may
be made, as suggestions to the student of the Psalter:
(1) We ought to study the ps of imprecation in
the light of the command. They are fiery and not
prose; and De Wett reminds us that the language of
oriental poetry is that of exaggerated passion.
Some of these imprecations pulse with the throb of
actual battle. Swords are drawn, and blood is
flowing. The champion of Jeh's people prays for
the overthrow of His foes. The enemies cursed
are men who break every moral law and defy God.
The Psalmist identifies himself with Jeh's cause.
"Do not I hate them, O Jeh, that hate thee? And
am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee?
I hate them with perfect hatred: they are
become mine enemies" (Ps 139 21f). Thus the
psalmists pray with God's glory in view. (2) We
ought to use the imprecation ps in the light of Our
Lord's teaching. We cannot pronounce curses on
our personal enemies. This heavenly artillery may
be turned upon the sinner, the brothel and the
the gambling hell, though we must not forget to pray
for the conversion of the persons who are engaged
in these lines of business.

"If a man dies, shall he live again?" What
answer do the Pss give to Job's cry for light? There
are expressions in the Psalter which seem to forbid hope of a blessed im-
mortality (Ps 6 5; 30 9; 39 13; 115 17). The psalmists
were tempted to feel that fellowship with God would cease at
death. Let this fact, however, be borne in mind,
that not one of the poets or prophets of Israel settled
down to a final denial of immortality. Some of
them had moments of joyous assurance of a blessed life of fellowship with God in the world to come.
Life everlasting in the presence of Jeh is the pros-
ppect with which the author of Ps 16 refreshes him-
self (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 inform-
ing articles on the history of the exposition of the Pss
is found in the Introd 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 exegetes, is most valuable.
Among modern commentators, Ewald and Delitzsch
are scholarly and sane. Their comm. are accessible
in Eng. tr. Hupfeld is strong in grammatical exegesis.
BHS, Beckingen (1912), and the recent Eng. and
American commentaries, the most helpful are
Perowne (1912), and M. A. Dods (1890–92), and Kirkpatrick in Cambridge, Bible (1893–95). Briggs in ICC (1906) is learned; Davison, New
Century Bible, is bright and attractive. Spurgeon,
Treasury of David, is a valuable compilation, chiefly
from the Puritans. The Chrysostom. The Book of Ps (1883)
and The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter (1891), is quite radical in his critical views. Binne, The Ps.
Their Origin, Teachings and Use (1886), is a fine intro-
duction to the Psalter. Robertson, The Poetry and Re-
ligion of the Psalms (1883), constructs an able argument
against recent radical views.

JOHN RICHARD SAMPEY

PSALMS, IMPRECATORY, im-pré-kā-tō-ri, im-
prē-kā-tō-ri. See Psalms, VI, 7.

PSALTER, sōl'ter (PSALMS), OF SOLOMON.
See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, III, 1; BETWEEN
THE TESTAMENTS, IV, 1, (1), (b).

PSALTIER, sōl'tēr. See MUSIC.

PSALTIEL, sōl'tē-el: Syr and RVm "Phaltil" of 2 Esd 5 16.

PSEUDO-MATTHEW, su-do-math'ō, GOSPEL OF.
See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, 1, (b).

PSYCHOLOGY, sī-ko'lō-ji:
1. Introduction: Scope of Biblical Psychology
2. Nature and Origin of the Soul
3. False Theories
4. Creationism and Traducianism
5. Trichotomy
6. Scriptural Terms
7. Pauline Expressions
8. Mosaic and Other Theories
9. The Fall of Man
10. Ends of the Fall
11. Death as a Problem
12. The Lightweight 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 dis-
igno. So much, therefore, is likely to be
(Schleiferbeweis) has boldly asserted that
Scope of "a system of Bib. psychology has
been got together without any justi-
Psychology function for it in Scripture." At
the outset, therefore, it must be borne in
mind that the Bible does not present us with a
systematized philosophy of man, but gives in popu-
lar form an account of human nature in all its
various relationships. A reverent study of Scrip-
ture will undoubtedly lead to the recognition of a
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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 NT, and if the NT and the "LXX" stress is there laid 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 destiny of the soul, as they are determined by the history of salvation" (Delitsch, 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 (Ps 146:4), waqyiyâth; 2. Nature of the Soul
LXX ἐνεφανείρετα, ἐνεφανερώθην; Vulg. and Origin inspiravit). The human being thus inspired by God was thereby constituted a nephes hayyâth ("living soul"), because the nishmath hayyâim ("breath of lives") had been imparted to him (Gen 2:7). Beyond this the first book of the Bible does not go. In later literature the soul is taught as equal to the breath. Thus in the Book of Job: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty gave me life" (Job 33:4). The difference in expression should be carefully noted. The "living soul" (LXX psuchê zôos) is made to depend upon, as it has its origin in, the "breath of life" (LXX pnuêmâ zôos). The nishmah ("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" (Job 32:8; 34:14), or, as it is represented in Prov 20:27, "The spirit of man [nishmath] is the lamp of Jehovah," 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)" (John 6:63), and with what Paul himself had stated elsewhere in his Epistle to the Romans (8:2): "The spirit of 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-coming life from God to man. 3. False Theories by which they declare 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 (Wis 8:19.20), "For I was a child of parts, and a good soul fell to my lot; but rather, being good, I came into a body unfallen." 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 birth)" (Bischoff, The Talm, 4). However, must be a later importation into Jewish theology through Talm and Kabbalâh. bischoff, The Talm, 4. Yet the soul is designated by the Pate to inhabit new bodies on earth—drink of the waters of Life, and live, and be filled with all remembrance of the joys of Elysium.

"The souls that transmigrate, in the flood. In Lebhe's lake they long oblivion taste. Of future life secure, forgetful of the past."

According to the Kabbalâh, souls are supposed to have an ideal as well as a real preexistence: 'ideal as emanations from the Infinite, which are the causes of the infinite real, as having been 'created' at a definite time' (cf. Eric Bischoff, De Kabbalâh).

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. Sheid, Hist of Christian Doctrine, 11, 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, and 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 ausserer Leib). Theorized orthodoxy is sometimes made to Jer 1:5, where Jehovah 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 Delitsch has termed an "ideal preexistence," i.e., a preexistence, not only of man as such, but also of the individual soul; and all of this on the ground of the 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? Passages and statements are and are not on this point. Many have supported the theory of Creationism by statements which point that in every instance where a new individual comes into being a soul is specially created by God, destinei to the new-formed body. This view of the soul has found great 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. It is a doctrine (i.e., by direct derivation, in the ordinary way of propagation). Tradition was a strong advocate of Creationism: "The soul of man, like the shoot of a tree, is drawn out (deducta) into a physical progeny from Adam, the parent stock" (Sheid, Hist of Doctrine, 11, 14). Jerome remarked that in his day it was adopted by maxima pars occidentalium ("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 body, is created in the womb (Sheid, Augustine, however, though doctrinally inclined to support the claims of Creationism, 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 it is little scriptural warrant for either theory. Birth is a mystery which necessitates investigation, 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. The Gospel of Nicodemus, the Apocalypse, the Necessity and in girls on the 80th. This indeed is the Reductio ad absurdum of Creationism. Whichever theory we accept, the difficulties are great either way. For if God creates a soul, that soul must be pure and sinless and stainless as it was in the womb. Then it is said that man is "conceived" as well as "born in sin"? If there is any sin, then, sin-stricken souls must be pure, unstained 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 and the body? Is its connection with Adam then purely one of physical or corporeal generation? Creationism cannot account for the birth of the soul as a creature, and it cannot account for the origin, nor for the hereditary taint of the soul. Hence as in a hopeless dilemma. In the one case we fail to account for the creationism; in the other, we plunge into a materialism which is equally fatal. E. Schraven (Gereformeerde Doopsgezinde Kerk, 11, 626). Perhaps the words of Petrus Lombardus, though frequently misunderstood and misapplied, throw most light on the subject of the soul. He wrote, "which is little more than "darkness visible"—creando infinitit ex creat "in creating God infuses the soul; and in infusing He creates." The problem is and remains insoluble.

Passing allusion may be made to another very curious theory, to which reference is made by Martensen (Jen. Theol. XIX, 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. Stalin, when he died in 1734, as physician to the royal family. We are here in a region where the way is barred—a' palpable closure without the light of day.

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 there is a tripartite division of the constitution of 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 Platonic philosophy the trichotomy found favor in the early church, but was discredited on account of the Apollinarian heresy. The threefold division of human nature into soma (“body”), psuché (“soul”), pneuma (or spirit) has been discredited. The Apolinaris, 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 (psuché) as the link between the two.

For the tripartite division of human nature two texts are specially brought into the discussion: viz. 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” (Davidson, OT Technology, 13). There is evidently a distinction of soul and spirit there—viz. of a soul distinct from the spirit, 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. Kuyper, Het werk v. u. Heiligen Geest, 111, 101) and this must be carefully borne in mind—that the apostle does not use them—our 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 telos, 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 He 4 12: “The word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and pierces 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 into that sword 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 lie in the unity of soul and spirit, but which have been kept in the background. “The meaning is 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:

1. The terms are used interchangeably, though they are not natural Terms synonymous. Lebádh (“heart”), “purpl” (“soul”), and “purph” (“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 36 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 (Jas 10 16), “ vexed” (Jas 16 16), “discouraged” (Nu 21 4, “weary” (Zec 11 8); but also as in “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 15 21); but we also read that His soul was “overflowed by the Holy Ghost” (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
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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 in flesh (Mt 26:34). 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, "spirit" is used (Gen 45:27; Jcs 15:19 i 8 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.

(6) From all this it would appear that philosophical distinction and scientific accuracy of expression is not met with in Scripture. Man 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 inseparably 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" (epiphanos oikia), that was prepared in the present, the abode of the occupant (skhos) (1 Cor 12:18; 2 Cor 4:7; 5:1). In the OT "we have such metaphorical expressions as 'houses 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" (Laistlaw). Hence in Scripture, soul and spirit are interchangeably used by God for human nature in general, not as though indicating separate distinct entities, but denoting a parallelism which brings out the full personality of the 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 ("Standing 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 spiriits spira, 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 [rpi, 'spiri'], they die, and return to their dust" (Ps 104:20). It is called, "God of the spirits of all flesh" (Nu 16:22 27; 16:27).

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 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 following texts. Philo exhorts the Philosophians 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" (aipneumato, Phil 2:2); he hopes to see their "good comportment" (elisapaucon, 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 therefore be that subtle distinction which men have found in the terms "spirit" and "soul," as though two separate essences were housed in one body. The spirit of God has made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life," is the key to the whole problem. The spiritus spirare—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 (pneuma, or His sheath) in the cross He Himself exclaimed: "Into thy hands I commend my spirit" (pneumo) (Lk 23:46). Spirit may therefore indicate the all-embracing power, guiding the inward and the outward life—principium illustre, eupsucho, ex qux (Gen 1:26; 2:7).

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; Sprit.

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, with the man as influenced by his own psuche. 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 psuche ('soul'), the second as a life-giving pneuma ('spirits'). Paul's word is intended, fitted to bear the peuché, while the pneumatic body is evidently the body capable of bearing 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, that organ, made ready by its own spirit 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 body which makes man, a soul or spirit, the "original unity" (Bain); or considers mind and body as equally real, and as "aspects," "appearances," "sides" of one and the same reality (scientific monism). It knows nothing of metaphysical dualism, which makes mind and soul the only reality, of which the text in 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 doctrine of Kornmann praeestablished 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 which can explain and fail.

The words of Shenton (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: "We are still very far from knowing definitely that atoms are composed entirely of electrons or that electrons are nothing else but 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 state of innocence 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 (aparadigmata of Israel). 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, where the introduction of sin (huparagia) into the world is described as the act of one man (s. Adam), and mankind being evidently working on the same line, rushing into the world of sin. The OT allusion in Hos. 6:7 can hardly be referred to Adam’s transgression; at any rate the reference is different, for the passage in which they have transgressed the covenant.”

The German and Dutch VSS give the same interpretation to the verse: “...like Adam. The LXX takes the term transgression (Makarios), but the Vulg refers the transgression to Adam (sine Adam transgressus sunt). The other allusions in the OT to this event are slight, as in Job 31:33, Eccl. 28:13, 15. In the NT, however, the references are much more frequent, esp. in the writings of John and of St. Paul. The Epistle of Jn 8:44: 1 Jn 3:8; 2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14. The strong 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 has 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 been miserable, wretched, naked, worn out, just emerged from the beastial 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. In his irresistible drive, says Professor J. A. Thomson, "as those who look back to a parliament in which man fell: we are as those who, rowing hard against an immeasurable constant grade of our own creation, do not dream it is a dream" (Bible of Nature, 226). If science definitely teaches that man has arisen by slow, insensible grades of development from the word may be said on the subject, then indeed the problem becomes utterly inexplicable. There can then be no agreement between the Bible, conception of the evolutionary theory as so presented. For primitive man’s transgression would simply be the natural expression of brute passion, to which the name of sin in the Christian sense can hardly be applied. But this "lifting" or "falling" number of evolutionists are appealing: if primitive man be not pictured as a semi-animal, subject to brutish impulse and passion, if with man’s new start was a "lift" occurred in the process of development under the guiding and directing influence of power. Almost it proves a different shape. A sinless creature, transgressing the moral law, is then not an unscientific assumption; conscience and voice Divine within the human soul is then not only possible, but actual and real, in the history of the race. 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, (essor 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 (ib. Driver, Genesis, 24)."

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 tree, thou shalt surely die." (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 mori, which according to older theologians was man’s privilege, was lost and was succeeded by a punishment of which the non posse mori was the outcome. The possibility of immortal life was followed by the impossibility of not suffering death. Not as though immortality was absolutely lost; for, with sin came decay, 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 the prison house, but only so long as a 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) main- tains on the one hand that "death is not an essential attitude of matter" (p.159), and on the other, “it is only a Problem from the point of view of utility that we understand the necessity of death” (p.23), and again death is to be looked upon as an occurrence which is advantageous to the species as one of the devices 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. 26). Death then 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 cannot safely fix the solution of 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 still leave the problem, because "by one man" will come "resurrection from the dead."—Rom. 5:12.

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 NT form is recited at the graveside of those who die in the Lord: "I will ransom them from the power of Sheol; I will redeem them from death, where are thy plaguses? O Shoel, where is thy destruction?" (Isa. 25:8). 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 the last word, the OT saint based all his hope and fellowship on God. That hope strengthened his soul when he shuddered at the distance 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. For in thy presence is fulness of joy; in thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Ps 16:11).

Whatever the ultimate verdict of science may be regarding the "utility" of death in regard to the human race, Scripture considers it absurd, unnecessary, an infraction, the result 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," 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. L. MARAIS

**PTOLEMAIS, tol-é-mi-as** (Πτολεμαῖος, Ptolemaios), but usually called Ptolemy—"the Warlike").

The name Ptolemy is rather common from the days of Alexander the Great. The 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 (Σωτήρ, Sóter, "Savior"). This called also Ptolemy Lagi, was born c. 366 BC, the son of Lagus and Arsinoê, 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 1:6 f). 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 Ccôl-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, Anti, XII, 1, 1), 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. About this time Ptolemy assumed the title of "king" following the example of the Syrian rulers. In 305-304 he defended the Rhodians against Deme- trius Polorocetes, forcing the latter to raise the siege—hence the title "Savior". In 285 BC Ptolemy having subdued the king of his youngest son Philadelphe—"the son of his favorite wife Berenice—and died in 283 BC. According to the usual interpre- tation this Philadelphus is "the king of the south" in Dn. 11:5. This Ptolemy shares with his son and successor the honor of founding the famous Alex- andrian Museum and Library.

(2) **Ptolemy II**, surnamed Philadelphus (Φίλα- δέλφος, Philadelphos, "Brother[sister?]-loving"), the youngest son of Ptolemy I; b. 309 BC in Cos; succeeded his father in 285 BC and d. 247. Like his father, he was actively engaged in two Syrian wars until peace was made about 250 BC, Berenice, the daughter of Philadel- phus, being given in mar- riage to Antiochus II. This Ptolemy planted numerous colonies in Egypt, Syria and Palestine which were several of the name of Arsinoê (his sister-wife), Philadelphia on the ruins of old Rabbah, Philotera south of the Sea of Galilee, and Ptolemais on the site of Acco. He devoted great attention to the internal administration of his kingdom, establishing the Museum and Alexandrian Library in which his father had taken much interest; in general he followed his father's example as a liberal patron of art, science and literature. According to one tradi- tion it was Philadelphia who was instrumental in beginning the LXX (see Septuagint). At any rate, he was favorably disposed toward his Jewish subjects, and in his reign Jewish wisdom and Gr. philosophy began to blend. Philadelphia is sup- posed to be "the king of the south" of Dn. 11:6, whose daughter "shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement."

(3) **Ptolemy III**, surnamed Euergetes (Εὐερ- γέτης, Euergetês, "Benefactor") of Phoenicia, son of Philad- phus, whom he succeeded in 247 BC. In 246 he was provoked to war by the number 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 Mace 11:8). Euergetes was, however, prevented from reaping the fruits of his victories by being recalled by internal troubles in Egypt. Antiochus fell with his army from the East the Egypt gods that Cambyses had carried away 300 years before, thus earning from the Egyptians the title of "Benefactor." Two traditions obtain as to his death: the more probable is that of Polybyus (II,74), according to which he died a natural death (222 BC), or, according to another (Justin xxii.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 (Φωλοπατορ, "Lover of his father"), or Tryphon (Τρύφων, Τρύφων), the eldest son of Euergetes whom he succeeded in 222 BC. Antiochus the Great of Syria declared war against Egypt about 224 BC. After consulting with Coele-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 discord 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 (Ἐπιφάνης, "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 Panaeus on the Jordan in 196 BC, and thus Pal phanised the Macedonian 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 succeed to the Macedonian dynasty. Some Romans now interfered to make Antiochus surrender his conquerors. Not daring to disobey Rome, Antiochus compromised by making peace with Ptolemy and betrothing to him his daughter Cleopatra, who was to succeed to the Macedonian dynasty (Jos, Anti XII, iv, 1; Polyb. xxviii.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 Seleucus, the successor of Antiochus, but was poisoned before his plans materialized, in 182 (151) BC (Jos, Anti XII, iv, ii). 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 (Φωλομέτορ, "Pond of his mother"), elder son of Ptolemy V whom he succeeded in 182 (151) BC. For the first 7 years of his reign his brother Cleopatra acted as queen-regent, and peace was maintained with Syria till 173 BC. Antiochus IV Epiphanes then invaded Egypt, defeated the Egyptians at Panaeus, and possessed the person of Ptolemy VI, whom he spared, hoping to employ him as a tool to gain the ascendancy 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 against again, and Philometor was expelled by the generals whom Euergetes' son, 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 Oenoparos and killed, but Ptolemy himself died in 146 BC from the effects of a fall from his horse in the battle (1 Mace 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 city of Egypt was sacked by Seleucus, andSeleucids were founded in 154 BC (Dnl 11, XIII, 1, ii, 1), 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 Aristobulus 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. xxviii.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 (Φυσκόν, "Big-paunch"), 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 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 Euergetes," 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 Ptolemies:

(1) Ptolemy Macron. See Macron.

(2) Ptolemy, son of Abubus, son-in-law of Simon the Maccabees. He treacherously assassinated Simon and two of his sons in the stronghold of Dok near Jericho, 133 BC (1 Macc 14:15).

(3) Ptolemy, the father of Lysimachus (Apoc) (Ad Est 11:1).

(4) Ptolemy, a son of Dositheus; he and his father were bearers of the "epistle of Phrauril" (Ad Est 11:1).

Literature.—J. P. Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, is the best account for Egypt of the 3rd—1st centuries BC. A long list of Ptolemies will be found, e.g., in Smith's Classical Dict. The ancient authorities are Josephus, Polybius, Justin, Pausanias, Plutarch (Cteom.), Livy, Diodorus, Jerome (Comm. to Dnl 11).
PUBLICAN, publi-kan. See Tax, Taxing.


PULSE, pul'as [pul'des], zərō'rim [Dnl 1 12 m, "herbs"], [pul'des], zərō'rim [Dnl 1 16]; cf. ־יִת, zərō'as, "sowing seed" [Lev 11 37, and ־יִת], zərō'm, "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 "parcheel" 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'ah-ment, EVERLASTING: 

I. PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS: 
1. Survival after Death: 
2. Retribution for Sin: 
3. Conscious Suffering in Future: 

II. SCRUTI NAL 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 αἰώνας, αἰών, 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 some few 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 be 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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(Hebraea); 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, the torment of the rich man. 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 2 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 upon punishment.

These things being assumed, the questions that remain are: Is the period of suffering for sin eternal, or is it terminable? May it be cut short by repentance or by annihilation? Is there any final solution of the problem through the unpunished? 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 passages of Scripture.

The doctrine of future punishment is not prominent in the OT, where rewards and punishments are chiefly connected with the present life.

1. OT and life. In a few passages (Ps 49 14.15; 73 18.19; of Isa 24 21.22; 66 24), 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, some that sleep in the dust are represented as awaking to 'shame and everlasting contempt' (the word for 'everlasting') is the usual one, 'ādām'. In the Jewish literature of the century before Christ, 'Sheol is regarded,' says Dr. Charles, 'as the place of the dead, as the judgment-seat of God's world, as the unpunished hell' (op. cit., 236; see Eschatology of the OT).

In the NT, the strongest language is used by Jesus and the apostle 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 terminal punishment, implying a process of purification, and not a mere consummation 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 seques of the aeons" and similar phrases are the practical NT equivalents for eternity, and that αἰώνιος in its application to God and to life ("eternal life") includes the idea of an unending duration (cf Jn 10 28.29 for express assertion of this). When, therefore, the term is applied in the same context to punishment, it is frequently used (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."

(2) 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 43-48; of Mt 13 48.50, variously those "unquenchable," "impossible," "death," "destruction," "second death," on which the advocates of conditional immortality build their arguments for final extinction. Such is the dictum of Jesus: 'He that obeiteth 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 unrighteous still: and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still." Finally, the notable Scripture, "the outer darkness" (Mt 8 12; 22 13): "The door was shut . . . I know you not" (Mt 25 10.12; of 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 gives in the remarkable form, "heath have neverthing, 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 GULF.

It adds to the terribleness of these sayings other things that, as Dr. Charles has been at some pains 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 Owenham, 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."

(3) The last judgment.—The NT doctrine of the last judgment is orthodox and solemn conclusion. 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 Scriptural view analogy might be urged. How constantly referred to in this life is the law illustrated of the tend.

3. Teaching 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 goodness are seen 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 threat of space 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 its effect not be to develop and fix existing character, rather than to change it. Such a view in which 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 inhere in this doctrine, with their undeniable effect of 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? Are the generations now passing through 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 bliss.

1. Universal Salvation. This tempting speculation—Salvation for all, is no more advocated by 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 Salverator 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 resist God endlessly (Maurice, Theological Essays, 470; Farrar, Evolution and Judgment, I, 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 the case remains and the passage 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 those Pref., xxv in the N. T. will not be reckoned, and will be destroyed (Mt 19:28; Acts 3:21). We read of Christ drawing all men unto Him (Jn 12:32), but we are not less clearly told that at His coming will pronounce on some a tremendous condemnation (Mt 7:23; 25:41); we read of all things being governed, or esteemed up, in Christ, of Christ subduing all things to Himself, etc.; but representative exeges like Meyer and Weiss show that it is far from Paul's view to teach an ultimate conversion or annihilation in the future kingdom of God (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 "conditional immortality" 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 overtaking the ungodly at the day of judgment, and not at some indefinite period thereafter. The theory conflicts also with the idea of a gradual development 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. The language of most Scriptural texts 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, from the difficulty of the case, refuge from the difficulties is frequently sought in the Probation hypothesis of an extended probation and work of evangelization beyond death. This theory labors under the drawback that, in marked contrast with Scripture, it throws immensely 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 also § V. X).

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 an opposite kind, as if it were not possible to the human mind to find in Scripture the doctrine of a final punishment of sin. Such a doctrine is consistent with the language of Scripture, with its undisguised 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 13:24-27). 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 eternal 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 expected to estrange him from the holy, but the hole is 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 damnation would eternally remain.

It is a sound principle that, in His dealing with the world in the coming, God's mercy will reach as far as ever it can reach. This follows

3. Range of from the whole Scriptural revelation of Divine 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 (Dt 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 goodness, which is the indwelling Spirit of our 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 revelation 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 is essential to be familiar. 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 "mercy 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 mercifully dealt with in comparison with others (Ezk 16 49; 55). There is to be for every one 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 in All" 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 subjugation 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 therein, though it can never repair that eternal loss accruing from exclusion from Christ's kingdom and glory.


JAMES ORR

PUNISHMENTS, punishment—mans. (מָוֶ, "fault," "faulty," "punishment for iniquity." "sin") (Gen 4 13, Lev 26 41; Job 19 29; Ps 149 7; Lam 4 22; Ezek 14 10 m; Am 1 3, 9; 11 13; 2 1 46, 6), פַּעַמָּה, "tribute," "fine," "punishment." (Lam 3 39, "fātāhāth, or ēfēsh, "sin" and its retribution, "penalty," "expiation." (Zec 14 19); הָסַיוֹן, "soul," "punishment," "torment." (Mt 25 46), הָסַיוֹנָה, ēpītima, alt. ēpitēma, "poll tax," hence "penalty" (2 Cor 2 6), ἡμπρία, ῥεμπρία, "vindication," hence "penalty." (He 12 29), ἱμπρία, ékphrēsia, "vindication," "retribution" (1 Pet 2 14 AV): A court could inflict for a crime against the person, a sentence of (1) death in the form of stoning, burning, beheading, or strangling, etc; (2) exile to one of the cities of refuge in case of manslaughter, where the stripes, not to exceed 40, in practice 39 or less (Dt 25 3; 2 Cor 11 24). Offences against property (theft, fraudulent conversion of deposit, embezzlement, robbery) were punished by exacting more than the value of the things taken (Lk 19 8), the excess going to the injured party, thus differing from a fine, which goes into the treasury of the community. The housebreaker was liable to be slain with impunity (Ex 22 2). A fine in the modern sense is unknown in the Scriptures, unless Lev 6 8-19 be interpreted as referring to such.

The earliest theory of punishment seems to have been that of retaliation—"blood for blood"—and to some extent this principle appears even in the Law of Moses (Lev 24 19-20; Mt 5 38). Early in the history of the Hebrew Law of the race, punishment was administered for sin and crime. Adam and Punishment Eve were driven from the Garden, and Cain, the first murderer, though not Putting and Cain, the first murderer, though not sentenced in retaliation in death, nevertheless, had a mark set on him. The words of Lamech (Gen 4 24) indicate that death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder, and the same thought apparently was in the minds of the brethren of Joseph (42 21). Judah, as head of his family, seems to have had power of life and death (38 24), and Abimelech threatens his people with the extreme punishment in case they injure or insult Isaac or his wife (26 11). Similar power is ascribed to Pharaoh (41 13).

Under the Law of Moses, the murderer was to be put to death without mercy. Even if he took refuge at the altar in a sanctuary or in an asylum city, he would not be imitated and Cain, the first murderer, though not sentenced in retaliation in death, nevertheless, had a mark set on him. The words of Lamech (Gen 4 24) indicate that death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder, and the same thought apparently was in the minds of the brethren of Joseph (42 21). Judah, as head of his family, seems to have had power of life and death (38 24), and Abimelech threatens his people with the extreme punishment in case they injure or insult Isaac or his wife (26 11). Similar power is ascribed to Pharaoh (41 13).

Under the Law of Moses, the murderer was to be put to death without mercy. Even if he took refuge at the altar in a sanctuary or in an asylum city, he would not be imitated and Cain, the first murderer, though not sentenced in retaliation in death, nevertheless, had a mark set on him. The words of Lamech (Gen 4 24) indicate that death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder, and the same thought apparently was in the minds of the brethren of Joseph (42 21). Judah, as head of his family, seems to have had power of life and death (38 24), and Abimelech threatens his people with the extreme punishment in case they injure or insult Isaac or his wife (26 11). Similar power is ascribed to Pharaoh (41 13).

Under the Law of Moses, the murderer was to be put to death without mercy. Even if he took refuge at the altar in a sanctuary or in an asylum city, he would not be imitated and Cain, the first murderer, though not sentenced in retaliation in death, nevertheless, had a mark set on him. The words of Lamech (Gen 4 24) indicate that death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder, and the same thought apparently was in the minds of the brethren of Joseph (42 21). Judah, as head of his family, seems to have had power of life and death (38 24), and Abimelech threatens his people with the extreme punishment in case they injure or insult Isaac or his wife (26 11). Similar power is ascribed to Pharaoh (41 13).
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) sedition, or being a rebel against a parent (Ex 21 15; 17); (2) blasphemy (Lev 24 14,16-23; Nu 21 10; Mt 26 65-66); (3) Sabbath-breaking (Ex 31 14; 35 2; Nu 15 32-36); (4) witchcraft and false pretension to prophecy (Ex 22 18; Lev 20 27; Dt 17 2; 19 20; 21 9); (5) adultery (Lev 20 10; Dt 22 22); (6) murder (Nu 35 15-21); (7) keeping medical intercourse with a woman, but detected afterw blaze (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) rap (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 16,19).

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: (a) offenses against parents, such as beheading a father (Nu 15 30.31); incestuous or unnatural connections (Lev 18 29-30-21); (2) breach of covenant, brought about through unchastened (Gen 17 14; Ex 4 24), neglect of Passover (Nu 19 13), Sabbath-breaking (Lev 26 1), neglect of Atonement Day (Lev 23 29), work done on the Atonement Day (Lev 23 30), children offered to Moloch (Lev 20 3), witchcraft (Lev 20 6), anointing an alien with holy oil (Ex 30 33); (3) breach of ritual, committed by eating leavened bread during Passover (Ex 12 15,19), eating fat of sacrifices (Lev 7 25), eating blood (Lev 7 27; 17 14), eating sacrifices while unclean (Lev 7 20.21; 11 3.4. 9), offering too late (Lev 19 8), making holy ointment for private use (Ex 30 33), making perfume for private use (Ex 30 38), general neglect of purification (Nu 19 13.20), bringing offering after slaying a beast for food (Lev 17 10), slaying the animal at a place other than the tabernacle (Lev 17 11,12), touching holy things illegally (Nu 4 15.18.20).

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; Lk 23 33). Stoning was inflicted in case of women, of whom there were at least two, were required to cast the first stone (Dt 13 9 f; 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 Cannaishit punishment, since it was practised by the Gibonites on the sons of Saul (2 S 21 5-9).

(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. 19 26). It is possible that it was used as a form of punishment for those who were赋 death by other means (Lev 17 27 .28), 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 Dn 3.

(4) The sword or spear as an instrument of punishment is mentioned in the law (Ex 19 13; 32 27; Nu 25 7 ff). It occurs frequently in monarchical 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 round 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 (q.v.); (2) drowning (Mt 18 Foreign 6); (3) sawing asunder or crushing Origin (2 S 12 31; Ho 11 37); (4) torturing (1 Ch 20 3; He 11 35); (5) precipitation (2 Ch 26 12; Lk 4 29); (6) suffocation (2 Macc 13 4-8). 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 Nuzi, II, 100.

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) Chastisement as withfuls or letters of 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 8 34; 2 K 25 7); also alluded to in the life of Paul (Acts 28 20; Eph 6 20; 2 Tim 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 6 17; or had been reserved for the army (Dt 2 35; 20 14; Josh 22 8); or given over to the priesthood (Josh 6 19). The term may be extended to include all things vowed or sanctified and those irrevocably devoted to consecration 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 20; 1 S 15 16-20).

(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; Nineveh and Babylon; mentioned figuratively in Mic 3 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; 2505 THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA
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Lev 24 12; Nu 15 34; 1 K 22 27; Jer 37 15-21; Lk 3 20; Acts 4 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 66-67; Lk 22 63 ff; Jn 18 22); also in the life of Paul (Acts 23 2).

(12) Mulctation (Jgs 6 7; Ezk 23 25; 2 Mac 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 mulctation (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 garments were in vogue to mark the convicts (Jer 32 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 19-22). A fine example of it is found in the law of Dt 19 10.

(17) Scorpions, chasting 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) Scourging. See separate article.

(19) Slavery. See separate article.

(20) Stocks. See Prison.

Punites, punits (ποριτες, πορινοι, probably “dark”): Descendants of Puvah, of the tribe of Issachar (Nu 26 23; cf Gen 46 15; Jgs 10 1; 1 Ch 7 1).

Punon, pūnon (πονον, πονον): A desert camp of the Israelites, the second after leaving Mt. Hor (Nu 33 42-45; Eusebius (Onom 299 85; 125 9) mentions the same place as Petra, a city rising seven days’ journey from the desert, where convicts were mining copper, called Phinon or Phainon. These are doubtless identical. See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

Pur, pūr (Est 3 7; 9 26). See Purim.

Purah, pūra (πορα, purah, “branch”): Gideon’s “servant,” lit. “young man,” i.e. armor-bearer (Jgs 7 10 f, AV “Phurah”).

Purchase, pūchās: In modern Eng., “to acquire by payment,” in Elizabethan Eng., “to acquire” by any means. In the OT, AV has used “purchase” to represent παραδοτικος, and its derivatives (vb. and noun), except in Lev 26 33, where the word is παραδοτικον, and “paradotikos,” in Acts 20 28; 1 Tim 3 13. But none of these words connotes 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 “gave” in 1 Tim 3 13. In the OT, RV 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, PURITY, pū,lī, PURITY, pū,ri,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 פור ⟨פורה⟩, fāhō; “purely,” occurs only once in AV, as the tr of וא, bōr, properly “that which cleanses” (cf Job 9 30, RVm “Heb. ‘cleanse my hands with lye’”). The same word is used in Isa 1 25, RV “thoroughly [in ‘as with lye’], AV ‘purely’] purge away thy dross”; “purerness” is the AV tr of the same word in Job 22 30, RV “cleanness.” In the NT “pure” is the tr chiefly of ευπνοον, katharōs (Mt 5 8, “Blessed are the pure in heart,” etc), but also of ἀγνοον, hagnōs (Phil 4 8; 1 Tim 5 22; Jas 3 17; 1 Jn 3 3)—always in an ethical sense. A different word (εὐκορίνης) is used in 2 Pet 3 1, RV “holy.” “Purity” more accurately “make holy,” in AV in Tim 4 12; 5 2; in RV in 2 Cor 11 3 (as the tr of τὸ ἁγιαστός).

See CLEAN; PURITY.

W. L. Walker

Purge, pūr: 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. and Gr. origins. 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) פור, fāhō, lit. “to be clean.” Used of the putting-away of idolatry from Judah by Josiah (2 Ch 34 3-8). “Purge” is used in all passages but, in Ex 23 13, ARV changes to “cleanse.” (2) ניקא, nikā, “to make a sin offering” (Ps 51 7), is changed without improvement to “purify” in AV, while “purge” is retained in ERV. (3) נפים, naphē, “to cover” or “to make atonement.” Occurs in Ps 65 8; 79 9; Ezek 43 20-26; in the two passages in Ps, RV has “forgive” (the “expire” of ἁναπνεύς) of is still better), and in Ezek the even more accurate “make atonement” (In both (4) ריקך, rīqār, “to refine” (Isa 1 25), and (5) נף, naphē, lit. “to rinse” (Isa 4 4), “purge” is well retained in RV. (6) נפק, nēfēk, “to shine.” RV retains in Ezek 20 38, but in Dtn 11 35 changes to “purify.” (7) פ:number, “to make clean.” “Purification” becomes “purify” in RV.

These usages 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 Apc and NT are καθαρισσεως, katharιsiseōs, and καθαρισμος, katharismos, and their compounds and derivatives.

2. In the NT, (a) properly translates “cleanse” (Mt 3 12; Mk 1 7; Lk 3 17; Jn 16 2; He 9 14-22; 10 2). In He 1 10 “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. ἀπο, apō, and εκ, ek, i.e. apokatharizō and ekkatharizō (Job 12 9; 1 Cor 5 7; 2 Tim 2 21), with strong signification to “cleanse out,” RV more properly retains the range of the meaning. But the change of the familiar verb in Jn, “Every branch, that beareth fruit, he purgeth” to “Every branch . . . he cleanseth” (15 2).

Purification, pūri-fi-kā-shun. See Purge; Purity; Unclean.

Purim, pūrīm (ποριμ, pūrī, “lots”); LXX Πορια, Phorourai). PUR, 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 References of the Purim story in the Bible are primarily in the book of Esther, as well as in the Apocrypha. The story is set in the context of Persian empire, with a plot against the Jews of Persia.

2. History of Purim Purim is a Jewish festival celebrated on the 14th day of Adar, commemorating the deliverance of the Jews from a planned massacre by Haman, the eunuch of the Persian emperor, Ahasuerus. The Purim story is told in the Book of Esther, a historical romance written in the Hebrew language.

3. Manner of Observance Purim is celebrated with feasting, drinking, and public readings from the Book of Esther. The feast is marked by merrymaking, and the story of Purim is read aloud at synagogues on the evening of the 14th of Adar.

4. Theories of Origin of the Name Purim Purim may be derived from the Hebrew word pur, meaning "rejoicing," but other explanations have been suggested. One theory is that Purim is a combination of the names of Mordecai and Esther.

Many attempts have been made to trace the origin of Purim in Persian or Greek folklore, but the present time without success, without approach to probability. It is the story of the triumph of truth, of the victory of good over evil, which has made Purim such an important festival in the Jewish calendar.

Edward Mack

PURITY, pûr’i-ti: 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 health are certainly high neighbors. But cleanliness and ethics do not dwell farther apart. We habitually demand cleanliness of others, but we are not always willing to practice it ourselves. The Bible teaches us that cleanliness is of great importance in the home and in society. cleanliness and health are necessary to maintain the well-being of the individual and the community. Without cleanliness, diseases can easily spread, and the health of the community can be jeopardized. But cleanliness is not merely physical, but also spiritual. The Bible teaches us that purity of heart and conscience is equally important.

The perception of this relationship is very ancient. Thorough it is Isaiah who says (59:11), "Cleanse yourselves, you priests, and put on righteousness, O inhabitants of Jerusalem! Let the people of Judah seek knowledge; let your priests seek knowledge; let your rulers know righteousness. Let them judge the fatherless and the orphan, and the right of the afflicted, and of the poor.

Edward Mack
and pots, and brason 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—physical and spiritual, 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, is the right of purity from the Bible, will not be hygiene or aesthetics, but morals. The Sex

1. The Sex

When we turn to that department of humanity which the well recognized in the religion of the Hebrews, the Bible recognizes the ideal of purity in family life as a thing of common life with each other. 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 reproductive of the shame and sin. In the Mosaic Laws the 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 integral 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. 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 educated to it. The Levitical restrictions upon incest and marriage 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 form of faith by an instance of the 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 far the Israelites were removed from the primitive life. Indulgence was 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 wiles 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 portraiture 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 poetic idealism of the Psalms and Proverbs. The Sex

2. The Prophets

The Prophets the relation of husband and wife, see bridegroom and bride, are always treated with tenderness and reverence. Here is familiar Scripture (Ps 19): "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which, as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course. That does not betray any lack of sympathy for 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 husband marry thee; and the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, and the young man over his damsel. The maiden 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. It is illustrative 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 care. The thoughts 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—

"I satoure 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 at His strictest did not set Himself against the charm of love. He said it should be eternally sincere and true in spirit. The maiden in the song goes forth in the light, in the simplicity of her heart (3 2ff). In the same simplicity, Evangelino 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 heart, which endures to the end. The exuberance of the charm, like every other spiritual quality 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 wide realm of ethical values, 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 many forms of legal proceeding, terminating the union or the exception 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, that 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 up in marriage. Even the exception confirmed his rule. If the exception is not 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 step 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 lack of moral indifference about the way in which Jesus disposed of the woman's case who was taken in adultery (Jn 8:5). He did condemn her. And she was cast out. No man, Lord. And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more. And 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 their moral condition the main issue. Her was not 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 in sin are left, to wrestle out adjustment with the Holy Spirit, who leaves no soul without conviction of sin, righteousness and judgment. The words of Jesus no more than the words of anyone else can explain all things once. They can cover a point of view, but much must always be left to the understanding that comes from known experience under the more universal law of 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 completed his repentance till he had asked the forgiveness of his mother and his elder brother? What is the subsequent psychological of a sinner as he disappears from your view? We can interpret to ourselves what we know about the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul: just as we know a material object, we can work off the spirit from where it is still under the domain of gravitation. Few who have thought on this subject have expressed the truth so well as Whittier in "Our Master's Voice": "And men took note of his gloomy air / The shame in his eye, the halt in his prayer. / The signs of a battle lost with sin / 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 to the tender rebuke, / As Peter did to the Master's look. / He measured his path with pain of prayer / For sin with God and grace 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.

6. Paul and Purity

how carefully and kindly Paul discussed all the complications in matters pertaining to sex. Then again, if Paul has exalted 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 Churches. The age of chivalry ought to have a word put to its credo. The knight took up the ideal of chastity, of reverence and purity, of the spirit of the church. Take art—compare a Venus and a Madonna. Not only spirituality, but even intellectuality was wanting from a Venus that does not inhere in flesh and sense. Of what would we or could we speak if we 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." We are aware that with an Apollo, again we have the contrast there is between a Madonna and a Venus. We have the physical and the aesthetic in an Apollo, but there is not a gleam 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 intellectual. There is no intent and purpose in him. But in the Puritan there is intent and purpose. He means much. He is still seeking, not "love" in the first place of emphasis among the nine, he has put "self-control" in the last.

C. CAVENZO

PURLOILING, pur-lO\'ning: Lit. "for far off," hence to carry away or steal; the word is the tr of προφύλαξις, προφύλαξις, "to take away for one's self," "to secret," "to steal," a word appropriate to those in a position in a master's service (Tit 2:10, "not purloining").

PUPRLE, pur'pl (πορφύρα, argamā́n; Chald. πορφύρα, argamā́n [2 Ch 2:7]; of Arab. ṣ̄ārjānu, urjuwûn, and Pers 𐭫𐭥𐭩𐭢, arghadānu; πορφύρα, porphāra, πορφύρος, porphēros [LXX and NT]):

Purple dye was manufactured by the Phoenicians from a marine mollusk, Murex trunculus. The shell was broken in order to remove the soft purplish-black thread that was removed and crushed. The crushed gland gives a purple fluid that becomes red or purplish with air. Piles 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 Dianthus.
Shells of *Murex trunculus* (the Broken Ones from a Large Shell Heap at Sidon).

(2 Ch 214; 3 14); in the palanquin of Solomon (Cant 310); and in the hangings of the palace of Ahasuerus (Est 16). The kings of Midian had purple raiment (Jgs 826); the worthy woman of Prov 3122 has clothing of fine linen and purple. Mordecai was clothed with purple by Ahasuerus.

(Est 815); Jesus by the Rom soldiers (Mt 1517.20; Jn 192.5). The rich man of Lk 1619 and the scarlet woman of Rev 1812.16 were arrayed in purple. In Cant 75 the bride has hair like purple. Purple is in the merchandise of Babylon (Rev 1812). It is surprising that Ezekiel speaks of the Tyrians as obtaining purple from the isles of Elishah (Ezk 277) and from Syria (Ezk 2716). See Colors; DyE; Dyeing.

**ALFRED ELY DAY**

PURPOSE, pûr'pûs. OF GOD (*προόρισμα, προβολής* [Rom 911; Eph 111]). The word “purpose” seems to be an equivalent of the word “decree” as used in regard 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, pûrs. See Bag.

PURSLAIN, pûrs'la'n, JUICE, jûs, jûs. See Juice.

PURTENANCE, pûr'te-nans: With the signification of “belongings,” this word occurs in AV of Ex 129 as the tr of ἡρεμία, “hereth,” “within,” “inward,” “roast, . . . with the pertenance thereof,” RV “inwards” (cf Lev 19; 33, etc).

PUT, put (אָמַס, pâl; φοῦθ, Phoûth, in Gen and Ch, variant for Gen פֹּר, Phoûth, for Ch, פּוֹש, Phoûth): 1. Renderings:

In consequence of the identification of the time, the prophets have “Libya” (Akkâr, *Libyen*), except Nah 39, where the Gr renders the word as ἰβωθ, πυφιῦ, “flight.” The Vulg has “Phut,” “Phuth,” and in the Prophets “Libyes” and “Libya”; AV “Phut.” In the “Table of Nations” Put is the third son of Ham (Gen 106), the first and second being Cush and Mischam, 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 469: “Cush and Put, that handle the shield; and the Lud, that handle and bend the bow”). See also Ezek 305, where the order in the Heb is Cush, Put and Lud. In Nah 39 Put is the number of No-amon (Thebes in Egypt), and in Ezek 2710 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 *Punt*, however, seems to be the *g* 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 Abyssinia (Somaland), and as it is described as being on both sides of the sea (the (Somali) and Red Sea), Yemen would seem to be Yemen included. In connection with this, it is worthy of note that a fragment of a Bab tablet describing Nebuchadnezzar’s campaign in Egypt in his 37th year mentions, as though in the neighborhood, the city (here, apparently, standing for the district) of *Puth-yamân*—probably not “Touân [Gr “Put”] (Lesbos, according to Winckler), but “Put of Yemen.” If this be in contrast to distinction to the district of Put (Punt) on the African mainland, the latter would be the *Pâtu* referred to in the Pers inscription of Naqsh-I-Rustem, which mentions, among the tributary countries, Kushiya, Putiya and Masiya, in Babylonia (masî, *mâsû*?), “the land Put, the land Kush (Ethiopia), the land Massû (?)”). 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 at some time from the original district. See W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, Leipzig, 1898, 106 ff.

T. G. Pinches

PUTEOLI, pû-tê'ô-lî (Πυτσελά, Putoleioi, “sulphur springs” [Acts 2313, WH], the modern Pozzuoli): A maritime city of Campania, which occupied a central position on the northern shore of a recess in the Gulf of Naples, protected on 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 (Liv xxix.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 (Liv xxix.45; Strabo v.245; Velleius, i.15). Its subsequent remarkable prosperity and commercial activity are to be attributed to the safety of the harbor and the hospitable 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; Suetonius Aug. 98; Strabo xxii. 793; Cicerio Pro Coelio 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 Rom 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 after- ward selected as the place of burial of Hadrian (Spartianus 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 1423 Eng., miles (Nissen, Italiche Landeskunde, II, 739). Later, Domitian reduced the distance to 139 Rom miles (about 129 Eng.) by laying out the Via Domitia along the coast, joining the Via Appia at Sinuessa. (Geog. Rome, IV, 32; Itin. Ant., 122; Tab. Peut.).

George H. Allen

PUTHITES, πο̂θίτες [πο̂θι, πο̂θι, “simple”; AV Puhtítos): One of the families of Kiriath-jearim, grandchildren of Caleb (1 Ch 2 50.53).

PUTIEL, που̂ς [πονμ, πο̂νμ, “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, πο̂υα. See PUVAH.

PYGARG, πυγαργ [πυγαργ, dishon; LXX πυγαργος, πυγαργος; of proper nouns, “Dishon” and “Dishan” (Gen 36 21-30; 1 Ch 1 38-42); accordinging to BDB, Hommel, Sanguithiere, derives דְּשָּׁן from דָּשׁ, Arab. دَشَ, “to tread,” and of Assy. dashku, “mountain-goat”): Dishon 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 pygargos (from πυγαργ, ῥυγ, “rump,” and ἄργος, ἄργος, “white”) was used by Herodotus (iv.192) 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 Cervus pygargus, the Tartarian roe, and Bubalus pygargus, a small South African antelope. The Arabic Bible has rtlâm, “a white gazelle,” a kindred word to rtlâm, AV “unicorn,” RV “wild-ox.” Tristram, NHB, considers dishon 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 Zoology.

Alfred Ely Day

PYRAMIDS, πυραμίδοι (πυράμις, πυραμῖς): Pyramids are mentioned in connection with the splendid monument reared by Simon Maccabeus in memory of his parents and brethren at Modin (1 Mace 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, πυρρός (Πυρρός, Πύρρος, “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, πυθωνόν: Occurs only in Acts 16 16, where RV reads, “a certain maid having a spirit of divination [in “a spirit, a Python”], met us” W meet, Πυθων, or Πυθόν, Πυθόδ, is the oldest name of Delphi (or the country about Delphi), in which was situated the famous Delphic Oracle. Consequently “Pythian 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 Pythian 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 DIVINATION.

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 Jehovah, 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 that day, and all the night, and all the next day, and gathered the quails: he that gathered least gathered ten 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 at the sand of the seas: And he let it fall in the midst of their camp, Round about their habitations. 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争论 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 sand to dry, just as Herodotus (i.77) records that Hecate 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 Straton-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 (μαρτυρεῖν, "complaint"; so RV). (2) In 2 K 5:7 (יָרְדָּה, "be opportune," RV "an occasion"). (3) In AV Lev 26:25 (loose tr of אָרַק, "naturalize," "vengence"; so RV). Cf Sir 31:29 AV (RV "conflict") and Prov 20:3 RV (AV "meddling").

Quarries, kwor'iz (ἐργαστήρια, ἔργαστήριον [Jgs 3 19:26, "graven images"], ἐργατήριον [Josh 7 5, "Shebarim," RV "the quarries"]: ἐργαστήριον is elsewhere tr "graven images" (Dt 7:5; Ps 78:65; Isa 10:10; Mic 5:13, etc) and is a pl. form of ψάλλω "graven image" (Ex 20:5, etc.) from ψάλω, "to carve." It occurs in the story of Enub and Egeus and refers to images or hewn stones in the vicinity of Gilgal. Shebharim is pl. of shebher, "breach," "fracture," "more often "destruction" (e.g. Prov 16:18), from shbher, "to break." The form shbharim is also found in Job 41:25, "consternation." 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 large blocks he skillfully 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 Aşûn 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, kwâr'tér:** Lit., of course, “the fourth part,” and so of the four “ends” (איה, kâgôd) in Jer 49 36, and AV of the four “corners” (so RV, ונוד, gônta) 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 quater-

**QUEEN, kwên:** The Bible applies this term: (1) To the wife of a king (“queen consort”) (מלכה, malkâh). In the Book of Est it is the title given to Vashti (1 9) and Esther (2 22); cf Cant 6 8 f. Another Heb word for queen consort is ונוכי, ḡîrîdâh, lit. “mistress” (cf 1 K 11 19, the wife of Pârâoh; 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 פִּנָּה, pînâh, 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, kwä'tus (Koásaro, Koâriano):** A Christian in Corinth who with “Erastus 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, kwä-tré'në-un (τετράδιον, 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 Rom 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 סְבָל, šēḇal, which some trace back to סְבָל, šēḇal, “to ravish,” a rather doubtful derivation. Still another term is רַגְלָה, raḡlâh, lit. “princess” (Isa 49 25). The LXX sometimes uses the word βασιλεία, basilēia; cf Ps 45 9. (2) To a female ruler or sovereign (“queen regnant”). The only instances are those of the queen (malḵâh) of Sheba (1 K 10 1–13; of 2 Ch 9 1–12) and of Candace, the queen (bâstîlîssa) of the Ethiopians (Acts 8 27). In Mt 12 42 (cf Lk 11 31) Christ refers to the queen of the south (בַּאֲרֹב נָּבְרָא, bastîlîssâ tôhô, “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.

**QUEEN MOTHER (מלכה, ḡîrîdâh, lit. “mistress,” then a female ruler, and sometimes simply **WILLIAM Baur**
the wife of a king ("queen," 1 K 11:19); in Doh 5:10 the term נַפְתָּה, malketha, "queen," really means the mother of the king: It stands to reason that among a people whose rulers are polygamists the mother of the king or chief prince becomes a person of great consequence. The records of the Books of K prove it. The גִּבְהִירָה, or queen mother, occupied a position of high social and political importance; she took rank almost with the king. When Bath-sheba, the mother of Solomon, desired "to speak unto him for Adonijah," 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 גִּבְהִירָה (29:2). The king was Jehoichin (Jecoeniah, Jer 29:2), and his mother's name was Nebushta (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, the mother of the king) as told in 1 K 15:2 (cf 2 Ch 10:16). She had used her powerful influence to further the cause of idolatry. In this connection Athaliah's coup d'etat 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 גִּבְהִירָה 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 Ammonites, the mother of Rehoboam (1 K 14:21); of ver 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 15:16). Azubah, the daughter of Shilbi, 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 Beroea, the mother of Jehoash (2 K 12:1); Jerobaal (2 Ch 21:1); Jehokadin (Jehoshaddan, 2 Ch 25:1) of Jerus, the mother of Amaziah (1 K 14:22; Jecochiah (Jechiah, 2 Ch 26:3) of Jerus, the mother of Azariah (2 K 15:2) or Uzziah (2 K 15:13, etc; cf 2 Ch 26:3); Jerushe (Jerushah, 2 Ch 27:1), the daughter of Zedok, 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 Jotham, the son of Amon (2 K 21:19); Zedekiah, the daughter of Asaiah 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); Zebiah, the daughter of Pedaiah of Ruma, the mother of Jehoahaz (2 K 23:36); Nehushta, the daughter of Elhanan of Jerus, the mother of Jehochina (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.

WILLIAM BAY

QUEEN OF HEAVEN (מַעֲלָה, נַפְתָּה, m'lecheth ha-shamayim, although there is another reading, מַעֲלָה, m'lecheth, "worship" or "godness"): Occurs only in two passages: Jer 7:18; 44:17–19:23, where the prophet denounces the wrath of God upon the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem 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 23:15, when men 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, which was practised by the inhabitants 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 heavenly bodies (Jeremiah, The OT in the Light of the Ancient 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 ab 2 supra; Ezek 8:10). In that worship, the queen of heaven was a prominent person.

The queen of this Ishhtar cult had a great antiquity and widely spread in ancient Babylonia may be seen from the symbols of it found in recent excavations (see Ninurta, II, 236). How far the astral theorists like Winckler and Jeremias are entitled to link up with this worship the mourning for Josiah, the denunciations 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 Jehovah is made clear by the denunciation of the worship of the queen of heaven by Jeremiah.

T. NICOL

QUEEN OF SHEBA, šē'bā (1 K 10:1–13; 2 Ch 9:1–12, called in Mt 12:42; Lk 11:31, "the queen of the south" בֵּאָשֶׁר, ְשֵׁבַת נַוּד) The two OT accounts of the coming of the queen of Sheba (see Sheba) to Solomon differ slightly from one another, and of the two, that in 1 K is the older. (1) The words concerning the Accounts names of Jeh in AK 10:1 are wanting in 2 Ch; while LXX in 1 K has "and the name of Jeh," apparently a corruption of the MT. (2) For 1 K 10:9, "because Jeh loved Israel for ever," 2 Ch 9:8 has "because the 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, with 1 K 10:10, 2 Ch 9:12 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 she brought to him, according to the king's desire, whatever pleased the king." The phrase "besides gifts commensurate with his own wealth and power (sBOT), or besides gifts which he gave her queen" is not in the RSV. 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 The Narrative presents to the king, and interviewed him: "And when the queen of Sheba had seen all the wisdom of Solomon which 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 RVm in 1 K 19 5, and also in 2 Ch 9 4); there was no more spirit upon the Spirit, etc., 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 refuses to accede to 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 wisdom of Jesus, a wisdom far greater than that of Solomon (see of D. M. Wise's, Days of His Flesh, 176 ff).

Eastern lit. has much to say about the queen of Sheba. The Arabs called her Bilak, Abyssinian legend declares that she came from Ethiopia, her name being Maqeda, and that she had a son by Solomon. See Delitzsch, Isa., 116-27; ZD. M. G., 19 ff.; J Fr T., VI, 523 ff. (1880). Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1905, 413 ff.; Bezaud, Kebran Nagast, 1906, and Memmius, Qrius, 60, 666 ff. For the Mahometan story, see Koran xxvii., with notes in Sale's tr.

QUICKSANDS, kwik'sands. See STYX.

QUIET, kwit't. Vb. or adj. only in EV, "quietness" being used for the noun. No special Heb or Gr words are represented, but in the OT usually for some form or derivative of καί, σκότος, "be undisturbed," (Jgs 18 17; cf. Prov 1 33, "φοβερόν, "to be quiet," Isa 17 17, "σκότων, "quiet," "be set on"). For "them that are quiet in the land" in Ps 35 20, see MEK; POON. For "quiet prince" in Jer 51 59, RV substitutes "chief chamberlain," in "quartermaster." "Jacob was a quiet [Σκότι, τόμ, 'gentle'] man" (Gen 26 27, AV "plain"). In the NT, it is the tr of AV, hēsuschazō, "to refrain from gossip or meddlesomeness;" "that ye study to be quiet" (1 Thess 4 11), and of φυσίας, hēsychios, "gentle": "a meek and quiet spirit" (1 Pet 3 4; cf. 1 Tim 2 2).

QUINTUS MEMMII, kwim'i-tus mem'i-us. See Memmius, Quintus.

QUIRINUS, kwir-in'i-us. See CHRONOLOGY OF THE NT, 1, 1, (2); LUKE, GOSPEL OF, 5.

QUIT, kwit: Same derivation as "quiet," so that "to be quit" (Ex 21 19-28; Josh 2 20 AV) is "to be relieved of responsibility," τί θέλεις, "wishes," πράσινον, "guiltless" (so RV Josh 2 20). Hence to quit one's self means "to be freed by discharging a duty." The phrase in EV, however, is a gloss, for in 1 S 4 9 it is used for γῆς, hāyāh, "to be," while in 1 Cor 16 13 ἀφίκομαι, andròcomai, means "to behave like a man."

QUIVER, kwiv'är (περσόν, 'asphah, 'ūts; φαρέσα, pharēsā) [Sir 26 12]: A case or sheath for carrying arrows, a part of the ordinary equipment of the warrior, both foot-soldier and charioteer (Job 39 23; Isa 22 6), and also of the huntsman (Gen 27 3). Figuratively of any one in passage, whether child (Ps 127 5) or prophets of Jeh (lsa 49 2) are spoken of as arrows. Arrows are called brūd 'asphah, "sons of the quiver" (Lam 3 13). By identifying the arrows with the arrows they produce, the quiver is likened to an open sepulcher (Jer 5 16).

QUOTATIONS, kwō-tā'šunz, NEW TESTA-

MENT: 1. INTRODUCTORY.

Limitation of the Discussion.
II. CONSTRUCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF NT QUOTATION

1. Unity of the Two Dispensations
2. Biblical Movement Planned to the Beginning
3. The OT Accepted as Authoritative
4. Issues involved in Foregoing Principles of Reference

III. TYPICAL INSTANCES OF NT QUOTATION

1. Unity of the Two Dispensations
2. Biblical Movement Planned to the Beginning
3. The OT Accepted as Authoritative
4. Argumentative Quotations
5. Catena of Passages, Illustrating Principles of Quotation

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.—There are, all told, approximately 300 direct quotations from the OT in the NT. The presence of so many citations, each one of which involves an interpretation of the passage given a new context in quotation, opens many avenues of discussion and propounds many difficult and far-reaching problems. In every separate instance, in the long list of NT quotations, the principle of accommodation (see ACCOMMODATION) in some form is involved, and, consequently, the question of historical and exegetical accuracy is unavoidably raised. In the process of shaping and shifting the original meaning that which is of far greater importance than the question whether the writer is incidentally correct, according to modern scientific principles, in any specific citation. This more important and vital issue is that the general principles adopted by the NT writers in their use of the book of the older covenant. A review of these principles, together with certain outstanding and typical instances in which these principles are used as applied, will form the substance of the discussion.

II. CONSTRUCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF NT QUOTATION.

In the first place, the NT writers regard the Christian religion as having its roots in the OT. From the call of Abraham to the founding and expansion of the Christian church the men of the NT recognize a single organic movement. In their use of the ancient oracles in new setting they constantly and confidently rely upon the unity of the two dispensations, that recordation in the OT and that in which they themselves were participants. Such a unity, taking for granted its existence, would remove to a degree the very distance, the temporal gulf, between the text and the text, and would involve a definite and organic relationship of all the books to each other. There are no longer two separate groups of books standing apart from each other and having bonds of union only within the group, but, on the contrary, two related sub-groups outwardly corresponding to contrasted phases of the historical movement, but inwardly conforming to the deep-lying principles which make the entire movement one. According to this idea the Book of Gen is as really related to the Gospel of Mt as it is to the Book of Ex. On the surface, and historically speaking, the Book of Gen leads immediately to the Book of Ex, which is its companion volume and complement, but go more deeply into Gen and just as really and just as directly if leads to Mt, which is also its fellow and complement. And so throughout. The unifying medium is, of course, the history which is one in that it involves the same organic principles applied to successive areas of human experience. The books of the Bible, therefore, form a group of books on a common subject, phases of each other, contrasted and yet intimately cognate. In quoting from the OT the NT writers were simply obeying an impulse common to all thoughtful writers and accountants for quotations, seeking for diversified expression of the same truths.

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 not merely a line of planned the beginning and preparation 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. This 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 entire history which is, on the Divine side, the fulfillment of a plan complete in thought before it was written. According to the NT, that plan is, 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 coming kingdom.

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 and acceptance 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 continued 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 1:9-10), and by the author of Hebrews when he says in God's spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by various portions and in various ways, hath at the end of these spoken unto us in His Son (1:2).

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 in Foregoing quotations scriptural is meaningless and futile except upon the basis of an explicit and consistent determination of these antecedent questions. To the present writer the validity of these principles is beyond question. The denial of any one of the three involves one in difficulties of interpretation, both critical and historical, from which there is no escape. It is to be noted, therefore, that the establishment of the principles, in accordance with which the NT writers quote, carries with it in a general way the justification of their usage.

III. TYPICAL INSTANCES OF NT QUOTATION.

For the NT writers 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 formulas exhibit 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 unbelieving people of His day “the prophecy of Isaiah” is fulfilled. The prophetic words here quoted (Isa 5 9-10) are not predictive in any immediate sense, but are susceptible of repeated application and realization of the prophecies if only they contain. 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 the world.

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 Isaac is a prototype of passage which affirms that his belief was counted to him 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 quoted literal passage.

While it may certainly be intended to imply literal prediction and an equally literal fulfilment, it may, on the contrary, be intended to intimate nothing more than a harmony of principle, fitting the passage to the person or event with which it is connected. 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 assent of thought. Not a few OT quotations were made for purposes of illustration and literary embellishment. Herein lies the significance of Matthew’s use (2 17f) 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 for 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 completeness, and there alone. 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 connection between the event and the assertion is, or is made to be, or is implied in the OT speaking or writing concerning the event or person in question. 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 2:17ff Peter interprets the Pentecostal experience in the terms of prophecy, referring to Joel (2:28ff), who promises an outpouring of God’s Spirit in a “great and notable day” of the Lord. The promise of the 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 use of this passage is whether 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 fulfillment measurable by the idea entertained in the prophecy. In He (8:8-12) reference is made to the promise of a new covenant in Jer (31:31ff) 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 2:17ff) 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 inwardly of the nature than outward and legal. 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 at Pentecost. The “new covenant” foretold by Jeremiah was established at Pentecost through the outpouring of the Spirit promised through Joel. To deny this as fulfilment to nullify the teaching of Christian history and to erase both promises from the page of credible prophecy.

(2) Contemporary persons or institutions are sometimes interpreted, not in terms of present actuality, but on the basis of the ideal 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 function. But when a prophecy is not at once understood, and taken up by an animate and not unapt prophet, as for example the "I and my servant" (44:1), "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord" (44:10), "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant, the 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 brought to its fulfillment in history. Both point unerringly to Christ as the historical fulfilment of Israel's mission and as the actual realization of the ideal and ministry of prophethood. The very prophecy of the messianic appointment (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 as the expectation embodied in the entire series of passages altogether realized. It thus becomes for sober thought a distinct revelation and portraiture 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 at Bethlehem (Mt 2:1), (b) His birth to a virgin (Mt 1:23f.), (c) 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 fulfilments in the life of Jesus, on the ground that they are not defined as having been to a virgin birth. Both these objections are based on the assumption that the interpretation of the OT passages connected with them; that is, the fulfilments 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 is not at all defined on the assumption that the mother was a virgin (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 stands the relationship of Jesus as nowhere else in history. Nevertheless, the connection is far greater than an isolated event and its occurrence. We may well say 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 imolation of the Divine Friend and Shepherd, which came to its 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 the profoundest insight into the meaning of history, "Which concerneth me hath fulfilment" (of Lk 2:44). He was more deeply concerned in 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 delivernments 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 argumentative in human history, "it pleased God to suffer"—as it needs be." 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 forewarned by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled" (Acts 3:18). This 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 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 it is preliminary and preparatory. There are different dispensations, but one economy. Whenever Our Lord uses the OT for purposes of argument (see Mt 4:4, 7; 12:17ff.; 19:16ff.; Mk 4:10ff.; Lk 19:46) it is on the basis of essential truth which is permanent and unchanging (Mt 5-19). On the other hand, He never hesitates to annul that which had a merely temporary or provisional or temporary (Mt 21:33-39; cf. Mk 12:32) and was not permanent ever ver (Mt 5-19). But to fulfill, 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. But for the Gentiles, 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 leading position of Paul's alleged "rabbinical" method: "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 (P77, zera') is singular. This, of course, means that a man's descendants are more important than inasmuch as they continue his life. The word would apply to any one of the family, but only by virtue of his belonging to the family. Etymologically Paul's argument would apply to Isaac as well as to Jesus, provided only that this is looked upon as being fulfilled in him. But the promise which was fulfilled in Isaac, was fulfilled in a larger way in Israel as a whole, and was fulfilled in the largest way of all in Christ. The use of the sing. detail indicates that Abraham's children were spoken upon as one seed to him—they are the children of Christ. The true children of Abraham are such as Christ. Historically the argument is fully justified. "The personality of Christ is in some sense coextensive with the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham" (Beet). "Christ is the organizer of the OT.

The classical passage in the discussion of justificaton based upon an OT quotation is Rom 1:17, quoting Hab 2:4. The quoted passage seems to fail the argument because the literal tr would appear to be that "the righteous shall live by their faithfulness." A deeper view, however, amply justifies the quotation; first, because the steadfastness demanded by the prophet is a persistent trust in God in view of the delay of the promised vision; second, the OT argument of the three essential principles of the OT is that stability of character has its root in trust in Jehovah (Isa 28:16; cf. 26:3-5). Nothing could be more foreign to the thought of the OT than that a man could be righteous without trust in God.

One further quotation argumentatively used by Paul may fitly close this section of our discussion. In Rom 11:26, 27 he quotes Isa 59:20, 21 as indicating the Divine purpose to include the Gentiles and to save them. This quotation was quite likely used by Paul in a large percentage of the NT quotations are taken from the LXX, the estimates of the number see Johnson, Quotations of the NT, ch.1). The text is as it was read and understood by those to whom the LXX was often the only version available, and the familiarity of that version was ample compensation for any slight loss in verbal accuracy. The only reasonable qualification of this general statement is that we should call in question any deviation which is dependent upon a point in argument. Kuenen, the severest critic of the NT writers in this particular, allows very few instances, and Professor Johnson has satisfactorily dealt with these in detail (as above). In the case immediately before us the deviations in the version used by Paul do not in the least modify, in the way of strengthening, the reference to the Gentiles (beginning NT in ver. 19 and continuing throughout) which is the point upon which Paul is laying stress. It is no more unfair to the Pauline writers than it would be unimpaired had he used the Heb text, upon which our RV rests (cf. Ho 6:9-10). In general, it may be presumed that in no instance is a quotation used by Paul should be considered binding upon writers who address a popular audience outside the sphere of the context. The substantive cogency of their arguments From the fair application of this reasonable rule the NT writers have nothing to fear.

For the most part the NT writers confine their quotations to the OT. In a single instance a canonical saying of Jesus (Acts 20:35), and, in at least two instances (Jude vs. 9, 14), non-canonical books are referred to (cf. Titus 1:12 and in his sermon at Athens (Acts 17:28) lines from native poets to illustrate and enforce his discussion (Acts 17:28). New Testament writers changed the latter instances the difference in usage from his ordi-
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 it, and it is not quoted when the context shows theChapter in the light of Christian truths (see Plummer, *Expositor’s Bible*. “James and Jude,” 134 f.).

(1) Based on unity of dispensations.—Mt 2 18; 13 14; 27 9; Mk 7 6; Lk 4 21; 20 17; Jn 4 37; 6 45; 8 49; 10 40; Acts 2 28; 3 16; 15 31; 1 Cor 15 22; 1 Thess 4 16. 2. Based on context.—Mt 7 8 10 10 17 11 17 12 17 20 17; Lk 2 22 23 4; 10 19 46; Acts 16 10 17; Rom 1 17; 4 3 7 8; 9 25 26; 10 5 14 15 12 19 17; 1 Cor 1 19 (identity of principle); 31; 1 45; 2 Cor 4 13; 6 216; 8 15; Gal 3 6 10 11 12. 5. Based on authority of the OT.—Mt 4 5; 5 38 43.

**RAAMA, râ-a-mâ (רָאָמָא, râ’amâh):** Thus spelled only in 1 Ch 1 9; elsewhere “Ramaâh” (רָמאָה, râ’âma, “Rabbah”); a son of Cash and father of Sheba and of Delan (Gen 10 7 = 1 Ch 1 9). In Ezekiel’s lament over Tyre (Ezk 27 22) the tribe of Ramaâh is mentioned along with Sheba as a mercantile people who provided the inhabitants of Tyre with spices, precious stones and gold. It has generally been identified with Rameses, mentioned by Ptolemy and Steph. Byzanzr. as a city in Southeastern Arabia on the shores of the Pers Gulf. The LXX (Πέρα, Ρημνα,) itself supposes this site. But the Arab. name of the city here indicated is spelled with a g and so gives rise to a phonological difficulty. A more probable identification has been found in the Sabean râ’âmah in Southwestern Arabia near Me’in in the north of Marib. Me’in was the capital of the old Minean kingdom. A. S. Fultron

**RAAMIAH, râ-â-mâ’â (רָאָמָא, râ’amâ’h):** râmâ’âh; B. Naamâ, Naamâh, A. “Pealâd, Rheelâm,” One of the leading men who returned with Zerubbabel from captivity (Nez 7 7). In the corresponding passage in Ezr 2 2, where the same list is named, a slight variation in form is given. “Raelah” is the name found in this passage. One is doubtful of a corruption of the other. Both have the same root meaning.

**RAAMESSES, râ-am’sês (Ex 1 11), RAMESSES, ram’sês (Gen 47 11; Ex 12 37; Nu 33 35.36, 13.34, râ’mês, râmês, râmês, ram’âmas):** 1. Meaning. Pâmos, Rameesî; Egypt Ramses or of “Store-settlement,” “Ra created him” or “it.” One of the two “settlements” (mish’âbah) 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 Heliopolis,” a town near Cairo (Ex 1 11). The Hebrew term mish’âbah comes from a root meaning “to settle down” (Assr. askanu or shakanu, “to set”), but it is rendered “strong cities” in LXX, “treasure cities” in AV, and (incorrectly) “store-cities” in RV. The “land of Ramses” in which Jacob and his sons settled, was apparently the “field of Zaan” (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, the 14th cent. BC, though even before Rameses I the name occurs as the name of a city in the light of the Bubastids during the 18th Dynasty. The usual te “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 serve to mark the age of the passages in the Pentateuch in which the Rameses-Hyksos invasion is referred to, but even then this cannot be thought to be proved (see Exodus). According to De Rové (see Pierret, *Vocab. Hébreux, 1875, 143*) there were at least three towns in Lower Egypt that bore the name Pa Rames-tes (“city of Rameses”); but Brugsch supposes that the place mentioned in the OT was Zaan, to which the 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 Raameses has still to be found.

There appears to have been no certain tradition preserving the site, for though St. Silvia (about 355 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, 1876,” *Aegyptische Zeitschrift, 60*) 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-Miamun,” which appears to lie between Zaan and it, since it was on the south bank. It was a very prosperous city when this letter was written, and a pa-ênennu 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 mead, of the “conqueror’s city,” beer was brought to the harbor from the Kath (in Cilicia), and oil from the Lake Saghaî. There is no reason to suppose that Zaan 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). C. R. Conder

**RABBAB, rab’a:** (1) “רבעב, rábâb, *Pašênâ, Rabhâb, Pašênâh, Rabhâb, Pašênâh, Rabhâb*, Rabhan. The full name is יַעַבְרָב, râbahth b’r’ā’āmôn; יַבְרֹע בְּרִיָּם, ’râbahth b’â’riyân; יַבְרֹע בְּרִיָּם, ’râbahth b’â’riyân. *Rabbah, the children of Ammon*: This alone of the cities of the Ammonites is mentioned in Scripture, so we may take
it as the most important. It is first named in connection with the "bed" or sarcophagus of Og, king of Bashan, which was said to be found here (De 3 11). It lay E. of the territory assigned to Gad (Josh 13 25). Whatever may have been its history in the interval, it does not appear again in Scripture till the time of David. This monarch sent an embassy of sympathy to King Haman when his father Nahash died. The kindness was met by wanton insult, which led to the outbreak of war. The Ammonites, strengthened by Aramaean allies, were defeated by the Israelites under Joab, and took refuge in Rabbah. After David's defeat of the Aramaeans at Helam a year later, the Ammonites were exposed alone to the full force of Israel, the ark of the covenant being carried with the troops. The country was ravaged and siege was laid to

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 1-8).

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; 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 Jerus or against Rabbah. Amos seems to have been impressed with the palace of Rabbah.

The city retained its importance in later times. It was captured by Ptolemy Philadelphus (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 (BJ, 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 (Heth and Moab, 158), "one of the finest Rom towns in Syria, with baths, a theater, and an odeum, as well as several large 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) הַֽרְבָּ֖יִת, הַֽרְבָּ֖י; B, וּֽרְבָּ֗יִת, סֹֽדְּכָ֖ה, A, אֶֽרְבָּ֖בָּה, Aрабָּבָ֖ה: An unidentified city of Judah named along with Kirath-jearim (Josh 15 60).

RABBI, rabbi, rab’hו (ר’), רבא, רָבָּבָּה, ραββάς, rabbi; a term used by the Jews of their religious teachers as a title of respect, from גָּרְבָּה, “great,” so “my great one” (cf Lat magister), once of masters of slaves, but later of teachers (Mt 23 7); therefore tr’ by δακτύλιος, δακτυλίας, “teacher” (Mt 25 8; 1 Jn 2 5; cf ver 49). In AV frequently rendered “Master” (Mt 20 25 44; Mk 9 5; 11 21; 14 15; Jn 4 31; 9 2; 11 8). John the Baptist (Jn 3 26), as well as Christ, is addressed with the title (Jn 1 49; 6 25), both by disciples and others. Jesus forbade its use among His disciples (Mt 20 25). Later (Galilean) form of same, RABBONI (q.v.). For Rabbinical literature see TALMUD. EDWARD BAGBY POLLARD

RABBITH, rab’ithו (ר’), הַֽרְבָּ֖יִת; B, דַּאֲבָ֖֖דְנָא, דַאֲבָ֖֖דְנָא, דאֲבָ֖דְנָא, Dabədən, 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 lbdkt. The hab is, of course, the def. art.

RABBLE, rab’l: This word is not found in AV. RV has it once as the tr of ἄγγελος, ἄγγελος (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 a mob.

RABBONI, rab’-ōni, rab’-ōni (ר’), רַבְבָּבָּוּנִי, rabboni, rabboni, “my great master” (Mk 10 51); ραββαβονι [WH -wel], rabbbonti [-nei] (Jn 20 16). See RABBI.

RAB-MAG, rab’magו (ר’), רבָּם-נָ֜גְּד, Ṭaqu-mm damage; LXX as proper noun, Ῥαβμᾶκη, Ῥαβμαγῆθ: The name of one of the Rab princes who were present at the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, during the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah (Jer 39 3 13). The word is a compound, the two parts seeming to be in apposition and signifying tautologically the same thing. The last syllable or section of the word, נָ֜גְּד, was the designation among the Medes, Persians and Babylonians for priests and wise men. Its original significance was “great” or “powerful.” Gr μεγας, μεγας, Lat magis, magus. 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,” tr’ fully, “Nergal-sharezer the chief prince or charioteer.” 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 gate, to wit, Nergal-sharezer, Samgarnebo, Sarsechim, [the] Rab-saris, Nergal-sharezer, [the] Rab-mag, after 39 3; and Nergal-sharezer, the captain of the guard sent, and Nebuzaradan, [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’sar-isו (ר’), רָבָּסָּרִי, rab-shar’i: 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, sar’i, is the title of eunuch or chamberlain. The tr then refers to the chief 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 eunuch was 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 who bore a real name was Sarsechim, who with the other Bab honces sat in the middle gate during the capture of Jerusalem. This event is described as having occurred in the 11th year of Zedekiah, king of Judah (Jer 39 3).

The third time, in connection with the name Nebuchadzaban, who, with the other chief eunuch 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 19).

Thus it is seen that based upon this accepted theory the three titles would be in their connections as follows: (1) simply “the chief eunuch,” (2) Sarsechim, the Rab-saris (or chief eunuch), and (3) Nebuchadzaban, the Rab-saris (or chief eunuch). See also ASSYRIA, X. WALTER G. CLIFFINGER

RABSHAKEH, rab’sha-ke, rab-sha’ke (רָבָּשָּׁקָה, rabshak’ih): 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,” here “leader,” refers to him 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; 28 37; 19 4 8; Isa 36 2 4 11 12 22; 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, Sheb- nah, 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 Jeh was vain, for He also would be unable to deliver them. Then the officers of the king of Assyria, requesting an interpreter in the Syriac 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 he persuaded. He bribery and appeal, by promise and by deception he exhorted them to turn traitor
to Hezekiah and surrender to him. However, true to the command of Hezekiah (2 K 18 36), "he held his peace, and answered him not a word." Afterward R. returned "found the king of Assyria warring against Libnah" (2 K 19 8). From this description it is inferred that R. was a man of considerable literary attainment, being able in all probability, to speak in three languages. He had, in addition to his official power, dauntless courage, an insolent spirit and a characteristic oriental disregard for veracity.

WALTER G. CLIPPINGER

RACA, ra'ka; ra-kal' (raak, raakh, WH with codd. Nk Be, etc.; raheh, rauchh, Tisch. with Nk D; Aram. ra'kal, rekh, from rakheth; rakkh, vain); 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, 11, 108). Chrysostom (who was acquainted with Syr as spoken in the neighborhood of Antioch) says it was equivalent to the Gr σφόν, σφομανία, "thus, 'used contemptuously instead of a man's name. Jerome rendered it manus et singulio abaque cerebro. It is generally explained as expressing contempt for a man's intellectual capacity (= 'you simpleton!'); while ματή, μαρακί (tr 'you 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 (ήργισομαι, ἐργίσιμαι), to be punished by the local or provincial court (τῷ κάθε, τῇ κρίσει, τῷ κρίσιν; the judgment;); (2) anger breaking forth into an expression of scorn (Raca), to be punished by the Sanhedrin (τῷ συνέδριο, τῷ συνεδρίῳ, the council); (3) anger culminating in abusive and defamatory language (Mrē), 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 he shall give the law to his brother, Raca, 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 inferior lower hand and inferior legal court 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" (Mr 2 24, 25; Mt 10 32a, ἀσύλος, practically equivalent to Raca, as is also James' expression, "O vain man," Jas 2 20).

D. MIALL EDWARDS

RACAL, ra'kal (tlt, raqalh, 'trader'): A place in Judah, enumerated among the "places where David himself and his men were wont to haunt," to the exclusion of share of spoils (1 S 30 29). The LXX reading "Carmel" has been adopted, by many, because of the similarity of the words in Heb (רֶאֶל and רֶהֶמֶר) and because there was a Carmel in the neighborhood of Hebron (Josh 15 55; 1 S 15 12), which figures in the story of David's adventures when pursued by Saul (1 S 26) in a manner that makes it improbable that he would overlook the place in his good fortune (AV "Rachal"). NATHAN ISAACS

RACE, ra's. (tlt, meqidāy, ḥw yns, ḥw bhdū′s, drīmās). See Games, 1, 2, 15.

RACES, ra's. See Table of Nations.

RACHAB, ra'kah (Pakhah, Rhachab): AV; Gr form of "Rahab" (thus Mt 1 5 RV).

RACHAL, ra'kal. See Racal.

RACHEL, ra'chel (tlt), râchel, 'ewe'; P'x'kh, Rachâch (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, when attracted by her beauty he immediately fell in love with her, winning her love by his chivalrous act related in Gen 29 10 ff. According to the custom of the times Jacob contracted with Laban for her possession, agreeing to serve him 7 years as the stipulated price (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 years more (29 21-29). To her great dismay "Rachel was barren" (Gen 30 30.51), while Leah had children. Rachel, envious of her sister, complained to Jacob, who reminded her that children are the gift of God. Then Rachel resorted to the expedient once employed by Sarah under similar circumstances (16 2 ff); she bade Jacob take her handmaid 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 love-apples of her son Reuben, but all to no avail (30 14). Finally God heard her prayer and granted her her heart's desire and she gave birth to 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 Beth-el 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. Character

Though a believer in the true God (30 8-29), 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 prevailing notions 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 (לְכָּרִית נְאָר, מסקַבְבֶּה יִשְׂרָאֵל): 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 10:22, which apparently represents another tradition, the place of Rachel’s grave was on the “border of Benjamin,” near Beth-el, about 10 miles N. of Jerus, 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

RADDAI, ra’d’a (-d’), ra’d-dai’ (-d’), roadway, ‘beating down’): The 5th of the 7 sons of Jesse, father of David, according to 1 Ch 2:14 (LXX Alex. “Rhadai”; Luc., “Rhadai”; others, “Zaddai”).

RADIAN, ra’d’i-ant (-d’), nābār, “to sparkle,” i.e. [fig.] be cheerful; hence [from the stream 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 in its moon, both the common sun and lighten each other, they are not only lightened, but radiant. So with the believers, “They looked unto him [Jeh], and were radiant.” Thus nābār 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, Zieaith, II, 430). M. O. Evans

RAFT, raft. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

RAFTED, raft’er (Cant 1:17). See GALLERY; HOUSE.

RAG: Pl. in Prov 23:21, “Drossiness will clothe a man with rage” (שִׁפַּת, b’re-im, “torn garment”; of 1 K 11:30), and figuratively in Isa 64:6 AV, “All our righteousnesses are as filth by rage,” in the sense of “tattered clothe” (שִׁפַּת, beqhezeth, AV “garment”). In Jer 38:11:12 ARV translates תְיָרָה, קַבּוֹחַ, as “rag” (AV, ERV “old cast clout”), while AV, ERV use “torn rag” for תְיָרָה, melah (ARV “worn-out garment”). Both קַבּוֹחַ and melah mean “worn out.”

RAGAU, ra’g’ō (Paya’o [WH], ‘Paya’o, Rhagag): AV; Gr form of “Reu” (thus RV) (Lk 3:35).

RAGES, ra’jēs, RAGAU, ra’g’ō ("Rages," Tob 1:14; 4:120; 5:5; 9:12; 9:2; "Ragau," Jsh 15:15; Paya’o, Payag, Payo’o, Rago’o, Raga’o). 1. Location ‘Peyn, Rhag, Paya’o, Rago’i; in Da’rus’ Behistan Inscriptions, II, 71,72, Raga’d, a province; in Avesta, Vend. I, 15, Rago’a, city and province; perhaps, “the excellent”): In Eastern Media, one forced march from Caspian Gates, 11 days’ journey from Ecbatana, 5/4 miles S. of present Tehrān; the capital of the province of the same name, though by Ptolemy called Rhagiana.

(1) Ancient.—A very ancient city, the traditional birthplace of the Zoroastrians (Zarathushtra, Zorakah Vandishkast, Zād a’vād ad Vuri, XV, 12; 2 History. Dābāstān-i Mazābeh). In Yasna XIX, 15, of the Avesta, it is thus mentioned: “The Zoroastrians, four-chief-possessing Raga’ah, hers are the royal chieftains, 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, who am Ahura Mazda, did create Raga’h, which possesses the three classes,” i.e. fire-priests, charioteers, husbandmen. Later it was the religious center of magus, 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 Europos. Later, Arsaces restored it and named it Arsacida.

(2) Mediæval.—In the early Middle Ages Raga’ah, then called Ra’i, was a great literary and often political center with a large population. It was the birthplace of Būrkhā’ār Khān, Timur (763 AD). It was sacked and plundered (1029 AD) by Sulṭān Mahmūd, but became Tangi-rī’s capital. In the Viṣa rām (c 1048 AD) it is an important place, 10 days’ journey according to the Zardūst. It was a small provincial town in about 1200 AD. It was sacked by Mongols in 1220 AD and entirely destroyed under Ghāzī Khān in 1259. A Zoroastrian community lived there in 1278 AD, one of whom composed the Zardūst.

(3) Present condition.—Near the ruins there now stands the village of Sīhā ‘Abūl’ Agīn, connected with Tīrān by the rail from Teherān (Persia railway in 1883).

LITERATURE.—Potter, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, Strabo, Thān’ut Atīr, Jām’ū t Fawārid, Thāmītī.

W. Sr. on Tissdall.

**RAGUEL, ra-qū'el (Pauōv, Rhagouēl):** "The friend of God," of Echatana, the husband of Edna, father of Sarah, and father-in-law of Tobias (Tob 3 7.17; 6 10; 7 2 f.; 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 Raguel 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-qū'el, ra-qū'el (Rāqāq, r'qū'ēl):** LXX Rhagouēl; The Midianite ḥāṭēm, 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 ḥāṭēm of Moses (Jgs 4 11). See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY. Moses' wife's father is called r'qū'ēl in Ex 2 18 where Lucian reads "Iothor" and EV "Reuel," which translation is adopted in RV in Nu 10 29 also. In other passages the hāṭēm of Moses is called "Jethro," i.e. "Jehotr." 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 "Jethro" 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, rā'hab:**

(1) (רָהָב, rā'hāv, "broad"); in Jos, Ant, V, i, 2, 7, (Pāxā'ē, Rhadah); He 11 31 and Jas 2 25, (Pā'āx, Rhadah); A zōnah, that is either a "harlot," or, according to some, an "inkeeper" in Jericho (LXX πυρην, πόρην, "harlot"). The two spies sent by Joshua from Shittim came into her house and lodged there (Jos 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 thou hast made God our 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 19 ff AV); and, "saying the author of Josh, "she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day." This 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, loudly 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 zōnah, deriving it from zān, "to feed," instead of zānāh, "to be a harlot," has been preferred by some of the commentators.

(2) (Pāxā'ē, Rhadah): Jos, Ant, V, i, 2, 7, so spells the name of (1) (LXX and NT contra). The wife of Salmon, and mother of Boaz (accord- ing 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.

(3) (רָהָב, rahab, lit. "storm," "arrogance"): A mythical sea-monster, probably referred to in several passages where the word is tr as a common noun "pride" (Jos 9 13), "the devil" (Job 8 6). Cf Ps 89 10. It is used in parallelism with lamin, "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 Bābah Bathrē speaks of rahabah as sar ha-yām, "master of the sea." See also ASTRONOMY.

Nathan Isaacs

**RAHAM, rā'ham (רָהָם), raham, "pity," "love"): Son of Shema, and father of Jorkam (1 Ch 2 44).

**RAHEL, rā'ehel (Jer 31 15 AV). See RACHEL.**

**RAID, rā'd (I 27 10). See WAR, 3.**

**RAIL, rā', RAILING, rā'ling, RAILER, rā'lēr:** To "rail" on (in modern usage "against") anyone is to use insolent or reproachful language toward one. It occurs in the OT as the tr of דָּרָל, darāl (2 Ch 32 17, "letters to rail on Jeh"), and of רָל (ות, hē, a SV 15, 4, of Nahal, "he railed at them," ERV "flew upon them," m railed on"). In the NT "to rail" is the tr of βαράλω, blasphēmō, "rail." (Mt 15 29; Lk 23 39; "railing," 1 Tim 6 4; 2 Pet 2 11; Jude ver 9). The word lōdorō, rendered " railing" in 1 Pet 3 9 AV, is in RV "reviling," and lōdaros, "railer," in 1 Cor 6 11 is in RV "reviler." See also RACA. W. L. Walker

**RAIMENT, rā'ment. See Dress.**

**RAIMENT, SOFT (nākēs, malakōs):** 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 Plumptre).

Geo. B. Eager

**RAIN, rā'n (ология, mātār, Arab. mār, "rain," ṣā'ām, "heavy rain," ḫā'ērān, mōrēh, "early rain," ḫūlîn, yīrēh, "former rain," ṣā'ām, "latter rain");** Supply in Egypt and Palestine. In Egypt there is little or no rainfall, the water for vegetation being supplied in great abundance by the river Nile; but in Syria and Pal there are large rivers, and the people have to depend entirely on the fall of rain for water, and therefore no rain, for their fields. The children of Israel when in Egypt were promised by Jehovah a land where "drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (Dt 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, so that the rains of the spring and fall seasons are absolutely essential for starting and maturing the crops. The lack of this rain in the proper time has often been the cause of complete failure of the harvest. The 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 mountain streams to dry up (1 K 17:7), and 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 perishing (1 K 18:5).

Pal and Syria are bordered 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 15 in. a month. On the eastern slopes the less, varying from 15 to 30 in. per annum. The highest amount falls in the mountains of Lebanon where it averages about 50 in. in Beirut the yearly average is 24.4 in. Between 33° and 34° S. from Syria, the amount decreases (Haifa 27.75, Jaffa 22.36, Gaza 17.61), while in the Sinaitic Peninsula there is little or none. Going from W. to E. the change is much more sudden, owing to the mountains which stop the clouds. In Damascus the average is less than 10 in. In Jerus the average for 50 years is 26.16 in., and the change is from 13.39 in 1879 to 41 in. in 1904. The records in the time of Ahab and Elijah, when the rain was very light, were given in the business transactions of the people (1 K 17:1).

### 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>23.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>18.04</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>15.51</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>28.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>23.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>14.39</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>17.42</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>16.39</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>34.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>34.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>28.87</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>29.75</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>33.33</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>24.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>20.90</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 enough to support the ancient cities (Travelq 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 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. This is called "rainy sea." During periods of the ridge of the rains, 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 rainy 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 winter grain may be sown 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 dry, 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" (Ps 68:8)."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 early rain covereth it with blessings" Uses (Ps 84:6). The severest punishment of Jeh was to withhold the rain, as in the time of Ahab and Elijah, when 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 (Eze 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**
RAINBOW, râm'bô (Heb. דָּבָל), kesheth, tr'd "a bow"; Gr. ἱψός, ἄειστα, "rainbow"): As most of the rainfall in Pal is in the form of short heavy showers it is often accompanied by the rainbow. Most beautiful double bows are the dead; and astronomically 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 being before being dried.

The interpretation of the significance of the bow in the sky is given at the close of the story of the flood, where it is called "the token of the covenant" of Jeh with Noah that there should be no more flood: "I do set my bow in the cloud, .... and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh" (Gen 9 13,15). This addition to the story of the flood is not found in other mythical accounts. The foundation for the interpretation of the bow in this way seems to be that while His bow is hung in the sky God must be at peace with His people. The glory of God is likened to "the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain" (Ezk 1 28). The rainbow forms a striking part of the vision in Rev 4 3: "And there was a rainbow round about the throne." Alfred J. Hoy

RAISE, râz: "To raise" in the OT is most frequently the tr. of the Hiphil form of רָכָה, kîm, "to cause to arise," e.g. raising up seed (Gen 38 18), a prophet (Dt 18 18), judges (Jgs 2 16,18), etc; also of רכָּךְ, ër, "to awake," "stir up" (Ezr 1 5 AV; Isa 41 2, etc), with other words. In the NT the chief words are ἐρεύνα, ἐκερέμ, "to awaken," "arouse" (Mt 3 9; Lk 1 69; 3 8, etc), frequently of the sun and the world. (Dt 32 24; Jn 5 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); "raised his gate" for "exacted 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). W. L. Walker

RAISIN-CAKES, râz'n-kâks: RV gives this rendering for AV "foundations" in Isa 16 7 (Heb דַּקְקִית, from דַּקִּית, "to found," "make firm," "press"). The trade in these would cease through the devastation of the vineyards, and AV "flagon" 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, râz'ns: (1) דָּבָל, Qimmeqim; σταφίδος, stephides, tr'd "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 slave of the Amalekites 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) דַּקְקִית, Dâkkîkh, something "pressed together," hence a "cake." In Hos 3 1, mention is made of דָּבָל הַרְדֶּסִים, דַּקְקִית הַבָּדֶסִים (עֵרָה יָדִים וְעֵרָה, pâmnata metá staphídon), "cakes of raisins": "Ich loveth the children of Israel, though they turn unto other gods; and love (in "or them that love") cakes of raisins." These are supposed to have been cakes of dried, compressed grapes offered to false gods. Gritz con-

siders that the Heb words are a corruption of 'dâshêm and hamâmêm ("sun images"). Cf Isa 17 8; 27 9. In other passages "cakes" stands alone without the "raisins," but the RV renders "cakes of raisins." Also Isa 16 7 in 2 S 6 19; 1 Ch 16 3; Cant 2 5 (AV "flagons"); Isa 16 7 in "foundations."

Raisins are today, as of old, prepared in considerable quantities in Pal, esp. at es-Salt, E. of the Jordan. The bunches of grapes are dipped in a strong solution of potash before being dried.

E. W. G. Masterman

RAKEM, râk'kem (מַרְכֵּם, rakem, the pausal form of מַרְכָּם, rekm): The eponym of a clan of Machir (1 Ch 7 16). See Rokem.

RAKKATH, rak'kath (מַרְכָּת, rakkhath; B, רֶכְבֶּץ, Rokhekth): 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. Certainly it is that Herod's town was built upon the ancient site, the grave of raisin, the old inhabitants being disturbed in digging the new foundations (Neubauer, Géog. du Talm, 208).

W. EWING

RAKKON, rak'kon (מַרְכְּנֵן), hâ-rakkôn;皮革數, Herrdôn). See Me-Jaekon.

RAM, ram (רָם, râm, "high," "exalted").

(1) An ancestor of David (Ruth 4 10 ["Appâr, Arrân"]; Mt 1 3.4 ["Abô, Arôm"]); 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 Hezron 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 Aram is a nephew of Bus (cf Elihu the Buzite), and the conjecture was at one time advanced that Ram was a contraction of Bar-am or Bar-ran; but this theory is no longer held to be tenable. The suggestion that the initial a (N) has been changed by a scribal error into h (N) is more acceptable. Rash, the rabbinical commentator, takes the quaint position that Ram is identical with Abraham.

Horace J. Wolf

RAM, ram: (1) The ordinary word is רָמָה, ram, which is remarkably near to רָמִים, ragim, "deer" (cf Lat cervus, capra, "goat," and capreolus, "wild goat" or "roe-buck"; also Gr θανάτος, darkâs, "roe-buck" or "goat"). (2) רָמָה, dôhâr, lit. "male" (Exod 23 13; Dt 7 17). The RV translates "battering ram" (Ezk 4 2; 21 22); elsewhere "lamb" (Dt 32 14, etc). (1) רָמָה, "altûâh, properly 'be-goat' ("ram"); Gen 31 10.12 AV). See Sheep.

RAM, BATTERING. See Siege.

RAMA, râ'mâ (Ῥαμᾷ, Rhomâ): AV; Gr form of Ramah (q.v.) (Mt 2 18).

RAMAH, râ'mâ (Ῥαμᾷ), hâ-râmân, without the def. art. only in Neh 11 33; Jer 31 15): The name denotes height, from root רָמָה, râm, "to be high," and the towns to which it applied seem all to have stood on elevated sites.
(1) B, Arav, Arāšt, A, Raw, Ramā: 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-Ramā, 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 slopes of the range. It is to be seen above ground; but the site is one likely to have been occupied in ancient times.

(2) Raw, Ramā: 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 Ramā with the modern Rāmūn, 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 Be distrust, with ancient ruins, and remains of a temple of which several columns and pillars still stand.

(3) B, Arav, Rhamā, A, Raw, Ramūd, and other forms: A city in the territory of Benjamin named between Gibeon and Beerotth (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). Baseba, king of Samaria, sought to fortify Ramā against Ass, king of Judah. The latter frustrated the attempt, and carried off the materials which Baseba had collected from Ramā and his city of Benjamin and Mizpāh (1 K 15 16; 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 Gibeah (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, Ar Ruia). From the passages cited we gather that Ramā lay some distance to the N. of Gibeah, and not far from Gibeon and Beerotth. The first is identified with Tell el-Ful, about 3 miles N. of Jerusalem. Two miles farther to the N. (el-Bih) about 3 miles W. of er-Rūmān, and Beerotth (el-Bireh) is about 4 miles to the N. Onom places Ramā 6 Roman miles N. of Jerusalem; while Jos (Ant, VIII, xii, 3) says it lay 40 furlongs from the city. All this points definitely to identification with er-Rūmān. The modern village crowds 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.

(Ammon): Ramāthaim: The home of Elkannah and Hannah, and the birthplace of Samuel (1 S 1 19; 2 11, etc.). In 1 S 1 1 it is called “Ramathaim-zophim” (רמאתם זופים, hō-Ramā-thayim-zophim). The phrase as it stands is grammatically incorrect, and suggests tampering with the text. It might possibly be tr “Ramatha-im-zoph” or “Thamathaim-zophim.” It was, however, within accessible distance of Shiloh, whether Samuel’s parents went up from year to year to worship and to sacrifice (1 3). From Ramāthaim as a center Samuel went on circuit annually, to judge Israel, to Bethel, Gibeath, and Mizpāh (7 16 f.). 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 f.). After his final break with Saul, Samuel retired to Ramāthaim (16 1 f.). 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 23). In 1 Samuel 11 34 it is named as one of the three chortaphories along with Aphaeraem and Lydda, which were added to Judæa from the country of Samaria in 145 BC. Onom places it near Dipsolis (Euseb.) in the district of Timnāh (Jerome).

There are two serious rivals for the honor of representing the ancient Ramāthaim. (a) Bet Ramé, 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 Bulil (GAP, 170). (b) Ramāthaim, 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 the place” 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. Clauses have also been advanced on behalf of Ramāthaim, 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 Nebi Samuel, which more probably represents the ancient Mizpāh (q.v.).

(5) Ramāthaim of the South, AV “Ramath of the South”: Ramāthaim is the construct form of Ramāthaim (Josh 19 8) (רמאתים נבanye, “Ramathaim neghebb”; Bāsēē sarā Mīzā, Ramāthim kāth idha). 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 “Ramōth [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, “Ramāthaim.” Identification has been made with Kubbat el-Ba’al about 37 miles S. of Hebron; and with Kurnub a little farther S. There is no substantial ground for either identification.

(6) B, Raw, Ramūth, A, Raw, Ramūth, Ramāthaim: Ramāthaim in 2 K 8 29; 2 Ch 22 6, is a contraction of Ramōth-gilead. W. Ewing

RAMATH, rā’math, of the SOUTH (Josh 19 8 AV). See Ramāth, (5).

RAMATH-LEHI, rā’math-lehi (רמאת לי, “Ramath lehi,” “the hill”) or “height of Lehi,” (אָלֶהוֹ נָאָסִיָנָס, Anaireis nierionos): 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 Phiils (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 Ramāth-mizpāh, and must be read as “Ramath of Lehi.” The name Lehi may have been given because of special importance in the place to the shape of a jaw-bone (Jgs 18 14, 19). It may have been in Wady es-Sarār, not far from Zorah and Timnāth; but the available data do not permit of certain identification. See JAW-BONE; LEHI. W. Ewing
RAMATH-MIZPEH, ra'math-miz'pe (רַמַּתְ-מִצְפֶּה), rāmāth ha-mizjph; B, r'āmāšt ha kātā lēn Mēzōpā, Arābdūt kātā (tō Massēphā, A, Pāwād . . .; Massōpā, Rhōmōt; . . .; Massāphā): A place mentioned in Josh 13 26 in a statement of the boundary of Gad, between Heshbon and Betinom. It may possibly be identical with Mizpah, (4).

RAMATHAIM, rā-ma-th'ā-im (1 Mac 11 34; AV Ramathem, ra'am-them). See Ramah, (4).


RAMATHITE, ra'math-it (רַמַּתְיָה, ra'māštēyāh; B, ḍē 'Pāḏ, ko ek Rḥāṭ, A, ḍē Pāwāḏās, ko Rha-mathāios): So Shimei 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, ram'ē-sēz, ram-mē'sēz. See Ramases.

RAMAH, ra-mā'-a (רַמָּה, rāmāh; żyḥ; kē Rāmōth: A city in the territory of Issachar assigned to the Gershonite 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 identical with er-Rāmāh about 10 miles S.W. of Jenin. (2) Ramoth of the South. See Ramah, (5). (3) Ramoth in Gilead. See Ramoth-Gilead.

RAMOTH, ra'moth: (1) rāmōt; rāmōth; kē Rāmōth: A city in the territory of Issachar assigned to the Gershonite 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 identical with er-Rāmāh about 10 miles S.W. of Jenin. (2) Ramoth of the South. See Ramah, (5). (3) Ramoth in Gilead. See Ramoth-Gilead.

RAMOTH-GILEAD, ra'moth-gil'e-ad (רַמַּתְו-גִּילָּד), rāmōth gil'āḏ: B, Pāwāḏās, ḍē Rāmōth Gālāḏr, A, Pāwāḏās, Rhōmōt, 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; Josh 20 8). It was assigned to the Merarite Levites (Josh 21 38; 1 Ch 6 80). In these four passages it is called "Ramoth in Gilead" (םַמַּת-גִּילָּד), this form is given wrongly by AV in 1 K 22 3. In all other places the form "Ramoth-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 (2d, VIII, xii, 3 b), and even now the descent 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 repulsed by Ahab's five sons; but his father's ill fortune followed him, and, heavily wounded, he retired for healing to Jereel (2 K 8 28 f; 2 Ch 22 5). During the king's absence from the camp at Ramoth-gilead Jehu was there anointed king of Israel by Elisha (2 K 9 1 f; 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 identical 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 the city is often mentioned under both names. It was probably to Gilead that Ramah would naturally have been transferred in the time of the monarchy. But it is not in its original position that Mizpah Ramah may become Ramoth, as we see in the case of Ramoth of the South.

Merrill identifies the city with Jerash, the splendid ruin of which is in Wady el-Den, N. E. of the Jabbok. He quotes the Bab Talm (Makkoth 96 b) 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 it to 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 seems very probable that Golan, lay far S. of a stream drawn from Kedes (Kidd. naphtal). 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 'Ajlun, and the country adjoining was not unsuitable for chariot evolutions.

Conder and others have suggested Reimān, an ancient site to the W. of Jerash. The absence of any source of supply-such as a spring or stream-disqualifies this identification. Buhi (GAP, 261 ff) favors el-Jīlāḏ, a ruined site on a hill S. of the Jabbok; see Gilead, (1). Eusebius and Jerome (Onom, s.v.) contradict each other, the former placing Ramoth-gilead 15 miles W., 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 Jabbok. Many have identified it with es-Salt, which is indeed 16 miles W. of 'Ammān (Philadelphia), but it is 10 miles S. of the Jabbok, 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 DI, 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 er-Romin, on the pilgrim road, about 10 miles S. of Mezerib (cf HGL, 566 ff). Cheyne's suggestion of Sabkha, away on the crest of the mountain of Bashan, is out of the question. The city of Gilead (Josh 13 31) argues in favor of Beit Rōs, 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 Gilgal. Ramoth, Capitolias, and Beit Rāa are in their respective languages idiomatic equivalents. It is improbable that a large city like Capitolias 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, ramp'part (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, rank: “Range” and “rank” 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"; מְסֹפֶר, s'dherah, "row"). Hence "to range" is "to set in a line" (Jdt 2 16; 2 Mac 12 20, diatassó) or "to move in a line" or, simply, "to roam", whence "a ranging bear" (Prov 23 15; מִסְפֵּר, šāhāh; "run to and fro"). A looking "range" is a scribe on which nothing can be set in a row, but the kirjātin (קֵרְצָתִין) of Lev 11 35 is a much more primitive affair, composed, probably, of two plates (קֵרְצָתִים is a dual). In Job 39 8 "range of the mountains" is good modern use, but קֶשֶׁר, yirh, should be pointed yāhār (not yəḥār as in MT) and connected with šār, "search." So translate "He searcheth out the mountains as his pasture." Burton Scott Easton

RANK, rank: (1) מְסֹפֶר, šōrāh, 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) מַסְפּוֹר, ma'darākhāh, "battle array" (1 Ch 12 38 AV; cf 1 S 4 16; 17 22 48). See Army.

RANKS, ranks (רָכָשׁ, ṭaṣād, "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, מְשֹׁפֶר, pādāhōn; 30 12; Job 33 24; 36 18; Prov 6 35; 13 8; 21 18; Isa 43 3, מֶשָּׁפֶר, kêpher; Mt 20 28; Mk 10 45, λύτρον, luitron; 1 Tim 2 6, αὐτόλυτον, autolutron); the verbal form occurs 4 t [Isa 35 10; Hos 13 14, מְשֹׁפֶר, pādāhāh; Isa 51 10 AV; Jer 31 11, מָשֹׁפֶר, gō'āl; these two Heb vbs. are generally rendered in other passages by the Eng. "redeem"]:)

1. Usage by Christ
2. O E of the Law
   (1) General Cases
   (2) Redemption Money—the Firstborn
   (3) Connection with Sacrifice
   (4) Typical Reference to the Messiah
3. CI of Apostolic Teaching
   (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 Christ the disciples concerning position in the kingdom, with the Kingdom, with the of 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 and unmistakable sense of the meaning and 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 deliver the deliverer from calamity by paying the forfeit. The familiar vb. רָכָשׁ, "to look for," "to set free," "to redeem," that which secures the freedom, the payment or forfeit; thence come the cognate vb. luitro, "to set free upon payment of a ransom," "to redeem," luitrois, "the actual setting free," "the redemption," andolutrois, "the redeemer." The favorite NT word for "redemption" is the compound form, αὐτολύσις.

The word luitro was common in Gr classical lit., constantly bearing the sense of "ransom price," and was frequently connected with μακρισ, and ἀναφορά, and expiation. Usage— But for the full explanation of Our the Law Lord's great thought we have to look to the OT usage. The two leading Heb vbs. tr in our version by "redeem," are generally rendered in the LXX by luitro, and derivatives of these words conveying the idea of the actual price paid are tr by this very word luitro.

The Heb is ποιλίλλον, a derivative of ποιλέλ, the LXX luitro. In vs 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: "You shall grant a redemption for the land" (vs 24). The Heb is ποιλίλλον, a derivative of ποιλέλ, the LXX luitro. In vs 25, the case is mentioned of a man who through poverty has sold part of his land, and near kin 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, then there is the standard scale of payment of his own price which is to be paid him by him who has been "redeemed" it (in RV "and he will purchase his own redemption in AV, and not himself be able to redeem it," "will pay his own redemption")—i.e. he will pay the price for the redemption of his land, and not that of another. If he does not have the means of paying it himself, he will be paid the price of it. "You shall grant a redemption for the land" (vs 24). We must observe how accurately, in both cases, luitro, the "ransom-price." In Lev 27 31 AV, the phrase "if a man will at all redeem of his brother's inheritance" is intended to represent the typical Heb idiom, "if a man redeeming will redeem," which is rendered by LXX ποιλόν καὶ διὰ λυτρώσεως αὐτοῦ διαιρέεται.
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 kopher; the LXX rendering is lutra the pauchta avtoo, "a ransom price for his soul." All the people were thus considered and regarded as ransomers, and rendering the same was 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 Jehovah, 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 surpluses of the firstborn males. In the LXX account, lutra occurr 4 times, twice for the phrase "those to be redeemed," and twice in the plural, meaning, 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 faint they might be their conception of the nature of that redemption.

(3) Connection with sacrifice. It is also clear in the text and in the usage that sacrifice and ransom were closely related. Even in classical Gr, as we have noted, the two words were frequently connected, and it is not surprising to find it so in the O.T. Kopher, we have seen, is lit, "atonement" and comes from kopher, lit. "to cover," and hence by covering to make atonement, or to cover by making atonement: and so it is in the Patristic, the most common and technical Heb word for making atonement, or expiation, or propitiation, and is frequently rendered in the Gr by kathisma, even though very often by the compound word latura. In Ex 21:30, as we noted, is used interchangeably with pidyon, both being representative of the kopher, Ex 30:12, Lev 25:35 31.32; the Heb kopher is lutra in the Gr. In the latter place, where it is twice stated that no satisfaction was made for the life of a man, the Heb is kopher, LXX lutra, 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 reminder of his appointed right, 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 Messiah would be the Redeemer in all phases and fullness 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; he knew that fullness of life was to be obtained by ransom and expiation, but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even that lamb which was taken for the Israelites in Ex 12:13. It is to be noted that Christ "through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." (Heb 9:12) The LXX (Rev 5:9) the song is, "Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe," etc.

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 antí, "instead of," and the idea of exchange, equivalence, substitution cannot be removed from this word. "Take the Levites instead of all the first-born," the LXX uses antí, which, like the Eng. "instead of," expressly represents the Heb tabath; 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 was 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 kingdom for redeemers. 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 Pentateuch which we have noted, special mention should be made of the two great passages which bear so closely upon the need of spiritual redemption, Ps 49 78, "None of them can by any means redeem [pádhāh; lutraō] his brother, nor give to God a ransom [kopher; exōlasso] for him (for the redemption of their life is costly, and it faileth for ever)." (The Heb gives pidyon for "redemption," the Gr LXX give lutra for the price of redemption, the Eng "ransom." 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 [pádhāh; lutraō] my soul from the power of Sheol." In Job 33 24, "Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom: 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 eureka is explained in the light of Christ's utterance; it finds its realization through the cross: "I have found a ransom," 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 noting that in apostolic thought the "ransom" 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 1819), "Ye were redeemed not with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with precious blood, of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even that Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world."

To make it most clear that Christ "through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." (Heb 9:12) The LXX (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, ἀπολύσις and λατρεία, both being connected with λατρεύω. In 1 Tim 2.5 Paul has a still closer verbal coincidence when he says, "Christ gave himself as a ransom for all" (τυλίγματος). The word used in the Apocalypse is συρρήσσω, to buy in the open market, and is frequently used of the redeeming work in the OT (Gen 24 2, Deut 20 17). In the two places where Paul uses it he adds the means of purchase: "To were bought with a price," which view would be equivalent to ransom. In the passage in Gal 3 13, 4 Paul uses the compound γενεαλογία, which is occasionally rendered "to redeem, 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 given (1) Not to Satan.—The idea entertained by some of the Fathers (Irenaeus, Orijen) 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 a "righteous claim 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 improbable that we are 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 wrath to be averted, some wrong 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 is the faith of 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.

6. Redemption by price: As to Satan's claim, 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 19-22). 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 nothing him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb 2 14), and so 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 by the sprinkling, and then the 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 at 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; DDC).

RAPE, rāp. See Crimes; Punishments.

. RAPHA, RAPHAH, rā'fa (N.7, rāphāh):
(1) In RvM these names are substituted for "the giant" in 1 Ch 20 46-8 and in 2 S 21 16.15.20.22. The latter passage states that the son of Angel, "Raphah, Rapha, Raphael" was one of the seven. The Raphah who was slain by David's warriors had been born to the rāphāh in Gath. The text is corrupt; Raphah is probably an eponym. Originally the name of one of the Philis who was of the body of Repha'ah's stood in the text. The plural of this word, or at least a plural of this stem, is Re'phaim (q.v.).

(2) Rapha (AV "Rapha"), a descendant of Saul (1 Ch 37). See REPHEH.

Raphael, rā'f-thāl, rāf-ō-thāl (N.7, rāphā, from rāphā, 'āl, "God has healed," "Rapha, Raphael"): The name of the angel who, as Azarias, guides Tobias to Ecbatan and Rages (q.v.). 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 Azmodanu (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 J. Kolbrin, from the seven Am-shapans (Amesha-spentas) 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 the healer; 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 Raphael is 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 medieaval writings; he with Michael and Gabriel cured Abraham (Yoma 37a); according to the book Zabur, 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, ra'ph-ā-im, ra-fā-ā-im (B omits; N and A have Rāphā'ēn, Rhapha'ēn: An ancestor of Judith (Jth 8 1).

Raphon, ra-fōn (Rāphā'ēn, Rhapha'ēn): The place where in his campaign E. of Jordan Judas Indicd disarrayed and defeated on the heights of Tmeothoas, the fugitives fleeing for refuge to the temple at Car- naim (1 Macc 5 37ff; Anti, XII, viii, 4). The same place is doubtless referred to by Pliny as "Raphana" (NH, v 16). It may possibly be represented by the modern رفاه, on the E. of the pilgrimage road, about 17 miles N. of Der'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, ῥᾰ́φῳ (ῥᾶφω, ῥάφω, "one healed"): The father of Palti, the spy selected from the tribe of Benjamin (Nu 13 9).

RASSES, ῥάσσες (Ῥάσσες, Rhodeses, A B, Ράσσες, Ράσσες; Vulg Tharsis; Old Lat Thrasus et Rassus): The children of Rasses are mentioned with Put, Lud and the children of Ishmael as having been subdued by Holofernes ( judges 2 23).

Their identity is a matter of conjecture only. Some think Vulg Tharsis (= Taras) is meant, others Ross (Ezk 38 23; 39 1), others Rhodes, a mountain range and city s. from Anmous, 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, ῥαθύμος (Ῥαθύμος, Rhathumos): One of those who joined in writing a letter to protest to Artaxerxes against the Jews (1 Esd 2 16 ff). In 2 17 he is styled "story-writer," RVm "recorder." (ὅ τα προσπίπτοντα σε, γραφόν, ὅ τα προσπίπτοντα [graphtin]) = "Bring the chancellor" of Esr 4 8. Rathumus being a Gr form of Beelzebub. In 1 Esd 2 16 his title appears as an independent proper name, Beelzebubus (q.v.) (here AVm gives "Babhumus," a misprint), and in 2 25 R. and Beelzebubus are given as distinct persons.

RAVEN, ῥάβν (ῥάβν, ῥαβῆ; κόρα, κόρα; 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 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 at an early age. In the time of Moses, and even in our day, ravens and jays are seen flying over the graves of men, as well as of the more recent dead. It is the favorite bird of many graves. The birds are gregarious, and are often seen in flocks of a dozen or more. Their nests are placed in trees, and are usually in holes in the branches. The eggs are from three to five in number, and are laid in May and June. The birds are said to be very fond of carrion, and are often seen feeding on dead bodies.

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 8 6-8). Because it partially fed on carrion it was included among the abominations (Lev 11 15; Dt 14 14). On 1 K 17 4-6, see Eliah and the present writer’s Birds of the Bible, 401-5. Among the marvels of creation and providence in Job 38 41, we have this mention of the raven,

"Who provideth for the raven his prey, When his young ones are every one heaped up in his mouth?"

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 'őреб means "black," and for this reason was applied to the raven, so the reference to the locks of the bride-groom in the Song of Solomon becomes clear (Cant 5 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, ῥαβν (ῥαβν), RAVIN, rayin: "Raven" (vb.) is from "rapine," "violent plundering," used for ῥαβάν, ῥαβαν, in Gen 49 27; Ps 22 13; Ezk 22 52, while "ravin" (noun) is the object ravened, in Nah 2 12 the two terms carcases (ῥαβανὶ, ῥαβανὸν). So a "ravenous bird" (Isa 46 11; Ezek 39 4) is a bird of prey (not a "hungry bird"), ῥαβὰν, "eagle," lit. "a screecher," "Ravenous beast" in Isa 39 5 is for ῥαβὰν, πάρκε, "violent one." In the NT ῥαβανεῖς, ῥαβανας, "rapacious," is tr" "ravening" in Mt 7 15, while for the cognate ῥαβανεῖς, ῥαβανας (Lk 11 39), AV gives "ravener," RV "extortioner.

RAZIS, ῥαζῖς (Ῥαζίς, Rhazes): "An elder of Jews," "lover of his countrystem," and for his good will toward them called "father of the Jews," accused before the Syrian general Nicanor an opponent of Hellenism. In order to escape falling into the hands of Nicanor's soldiers he committed suicide with the greatest determination in a rather revolting manner (Macc 14 37 ff), in his death calling upon "the Lord of life" in the hope of a resurrection. His suicide—contrary to Jewish sentiment—was regarded with approval by the author of 2 Macc 14 42-43.

RAZOR, ῥαζόρ (ῥαζόρ, ῥαζόρ, "knife") [Nu 6 5; Ps 62 2; Isa 7 20; Ezek 5 11, ῥαζόρ, mordh, "razor"] [Jgs 13 5; 15 17; 1 Sam 1 11]. See Barber; Hair.
READING, rēʾḏing (שְׁלָלֵי, mikraʾ; καταθλιπτικά, anagôngia): As a noun occurs once in the OT (Ne 8 8) and 3 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” (שְׁלָל, קָדָר; καταθλιπτικος, anagôngos) 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 21 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 K 5 7; 19 14; Acts 23 34, etc.).

D. Miall Edwards

READY, rēʾḏ (אָבִא, māḥir): Occurs twice in the sense of apt, skilful (Ezr 7 6; Ps 45 1). RV gives “ready” for “fit” (Job 24 27), for “asketh” (Mic 7 13), for “prepared” (Mt 14 13), for “not negligent” (2 Pet 1 12).

REALIAH, rēʾi-ʾya, rēʾ-ʾi. (ריָיָה), rʾapāḥ, “Jeh has seen”, LXX B, Pašē, Ḳadd, A, Ḳad, Rheid); also a tribe of the Calebite family (1 Ch 4 2). The word “Realiah” 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 “Rezaia”). See Josh.

(3) The family name of a company of Nethinim (Ezr 2 47; Neh 7 50=1 Esd 5 31).

REAPING, rēʾ-ing (שְׁלָל, קָדָר; πείδιαμα, theriaν): Reaping in ancient times, as at present, consisted in either pulling up the grain 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 sparce scarce. Even where the sickle is used, much of the grain comes up by the roots, owing to the toughness of the dry stalks or the dulness 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 clamoring (1 S 9 12).

Figurative: 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 6). “He that regardeth the clouds shall not reap,” i.e. a lack of faith in God’s care will be punished (Ecle 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; Mal 3 11). 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 to his own self shall reap to his own self” (Dn 4 36-38). In John’s vision he saw an angel reap the earth (Rev 14 15.16). See Agriculture; Gleaning.

James A. Patch

REARWARD, rēʾ word (תַּחְנִית, ἀναφά, “to gather.” Nu 10 25; Josh 6 9 (AV ‘gathering host’); Isa 52 12). See Army; Dan, Tribe of; War, 3.

REASON, rēʾ-ʾn, REASONABLE, rēʾ-ta-n-bʾ, REASONING, rēʾ-ʾn-ing (raison, יָקָקִים, etc); καγών, ambros, Beor, (τέκνα, πείδια, συμφωνία), “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 dibbâr, “a word” (Rv “answer”); but in other cases renders prepositional forms as “from,” “with,” “because of,” “for the sake of,” etc. As the ground or argument for anything, it is the ταʾαι (Pro 26 16, Rv “answers discreetly”), of γάγκα, 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 šāḥâk, 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 (λογος) for the hope that is in him (1 Pet 3 15 AV). “Reason” as a human faculty or in the abstract sense appears in Apoc in Wad 17 12 (logismos); Ecles 37 16, “Let reason [logos] go before every enterprise,” RV “be the beginning of every work.” In Acts 15 14, “reason would” is lit. kad ἀλογον, “according to reason”; in Rom 12 1, for “reasonable [logikos] service,” RV has “spiritual,” and in m “Gr belonging to the reason.”’” In RV “reason, etc., occurs much oftener than in AV (cf Lev 17 11; Job 28 47; Jgs 5 22; Job 20 23; 27 3; etc; Lk 3 15; 12 17; Acts 17 17, etc).

W. L. Walker

REBA, rēʾba (רֶבֶה, rebha, “fourth part”; LXX B, ḲoBe, Ṭhbe, A, ṬqBe, Ṭhbeok, Ṭhbeok): 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, rēʾbak (רֵבְכָּה), rēḥbakh; LXX and NT Ῥῆβεκκα, Ῥῆβεκκα, Ῥῆβεκ (the usual Eng. spelling Rebecca): Daughter of Bethuel and an unknown mother, granddaughter of Nahor and Milcah, sister of Laban, wic of Isaac, mother of Esau and Jacob.

Her name is usually explained from the Arab, ’rēʾbak, “a tie-rope for animals,” or, rather, “a noose” in such a rope; its application would then by figure suggest the beauty of (r) 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” or “stall,” in the “familiar paraphrased calf.” The nom. pl. “calf” is used in view of the meaning of such names as Rachel and Eglah the name Rebekah might well mean; “concrete (for abstract, like ἀγών, ἀγωνία, ἐρήμια, etc), a “tied-up calf” (or “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 whose subsequent appearance 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 God," that we first meet Rebekah, 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 theatrical and too simple to require comment. Besides, the substance and outline of the whole of Rebekah's career 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), Rebekah bore him no children for 20 years (Gen 25 20). But Sarah, too, was barren, and 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 extorting Jacob from the dangerous situation into which that deception had brought him (vs 42–46). When the absence of Jacob from home became essential to his personal safety, Rebekah 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, Rebekah, too, had died during this term. We learn definitely only this, that she was buried in the cave of Machpelah near Hebron (Gen 49 31).

Outside of Gen, Rebekah 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 native eastern stock, that 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-bük': As a vb. "rebuke" is in the OT the tr of ḫet, qoṭar and ʿēqāḥ; yeḥāḥ; another word, ṭūḥ, in Neh 5 7, is in RV tr "contended with." Rebuked, f., whose subsequent appearance, 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

R E C A H , rē'kah, rēkhāb; Rēkhāb; Rechab; AV Rechah: In 1 Ch 4 17 certain persons are described as "the men of Rechah," but there is absolutely no information either about the place or its position.

RECEIPT, rē-kēp't, of custom. See Custom.

RECEIVER, rē-sev'er: Found in AV (Isa 33 18); but RV substitutes "he that weighed the tribute." The Heb is šeḵēd, which means "one who weighs," a "weigher."

RECHAB, rē-kāb, RECHABITES, rek'ā-bits (רֵכָּב, רֵכְּבָּהָה, rek'ā-bīthim): Rechab is the name of two men of some prominence in the OT records:

(1) A Benjamite of the town of Beeroth, son of Rimmon (2 S 4 2); 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 noon 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 own 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 1 40) and friend of the Kenite tribe who joined the Israelites during the wilderness wanderings (Nu 10 29–32; Jgs 1 10; 4 17), becoming identified with the tribe of Judah, although Heber and Jael his wife were settled in Northern Pal (Jgs 4 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 f).25, who, having joined and lived with the people of the town of Ben-ha-acab, a zealous Jeh-worshipper and took part with Jehu in the extermination of Baal-worship and the house of Ahab. He set for his descendants a vow of asceticism: that they should drink no wine, nor plant fields or vineyards, nor build nor live in houses throughout their generations (Jer 35 6–7). That must have been a singular feature in Palestinian life: the simple, nomadic life of this family from generation to generation in the midst of settled agricultural and industrial conditions? They followed this simple life, not outward against the enervating 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 Gazzah by Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of the land, as an object-lesson to covenant-
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breaking Judah. 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). The Rechabites also 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 Malchijah, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jerus, may have abandoned the vow of his ancestors, for he was "ruler of the district of Beth-haccherem" (i.e. "house of the vineyard").

RECHAH, re'ka (רכה, рехаh). See REACH.

RECLINING, рельдинг (Jn 13:23). See NAILS; TRICLINIUM.

RECONCILE, rek'-on-sil. RECONCILIATION, rek-on-sil-i'-shun (καταλλασσων, katallassos, καταλλαγη, katallage), also the compound form ἀποκαταλλασσων, apokatallassos; once the cognate διαλλασσω, diallasso (katallaššai is used in Mt 5:24).

1. The Terms

(a) NT Usage. In the last case, Mt 5:24, the word is not used in a doctrinal sense, though its use is very helpful in considering the force of the other terms. All the other instances are in Paul's Ep. (Rom 5:10; 1 Cor 7:11; 2 Cor 5:18-20, the vb.; Rom 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor 18:19, the noun; Eph 2:16; Col 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 man, 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 may mean that it is only the "nature of the one 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.

(b) 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 kaphar, which is generally rendered by "atonement," and by ἀφιλα-κτασσων or εὑρισκατασσων in the Gr. (In one passage of the NT [He 2:17], the phrase "to make reconciliation" represents the Gr kileskosmati, 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 renders kaphar 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 changed 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.

2. Special passage in 3 S 29:24. There is yet another Heb word rendered "reconciliation" in 1 S 29:4, and inasmuch as this passage in the LXX has as the equivalent of the Heb the word διαλλασσειν, it is possible that this word is also being used in guiding to the NT meaning. On one occasion when the Philis gathered together to battle against Israel, David and his men had evidently of men accustomed to the use of the bow to the muster-place. "The princes of the Philis" did not at all like the presence of the present king, and although Achish testified in favor of David's fidelity, they were very indignant, and demanded that David and his men leave the tribe, "lest evil event befall thee and an adversary to us: for wherewith should this fellow reconcile himself into the Lord's hand unless it be with the heads of these men?" The Heb is רכשא, which means "to be pleased with" or "to accept favorably and the Hiphil form here used is made to mean pleasing or acceptable." "to reconcile himself." But assuredly the Philistines' idea of David reconciling himself to Saul 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.

3. Usage in the Apocrypha.—It may be noted that in 2 Macc 5:18 the διαλλασσειν is used to mean the Godward side: "And the place which was forsaken in the wrath of the mighty was, at the presence of the great Sovereign, restored again with all glory." The vb. occurs in 2 Macc 5:18 when again the Godward side seems intended, though not perhaps in accord with God . . . . hearken to your supplications, and be reconciled with you, and unto thee in 7:33: "If for rebuke and chastening our living Lord has been angered a little while, yet shall he again be reconciled with his own servants," and in 9:5: "Then he taught the men of the Lord to be wholly reconciled with his servants." In these two, esp. the last, it is unreasonably the laying aside of the Divine displeasure that is meant.

Before passing on to look at the great utterances in the Ep, we must now look at the passage so referred to at the beginning. There is, indeed, another non-doctrinal instance in 1 Macc 7:11, where the king parted from her husband is enjoined other than to be reconciled to her husband." But as it is indeterminate whether the wife or the husband was the offending party, and so which is the one to be influenced, the passage does not help us much. But Mt 5:24 is a very illuminating passage. Here as in the passage from 1 S, the word used is διαλλασσειν, but it is practically identified in meaning with katallassos. The injunction is given by Christ to the one who is at variance with his brother, not to complete his offering until first he has been reconciled to his brother. 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 remission of enmity. If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thou hast a grudge against thy brother but that thy brother hath sought against thee, the brother was the offended one, he is the one to be brought round to leave there the offering and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Perhaps he should do something to remove his brother's displeasure and so bring about a reconciliation.

(1) Rom 5.—Turning now to Rom 5, how stands the matter? Paul has been speaking of the blessed results of justification; one of these 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 and sinner and unloveable. The sinful 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 sufficiently to give His Son 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" (8:9). (a) The fact of Divine wrath: It is well to note, then, that there is a variance of opinion of God against sin and sinners. One of the key-thoughts of the apostle in this ep. is that "the wrath of God
is reconciled from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men” (1:18), and the coming day of judgment is “the day of the righteous judgment of God” (5:2). And because of this stern fact, the gospel is a revelation not only of love, but specifically “a righteousness of God” (1:17). And he shows that the essence of the gospel is found in the propitiatory death of the Lord Jesus Christ (3:14-25:26), through whom alone can men who have been “brought under the judgment of God” (3:19) find justification, salvation, deliverance from the wrath of God (4:25; 5:1-6). Christ’s propitiation is not possible of itself, or 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, 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 the deliverance “from the wrath 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, “hatred of God,” seems far preferable, and is indeed demanded by the context. Paul uses the vb. echrōi, “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 proposition, 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 phrase 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.” Or, there have been men who 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. And he exhibits 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) # Cor 5:18-20—(a) 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 side, but that the whole work 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.

And because of this stern fact, the gospel is a revelation not only of love, but specifically “a righteousness of God” (1:17). And he shows that the essence of the gospel is found in the propitiatory death of the Lord Jesus Christ (3:14-25:26), through whom alone can men who have been “brought under the judgment of God” (3:19) find justification, salvation, deliverance from the wrath of God (4:25; 5:1-6). Christ’s propitiation is not possible of itself, or 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, 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 the deliverance “from the wrath 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, “hatred of God,” seems far preferable, and is indeed demanded by the context. Paul uses the vb. echrōi, “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 proposition, 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 phrase 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.” Or, there have been men who 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. And he exhibits 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) # Cor 5:18-20—(a) 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 side, but that the whole work 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.

And because of this stern fact, the gospel is a revelation not only of love, but specifically “a righteousness of God” (1:17). And he shows that the essence of the gospel is found in the propitiatory death of the Lord Jesus Christ (3:14-25:26), through whom alone can men who have been “brought under the judgment of God” (3:19) find justification, salvation, deliverance from the wrath of God (4:25; 5:1-6). Christ’s propitiation is not possible of itself, or to be thought of as having any unworthy or capricious element in it—it is the settled opposition of His holy nature against sin.
ennedy, there could now be no point in the exhortation, "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 intelligence, 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 large cosmic creating or establishing of the Divine authority. 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 his 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.

REFERENCE.—See the works on NT Theology of Weake, Schmidt, Stevens, etc; Denney, Death of Christ; arts. on "Reconciliation," in HDB, DCG, etc.

ARCHIBALD M'CARR

RECORD, rek'rord, rek'tord. (1) The Eng. word, where it occurs in the OT and the NT in the sense of testimony, is tr'ed in RV "witness." (Dt 30:19; 31:28; Jn 1:19; 3:13). (2) See Witness. But in Job 19:19 for AV "my record," RV "he that voucheth for me." (2) In Ez 4:15; 6:2 (dokhrdn, dikhrdn), and Est 6:1 (zikhrdn), the word denotes Pers state chronicles; of 1 Mace 14:23; 2 Mace 2:1.

RECODER, rek'ar dr. (Rek'tor, mazkdr; 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 King's Printer, who printed S 8:16; 20:24; 1 Ch 15:15, etc. His high rank is shown by the fact that, 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, rek'ar vdr. "Recover" has (1) the transitive meaning of "to retake" or "to regain" (anything); and (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 עָנָֹל, náqóš, "to snatch away" (Jgs 1:16:26; 1 S 3:8:23; 1 Hs 2:9, RV "pluck away"); also of עִנָּל, šabbâh (Kal and Hiph. 1 S 30:19 AV; 2 S 8:3, etc), and of various other words in single instances. In 2 K 3:6:7.11, "to restore to health" is ᾗ, ἄφημ, In its intransitive sense "recovery" is chiefly the tr' of עֵנָל, ἄφημ, "to live," "revive" (2 K 1:2, etc; Isa 36:9.21). "Recovery" appears only twice in AV of the NT; Mt 16:18 (or καθὼς ἦν ἡ σήμερον) and 2 Tim 2:26 (from ἀναπαύν- RVm "Gr return to soberness"); but RV has "recovery" for "do well" in Jn 11:12 (σωθήσεαι; or Gr "be saved"). "Recovering" (of sight) (anabaphôs) occurs in Lk 4:18. W. L. WALKER

RED. See Colors, (10).

RED DRAGON. See Revelation of John.

RED HEIFER. See Heifer, Red.

RED HORSE. See Horse, Red; Revelation of John.

RE RED SEA (יוּם עַ-גָּפָה, yom qâph [Ex 10:19 and often]; by many passages it is simply נַבָּה, ἐνῶ, the sea]; LXX with 2 or 3 exceptions renders it by ἑ, ἐνῶ, ἀλαμάς, ἀλάλας, the "Red Sea"); Lat geographers Mare Rubrum):

1. Name
2. Peculiarities
3. NT References
4. Passage of, by Israelites
5. Objects
6. The East Winds
7. The Miraculous Set Aside

LITERATURE

The Heb name ym-qâph has given rise to much controversy. ym 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. the river Nile. It implies that the river Nile Ex 2:3.5. But as this word does not in itself mean red, and as that is not the color of the brusht, authorities are much divided as to the reason for this designation. Some have supposed that it was the red from the blood of the mountains on the western coast, others from the red color given to the waters of the Nile by the corals, red coral, or some species of seaweed. Others still, with considerable probability, suppose that the name originated in the red or copper color of the inhabitants of the Syene pestilential peninsula. But the name m-âqâph, though applied to the whole sea, was esp. used with reference to the northern part, which is alone mentioned in the Bible, and to the gulf of Suez (Nuqâph and akâkah) which border the Sinai peninsula, esp. the Gulf of Suez.

The Red Sea has a length of 1,350 miles and an extreme breadth of 205 miles. It is remarkable that while it has no rivers flowing into it and the evaporation from its surface is enormous, it is not much saltier than the ocean, from which it is inferred that there must be a constant influx of water from the Indian Ocean through the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb. The sea contains more saline water beneath the surface. The deepest portion measures 1,200 fathoms. Owing to the lower land levels which prevailed in recent geological times, the Gulf of Suez formerly extended across the land which separates it from the Bitter Lakes, a distance of 15 or 20 miles, and was traversed by the Suez Canal, which encountered no elevation more than 30 ft. above tide. In early
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 Pithom, the scene of the Bible of, by miracle was placed at Suez, the present head of the Gulf. But there is at Suez a passage-way of such a nature that 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 23 ft. above tide, is formed by a fixed sandbar at the entrance of the Gulf of Suez. If the wind at Suez had been such as 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 scowls, and the top of simple clay without open staddle to hold the brick together (see Naville, 'The Store-City Pithom and the Route of the Exodus,' Egg Exploration Fund, 1885; M. G. Kyle, 'A Re-examination of Naville's Works,' Records of the Past, VIII, 1901, 904–7). The next day's journey brought them to Taposiris Magna at the head of the Fresh Water Canal leading from the Nile to the Bitter Lakes. One day's journey from Taposiris Magna to the Nile enters the Nile at Apollinopolis Magna, at the site of the ancient Taposiris Magna. But then through the discoveries of Naville in 1885 this has been identified as Pithom, one of the store-cities built by Pharaoh Rameses IV, which supplied the stores for the expedition against Egypt (Ex 1 11). Here Naville uncovered vast store pits for the holding grain and querns, as was in the ancient times used for a canal, which has recently been opened to furnish fresh water to Suez, and the depression is followed by the railroad. According to Dawson, large surfaces of the desert N. of Suez, which are now above sea-level, contain buried in the sand "recent marine shells in such a state of preservation that not many centuries may have elapsed since they were in the bottom of the sea" (Egypt and Saria, 67). The Red Sea is connected with the children of Israel chiefly through the crossing of it recorded in Ex (see 4, below); but there are a few references to it in later times. Solomon is said (1 K 9 20) to have built a navy and store of ships beside Ezion-geber, which may be the same as Etham on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom. This is at the head of the Gulf of Akabah, the eastern branch of the Red Sea. Here his ships were manned by Hiram king of Tyre with 'shipsmen that had knowledge of the sea' (ver 27). And (ver 25) they came to Etham, and fetched from thence gold. But Etham was evidently lost to Israel when Edom successfully revolted in the time of Joram (2 K 8 20). For a short time, however, it was restored to Judah by Amaziah (2 K 14 22); but the use of his foreign Syræa, Syrian or more probably, according to another reading, the Edomites, recovered the place and permanently drove the Jews away. But in 1 K 22 48 Jehoshaphat is said to have made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold; and also "he made ships of Ezion-gaber"; while in 2 Ch 20 36 Jehoshaphat is said to have joined with Ahasiah to make ships to go to Tarshish; and they made the ships in Ezion-gaber.

Unless there is some textual confusion here, "ships of Tarshish" probably means either a ship going to Tarshish or an annual return from Tarshish with its cargoes, as the scene is like the "East Indianam," and Tarshish in Ch. 2 Ch. may refer to some place in the East Indies. The probability is that went to Tarshish once every 3 years came "bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks, that could hardly be found other place than India. See Ships and Boats, II. 1 (2).
called Thane K. of Lake Timah, where there is a shrine at the present day, visited every year about July 14 by thousands of pilgrims to celebrate a religious festival; its sacredness existing on this account was so strong that it was impossible to connect it with any sanctuary of the Canaanites. Dawson favors the general location which we have assigned to Pishonoth, 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 Geneefeh and the Bitter Lakes. No attempt has been made to determine exactly how near they were 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 Israelitish 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 Chelooft, every condition would be found to suit the narrative which follows. Moses was told by the Lord that in no cold season of the children of Israel could cross over on dry ground. And, in compliance with the Divine command, Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, "Jehovah hardened the heart of Pharaoh that he would pursue them in the sea, through the daytime, and 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 the right hand, and on the 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 solely on the other side the wind 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 34 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 given the trial deep and amply proved by facts of recent observation. Major General Tulloch of the British army (Proc. Victoria Inst., XXVIII, 267-80) reports having witnessed the driving off of the water from Lake Manzaleh 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 place themselves in the wind during passage this 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 Suez more than 6 ft., 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," but we consider the metaphorical 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 other chance for the Israelites to go forward, the sea 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 hardened the heart of Pharaoh that he would pursue them in the sea, through the daytime, and 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 the right hand, and on the 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 solely on the other side the wind 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 34 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 given the trial deep and amply proved by facts of recent observation. Major General Tulloch of the British army (Proc. Victoria Inst., XXVIII, 267-80) reports having witnessed the driving off of the water from Lake Manzaleh 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 place themselves in the wind during passage this 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 Suez more than 6 ft., which we have supposed at that time to separate Egypt from the Sinaitic Peninsula. See Exodus, The.
SERMON ON REDEMPTION

1. Gradual Moralizing of Idea of Redemption
2. Redemption as Life in Individual
3. Redemption as Social Process
4. Moral Implications in Scriptural Idea of Redeemer
5. Preparations of Son of God as Redeemer

The idea of redemption in the OT takes its start from the thought of property (Lev 25:26; Ruth 4:4-7). Money is paid according to law to buy back something which must be delivered or rescued (Nu 3:1; 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 Kgs 23:1; 1 Ch 11:21; Is 62:5). The idea of redemption includes 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 48:16; 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 15:15) 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 of a suggestion of ransom. Men are held under the curse of the law (Gal 3:15), or of sin itself (Rom 7:24). 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 process of redemption 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. Through the same process of spiritualization, the idea of redemption becomes 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 moral corruption and spiritual depression, 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 be well keep in mind the Master's word as Life. It was the one human experience, 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 "life." The word of life is indefinite. 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 enlargement. 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, the examples set by men's thoughts were a mine of life this is the highest gift of redemption, 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 hearken in men's hearts the will to do right, once the life, leads men to seek successfully all possible avenues for life. 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 new form of selflessness. In the unselfish seeking of life for others the redeemed life finds its own greatest achievement and happiness (Mt 16:25).
Just as the idea of redemption concerned itself chiefly with the inner spirit, so also it concerns itself with the individual as the object of

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 a class, 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 snatching of individuals 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 Scriptural idea 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 for Divine purposes. The see 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 need clear conceptions of the aim of redemption if we are to make men like Christ (Rom 8:9). Otherwise, it might be possible to use the word "life" so as to imply that the life consist of or is somehow other than what 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 clean because of the word 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 would not put the accent; 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 Scripture has to do with paying a price for a man's deliverance, whether the man is in slavery or in sickness or in being overjoyed at being redeemed; but in dealing with men whose lives are rendered useless by the sin of redemption is that which is 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 will. 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 men be made 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 from the world, as 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 same process must be used, whether the man be 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. Having already disposed of the idea of a plan of salvation, we can now consider what we mean by redemption. The idea of redemption is to beget in men life like that in Christ. 5. Moral Implications has to do with paying a price for a man's deliverance, whether the man is in slavery or in sickness or in being overjoyed at being redeemed; but in dealing with men whose lives are rendered useless by the sin of redemption is that which is 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 will. 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 men be made 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 from the world, as 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 same process must be used, whether the man be 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. Having already disposed of the idea of a plan of salvation, we can now consider what we mean by redemption. The idea of redemption is to beget in men life like that in Christ. The moral implications of redemption is that it brings men under a cleansing process without the assent of their own will. 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 men be made 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 from the world, as 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 same process must be used, whether the man be 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. Having already disposed of the idea of a plan of salvation, we can now consider what we mean by redemption. The idea of redemption is to beget in men life like that in Christ.
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. Man may voice the thought that the 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 outwarding of the mind of the blind. The gathering 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 sin there is no redemption; but if there is 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, or at least a great deal, in the redemption of man. The early times men conceived of the human race as under the dominion of Satan, and of Satan as released by the deliverance of man and therefore entitled to summation, 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, then it was not His Son, but His Son paid the cost of offended dignity. If their idea was that a substitute for sinners must be furnished, they included the thought of God Himself as providing a substitute. If they conceived of the universe as a vast system of moral laws—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 declaration upon Himself. Each phrasing of the doctrine of redemption is the attempt of an age to express in a way of its own way 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 presentation of the Christian teaching, the teaching of the Church. 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 Son of God, requires 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 Son of God, requires that a man must be able to say something like 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 do not know 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 voice the great aspirations; but we 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 would 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, as it becomes feasible, would give us 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 if any real process of redemption. We need not only the ideal, but we need power by which to reach the ideal. If the 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 not only furnishes 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 of elements in education 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 manifestation of God's love 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 on the terms of their own power. 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.

**REDEEMED, re-doun'd** (from re, "back," and unde, "to surge as a wave"); To be sent back as a reaction, to overflow; occurs only as the tr of περισσεύω, perissēō, "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.

**REED** (Job 31:22); used of the cross-beam of a "balance" (Isa 46:6); "a measuring reed" (Ezek 40:3); "a staff of reed," i.e. a walking-stick (Isa 36:6; Ezek 29:6); the "branches" of a candlestick (Ex 37:18). (6) καλαμός, καλάμος, "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 27:48; 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 καλαμός 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.

**REDNESS, red'nes, OF EYES.** See DRUNKENNESS, II.

**REDOUND, re-doun'd** (from re, "back," and unde, "to surge as a wave"); To be sent back as a reaction, to overflow; occurs only as the tr of περισσεύω, perissēō, "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.

(1) The most common reed in Pal is the Arundo donax (N.O. Gramineae), known in Arab. as kāneh ha-tāb, "sweet reed," or "pleasant cane," and in Ex 30:23, בְּרֶשֶׁת יָרֶק, krūth bēšam, "sweet calamus," or, better, a "cane of fragrance." Cant 4:14; Isa 43:21; Ezek 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;...
Ezek 27 19, and it was rare and costly (Isa 43 24). It may have been the "scented calamus" (Azoros calamus) of the Bible (XII, xiii, 48), or some other aromatic scented reed or flag, or, as some think, some kind of aromatic bark. The sweetness refers to the scent, not the taste. See also Bulrush; Papyrus.

E. W. G. Masterman

REED-GRASS (Gen 41 2.18; Job 8 11 m). See Flag, (2); Reed, (1).

REED, MEASURING, mes'hr-ur-ing (ם"ערא), [דמ'ערא, "measuring", "measuring rod"]). In Ezekiel’s vision of the temple a “man” (an angel) appears with a “measuring rod” to measure the dimensions of the temple (Ezek 40 3 ff; 42 16 ff). The reed is described as a cubit long, “of a cubit and a handbreadth each,” i.e. the cubit used was a handbreadth longer than the common cubit (see Curt. Weights and Measures; Temple). In the Apocalypse this idea of a measuring reed reappears for measuring the temple (Rev 11 1) and the holy city (21 15-16, "a golden reed"). The thought conveyed is exactitude in the dimensions of these edifices, symbolic of the symmetry and perfection of God’s church.

James Orr

REELAIH, re-el'-a'ya, re-el'-a' (ר"לאיה), R'el'-yäh): One of the 12 chiefs who returned with Zerubbabel (Exz 2 2; Neh 7 7). In the passage in Neh the name is “Raamiah” (ר"מאיה), R'd'am-gäh), and in 1 Esd 5 8 “Resians.” Which is the original, it is almost impossible to decide; “Reeliah” seems preferable.

REELIAS, re-el'-i-ás (א ר'ליאס, Rhedias; [Fritzsche], B, followed by Swete, Bopohelas, Bollerman). AV Reelias: One of the “leaders” with Zerubbabel in the return from exile (1 Esd 5 8, m “Reelias”). It occupies the place of the “Bigvai” in Ezr 2 2; Neh 7 7, but in form it must be the equivalent of “Reeliah” of Ezr and “Raamiah” of Neh. It is perhaps a duplicate of “Resian.”

REESAIAS, re-e-sa'-yas, re-e-sa'-sas: AV; RV REESAIAS (q.v.).

REFINER, re-fin'er, REFINING, re-fin'ing: Two Hebrew words have been tr “refine”: (1) [ם"ערא], gaphar, lit. to “use” (Zec 13 9; Isa 48 10; Mal 3 2.3, etc). The same word is rendered also “tire” (Ps 66 10); “melt” (Jer 6 29 AV); “purge” (Isa 1 25). (2) [ץ"ערא], zahak, lit. to “strain” or “sift.” In the case of silver and gold the term probably referred to some washing process in connection with refining, as in Mal 3 3 both gaphar and zahak are used (1 Ch 28 18; 29 4; Job 28 1). The same word in Isa 25 6 referred to the straining of wine. Gr μαμαθέω, puréo, in the passive, lit. “to be ignited,” is tr “refined,” in Rev 1 15; 3 18. The ancient process of refining gold has already been described under Metallurgy (q.v.). Most of the Bible references are to the refining of silver. (Prov 25 4; Zec 13 9; Isa 48 10). The silver used by the ancients was probably obtained by smelting lead sulphide ore, rich in silver (argentiferous galena). After the ore had been reduced to a metallic condition, the lead was separated from the silver by blowing hot air over the surface of the melted metal. The lead was thus changed to lead oxide which, in a powdered condition, was driven away by the air blast. 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 18-22 may indicate that a flux (cf “as with lye”, Isa 1 25 AVnavigation 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.

REFORM, re-form' (ר'פור, "yasar"). 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,” etc, by church discipline to learn the lessons of this chastening.

The Heb word is the same in a similar connection in Jer 6 8, where it is rendered, “Be thou instructed,” and similar passages. (Jer 31 18, “Be thou instructed”; Prov 29 19 “corrected”) use the Heb term of admonition by the words of man.

AV also has “reform” in 2 Esd 8 12; Wisd 9 18.

REFORMATION, re-for-ma'shun: The word is found only in Heb 9 10, being the tr of ἁλοricht, ἁλιθίας, 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 right, and 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 יִכְבָּר, yihbareh, “to take breath,” figurative “to be refreshed” (Ex 23 12; 31 17; 2 S 18 14); of יִכְבָּר, râ'abah, “to have room” (1 S 16 23; Job 32 20, m “find relief,” AVm “may breathe”); of יִכְבָּר, yâ'adâh, “to support” (1 K 13 7); and in the NT as the tr of ἐπανατέιλθαι, anapanaiô, “to give rest” (1 Cor 18 18); 2 Cor 7 13; and James 4 2.10; in compound words (1 L 15 32 AV); and anapanâvcho, “to invigorate,” “revive” (2 Tim 1 10), and other words. “Refreshing” is found in Isa 28 12 marḡ‘ôth, “rest” or “quiet”; and in Acts 3 19, ἀναπαύειν, and παράδεισος, “seasons of refreshing,” through the coming of Jesus the Christ; cf 2 Esd 11 46 and Av Sir 43 22 (יִפְדָּע). W. L. Walker

REFUGE, ref'uô: A place of resort and safety. The principal words in the OT are יִכְבָּר, yihbareh, ἁλοricht, ἁλιθίας (Ps 14 6; 46 1; 62 7.8; Isa 4 6, etc), and יִכְבָּר, yihbareh, ἁλιθίας, yihbareh (2 S 22 5; Ps 89 16, etc), both applied chiefly to God as a “refuge” for His people. For AV “refuge” in Dt 33 27, RV has “dwelling-place,” 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 (יִכְבָּר, יִכְבָּר, יִכְבָּר, ha-milh̀l; בֵּית הֵרְמִי, בֵּית הֵרְמִי, בֵּית הֵרְמִי, [cf 1 Macc 10 28, and other

1. Location forms: Six cities, three on each side of Jordan, were set apart and placed in the hands of the Levites, to serve as places of asylum for such as might shed blood unwittingly. On the
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 Kodosh 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 average of blood, i.e. the nearest of kin, should pursue and overtake him, and, overtaking him, should smite him mortally. On reaching the city he was to be received by the elders and his case heard. If this was satisfactory, they might give him asylum, provided for his 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 death, i.e. of a wilful slaughter, there was no more protection for him. 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 recognized in Israel as attaching to the altar in the temple at Jerusalem (1 K 1 50; 2 S 12 14). 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 cur-

atives, Vulg., Montepulc., Armenian and Ephraim, and

and is placed in the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf and

Fregelle (WH in list of "Suspected Readings" says:

"Some primitive error probably: perhaps the first letter

an interpolation"). Of ver 19, where the same Gr word

occurs it is in the same sense (AV "convict"); of also 1 Tim 5 20; Tit 1 9, where the same idea of refuting the sinful occurs.

D. M. IALL EDWARDS

REDEMPTION, ré'gem (ירקמ), "redeem" [?] 1. A Calebite, son of Jadhai (1 Ch 2 47), mentioned as the eponym of a Calebite family or clan.

REDEMPTION-MELECH, ré'gem-me-lek, -mel'ek (ירקמ המלך): 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 rehmekleh as a title, perhaps personal, rather than as a name. "They of Beth-el had sent Shareazer [q. v. (2)], the friend of the king.

REGENERATION, ré'jan'er-d'zhun, ré'-

I. The Term Explained

1. First explanation (Eschatological): For Acts 21 21, the vb. is found in Mt 17 11, ἀφανετασθήσεις, apokateskasthe, aor., aor. subjunctive, with ἀποκαταστάσεως, apokatapastase, "shall restore all things", and ἁμαρτίαν, ἀποκαταστάσοντα, "shall restore all things"), 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 subjection 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, iii. 9) speaks of the ἀνακάθεσις καὶ παλιγγενεσία τῆς πατρίδος, "a new foundation and regeneration of the fatherland," after the return from the Bab captivity. Philo (ed. Mangen, ii. 144) uses the term to signify the great post-faculating of the earth, as of a new world, and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (xl. 1.1), 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 word. There is no new thing under the sun (Ec 1:9). In this sense the Gr. word is 5. first mentioned in classical Gr. It is used in the New Testament as representing the re-creation or "renovation" of the individual as described in the New Testament and Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls (Phut., ed. Xylander, 1490; Clem. Alex., ed. Potter, 1505) or else of a revival of life (Phil. 1 20). Cleeve uses
the word in his letters to Atticus (v.6) metaphorically of his own life as a new exilic 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 or the individual. 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 generally interpreted to agree with the numerous nouns and vbs. 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. πνευματικός, pneumatikōs, "spiritual" (cf anaparistē, Acts 3:20; see Refreshing). In this latter sense the word is typically Christian, though the OT contains many adumbrations 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 individual 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 perceived 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 Jehovah 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 way of purification 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 Is 62:15 the sprinkling of many nations is mentioned and is soon understood in the sense of the "baptism" which is to be performed upon them prior to 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 Ybākâ in the Talmud). Would it be surprising then, that Israel which had been guilty of many sins 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 3:5-6; Lk 3:1-16).

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 suffered by Jehovah, is at the same time the agreement 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 circumscription 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 takes root that human sin and depravity can be effectually eliminated only by the act of God Himself renewing and transforming the heart of man (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 promise of this conviction is found in the prayer of David: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right [in "stetfast"] 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 Ephasim: "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 flaming 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 foreshadings 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 that 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. 3:1). It is based upon (1) the observation that man, even the most pungent 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 this (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, RV, "from above," Gr ἀνανεωθησόμενον), 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 (57:1-10). It is the "breath from Jehovah," 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 recognized by more human endeavor. Bildad the Shuhite declared, and his friends, each in his turn, expressed
very similar thoughts (Job 4:17; 14:4): "How then can man be just with God? Or how can he be 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!" (25:4-6).

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 never perish, neither shall anyone snatch them out of my hand" (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). The 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 sinner who had 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 eternal life, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him 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 ignorance," because they have rejected knowledge: "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I also will 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 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 "see and to hear," to be "attributed to sin" (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 thus is a new life in store for those who have been spiritually dead. To the Ephesians he writes: "And ye did he make alive, when ye 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" (2:45). 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 hath been created in righteousness and holiness through faith. (Eph 2:10). This is a new man, this being reformed 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 author of this change. "By 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 (adolescence, hupotesia, 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 exhibited the "new creature" which Christ brought out of darkness into the marvelous light of His grace. "It is no longer I that live, 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 [the] "layer" of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour." In 1 Cor 12:13 such cleansing is called the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the repeated promise (Job 2:25 [in the Hebrew 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 washeth 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 ignorance of natural man is placed in contradiction to the enlightenment of the new life (see also Col 3:10). The church redeemed and regenerated is to be a special "possession," 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 doxological. 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 "see and to hear," to be "attributed to sin" (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 thus is a new life in store for those who have been spiritually dead. To the Ephesians he writes: "And ye did he make alive, when ye 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" (2:45). 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 hath been created in righteousness and holiness through faith. (Eph 2:10). This is a new man, this being reformed 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, without righteousness" (2 Pet 3 13). Still he alludes very plainly to the regeneration of individuals (1 Pet 1 3.23).

The idea of a second birth of the believers is clearly suggested in the expression, "newborn babes" (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 15 3. 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 points out the continuity 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 after a true likeness [Rv'm in the antitype] doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting in, but the washing, that that which proceeds from the water [Rv'm '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 energies "rivers" of water 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 Paracletos], 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 5 2). At the same time it is not Jesus alone, but also fellow-believers in Christ, victorious life which characterizes 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 an explanation of what it is 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, distinction 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 14). Christ, brings many sons to 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" (1 12; 3 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. While Baptism as initiation into the Church was thought of as accomplished by the mediation of ministers thereto appointed, the creation hereby employed became means to which magic powers were of necessity ascribed. This we see plainly in the view of baptismal regeneration. This, 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 are highly metaphorical and need to be understood in a different context. Thus, "baptism of Christ" (Acts, ii 32) is seen as the second of the three births which a child of God must experience (regeneration, the birth of Christ, the third the resurrection). This birth is "of the day, free, delivering from passions, taking away all 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, Gregory v. Natures, 327). Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat., xvii, c. 37) ascribes to baptism the power of absolution from sin and the power of endowment with heavenly virtues. Augustine ascribed baptism is essential to salvation, though the baptism of blood (martyrdom) may of course follow. It is significant that as in the case of the thief at the cross (Aug., De Anima et Vitae Originali, ii. 9; Epp. liii. 1), who, while changing the Great, compares the spirit-filled water of baptism with the spirit-filled womb of the Virgin, in which the Holy Spirit engenders a sinless child (cf. Gen. ii 24, xxvi. 5; see Hagenbach, Dogmengeschichte, § 137).

In general this is still the opinion of pronounced sacramentarians, that the evangelical 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 may 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 representing in us a new 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). This response of God enters into union with the believing, accept-
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 subconscionality, and psychological investigation thus 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 reparation lies somewhere within the purview of the new manifestation."

The study of the relations psychological 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 psychical being as portrayed in explicit scriptural utterances: 'Create in me a clean heart' (Ps 51 10). It must be born again." (Acts 2 38) As in Christ he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new again (2 Cor 5 17; AV). AV is in the region of subconsciouness. To look in the region of consciousness for this Person or for His work is fruitless and conclusive with Christian conception. Christian psychology thus traces its deepest-laying retreat the Divine intervention in the regeneration of man, 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. Warner, 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 in with the law of God, to strive upward to the coming of God's kingdom, and to accept the teachings of God's spirit. Thus regenerate man is made 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, witnesses 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 innermost principle, which is recognized by the power of the life of the indwelling Christ (Col 1 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 23), 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 20).

(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 reality 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 tendencies 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 Religionsphilosophie, Leipzig, 1912, 17 ff; Der Kampf um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt, Leipzig, 1907; Grundlinien einer neuen Lebensanschauung, Leipzig, 1907; Johannes Müller, Bauernsee für persönliche Kultur, 3 vols, München, 1908).

Thus the latest development of idealistic philosophy corroborates in a remarkable way the Christian truth of regeneration. See also Conversion.
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JOHN L. NULSEN

REGREATION, BAPTISMAL. See Baptistical Regeneration.

REGION, re'jün: A "district," as in modern Eng. The word "region" is used by RV interchangeably 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 ἐρεβικuentoι or ἐρεβίκον, "surrounding country." For a possible technical use of "region" in Acts 16 6 and RV 18 23; see Galatia.

REGISTER, re'jus-r. See Genealogy; QUINNIUS.

REHABIAH, re-ha-bi'a (רֶהֶבִיָּה), r'habhyah, r'habhyyah, "Jeh is wide": Son of Eliezer, and grandson of Moses. Eponym of a Levitical city (1 Ch 23 17; 24 21; 26 25).

REHEARSE, re-hér's (דְּבָה , sūm, דָּבָה, dabhār, דַּבָּה, nāhpadh, דַּבָּה, tānāh; ἀναγγέλλω, ἀναγγέλλει); Usually means simply "to relate," "to tell," "to declare" (Ex 17 14; Jgs 5 11; 1 Ss 8 21; 17 31; Acts 14 27); with ·"rehearse from the beginning" (Acts 11 5; ἐξαίρουσιν, ἐξαρχάται, begin) (so RV). RV has preserved uniformity by translating ἀναγγέλλει by "rehearse" also in Acts 16 4, and has introduced "rehearse" as the tr of ἐξαίρουσιν, ἐξαρχάται, through-out (Lk 24 35; Acts 10 8; 15 12 14; 21 19), except in Jn 1 18 ("declare"). Sir 44 7, AV has "rehearse for despouye, doutous, "repeat" (so RV).

REHEB, re'hōb (רְהֹב), r' lodh; 'Paad, Rhoab, 'Paad, Rhoab):

(1) Etymologically the word means "broad" and might be applied either to a road or a plain. Reheb is given (Nu 13 21) as the northern limit
of Israel as reached by the spies. This agrees with the position assigned to Beth-rehoab 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 14:47-50, 1 Xx 37-40) 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 Hinnom, but it hardly suits the references. Buhl (GA'L, 240) following Thomson (Lb, 11, 547) seeks it at Panecas (modern Bandid). This would suit all the requirements of the capital, Beth-rehoab, which might then be the second Rehoab, assigned as part of the territory of Sidon to the tribe Asher (Josh 19:28-30; Jgs 18:28). We must, however, assign to the kingdom of Rehoab a territory extending from the settlements of the Danites to the "entering in of Hamath" or to Libo (modern Leboue), 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 Gershonite Levites (Jgs 21:31), and one is mentioned as remaining in the hands of the Canaanites (16:3). It was one of the last Canaanite cities to be taken in the time of David.

(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 Tisri, 4th Bi, 10th (1 Ch 9). W. M. Chishime. REHOBOAM, re-hô-bo'am (2277), rhabob'am, "the people is enlarged," or perhaps "Am is wide.

2. Underlying Causes of Disruption

1. The Disruption of the Kingdom
2. Underlying Causes of Disruption
3. Shemaiah Forbids Civil War
4. Rehoobam's Prosperity
5. Shishak's Invasion
6. His Death

The son and successor of Solomon, the last king who claimed to rule the old kingdom and the first king of Judah after the division of the kingdom. He was born c. 975 BC. His mother was Naamah, an Ammonite princess. The account of his reign is contained 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 14:20; 12:13; 1 Ch 22:9; 23:16 years). He ascended the throne at Jerus immemorially upon his father's death with apparent opposition. North of the Kingdom 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 tradition 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 negligence 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 demand. 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 ripper 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 sibierness 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, misunderstood 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 Marseillaise of the people: What portion have we in David? neither have we any inheritance in the son of Jesse. A chain of cities: to your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David" (1 K 12:16). Thus the ten tribes deschonned R., and elected Jeroboam, their champion and spokesman, their king (see JEROBOAM). R., believing in his ability above the old tradition, but Jeroboam, R.'s successor, was exiled ignominiously back to Jerus, king only of Judah and of the adjacent territory of the tribe of Benjamin. The mistak of the 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 monarchy from the outset. From the comparatively minor federation of tribes it was perfectly cemented. They seldom united against their common foe. No mention is made of Judah in the list of tribes who fought with Jehoram against Sessai. A chain of cities was held by the Canaanites, stretching across the country from E. to W., 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 with the past, but in his reign Israel rebelled twice. Northern Israel had produced many of the strongest leaders of the nation, and the Axum authority for this reason was usually a ruler from the Judaeas dynasty. Solomon, following David's policy of unification, directed the centralization of worship at Jerus and through the general splendor of his reign, but he, more than any other, finally divided the nation, the North and the South, through his unjust discriminations, his heavy taxes, his faded religious policy, and his general extravagance of his reign. The religion of Jeh was the only bond capable of holding the nation together. The apostasy of Solomon reversed this bond. The prophets, with their profound knowledge of religious and political values, saw less danger to the true worship 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 encouraged the revolution, while Shemaiah gave it passive support.

Immediately upon his return to Jerus, R. collected 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 Shishak, who declared his Civil War. The ground that they should not fight against their brethren, and that the division of the kingdom was from God. Notwithstanding the prohibition, we are informed that "there was war between R. 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 Judaean 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 people into the new city of Jerusalem, which came to Jerus because of their opposition to the idolatrous worship instituted by Jeroboam. All who were loyal to Jeh in the Northern Kingdom are represented as following the example of the priests and Levites in going to Jerusalem to pray, not simply to sacrifice, but to reside there permanently, thus strengthening R.'s kingdom. In view of the fact that R. added to the innovations of his father, erected pillars of Baal in Jerusalem long before they were common in Northern Israel, and that he permitted other heathen abominations and immoralities, it seems that the true worship of Jeh was received little encouragement from the king himself. As a further evidence of his prosperity, Ch gives an account of R.'s family. Evidently he was of luxurious habit, and followed his father in the possession of a considerable harem (2 Ch 11 18-23). He is said to have had 18 wives and 60 concubines, (2 Ch 11 21; LXX B and Jos, Ant, VIII, x, 1 give '30 concubines').

One of the first results of the disruption of the kingdom was the invasion of Pa\ a by Shishak, king of Egypt, in the 5th year of R. Shishak is Sheshonk I, the first king of the XXIIIrd or Bubastite Dynasty. He was the same ruler who implored hospitality to Jeroboam when he was obliged to flee from Solomon (I K 11 40). The LXX (1 K 12 24) informs us that Jeroboam married A
c, the sister of Shishak's wife, thus becoming brother-in-law to the king of Egypt. It is therefore easy to conceive that Jeroboam, finding himself in straits in holding his own against his rival, Rehoboam, called in the aid of his former protector. The results of this invasion, however, are inscribed on the temple at Karnak in Upper Egypt, where a list of some 180 (Curtis, 'Chronicles,' I CC) towns captured by Shishak is given. These belong to Northern Israel as well as Judah, showing that Shishak exacted tribute there as well as in Judah, which seems scarcely reconcilable with the view that he invaded Pa\ a as Jeroboam's ally. However, the king of Israel, implored the aid of Shishak against his rival, the latter made himself vassal to Egypt. This would suffice to make his towns figure at Karnak among the cities subjected in the course of the campaign. The Chronicler saw in Shishak an instrument in the hand of God for the punishment of R. and the people for the national apostasy. According to 2 Ch 12 3, Shishak had a force of 1,200 chariots and 60,000 horsemen to which Jos adds 400,000 foot-soldiers, composed of Lubim, Sukkilm and Ethipians. No resistance appears to have been offered to the advance of the invading army. Not even Jerus seems to have stood a siege. The palace and the temple were robbed of all their treasures, including the shields of gold which Solomon had made. For these R. later substituted shields of brass (vs 9,10). R. died at the age of fifty-eight, after having reigned in Jerus for 17 years. His son Abijah became his successor. He was buried in Jerus. Jerus in that disposition he was a proud and foolish man, and that he "despised the worship of God, till the people themselves imitated his wicked actions" (Ant, VIII, x, 2). S. K. MOSHMAN

Rehoboth, rē-hōˈboth, rē-hōˈbōth (רֶהֶבֹ֥וֹת), rēhōbatis, "bread places"; Ἱππόλειος, Ἰππορίχαία; one of the wells dug by Isaac (Gen 26 22). It is probably the Rubata of the Am Tab (Petre, nos. 256, 260; see also Expos T, XI, 239 [König], 377 [Seyce], and it is almost certainly identical with the ruin Rēhabēb, 8 hours S.W. of Beersheba. Robinson (BR, 1, 190-97) describes that ruins of an ancient city on this spot, which "occupied a tract of 10 to 12 acres in 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 suburban population extending both to the N. and to the S. of this once important place.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

Reho\b\o\ th by the River (רְהֶבֹ֥וֹת הַנַּ֨הְדָּה), rēhōbatis ha-nahādāh; B, Ρωθπάθα [Ρωθάδα in Ch] 'rēhōbatis ha'-nahādāh, Shishak's capital.

However, R.'s evidence only mentions that the city was possessed by R. Therefore, R. adds that the city could hardly have been Edom, for it might be identified with Rasah on the W. of the river, 8 miles S. of its confluence with the Khabir. Winckler thinks it might possibly be on the boundary between Pal and Egypt, "the river being Wady el-'Arish, the 'brook of Egypt.'" (Nn 34 5; Josh 15 4, etc.). W. EWING

Reho\b\o\ th-by the River, or, rē-hōˈboth (רְהֶבֹ֥וֹת), rēhōbatis, 'br, "Rehoboth City"; LXX Ρωθπάθα [Ρωθάδα], Ρωθόβαθ, or Rēbīt.

1. Probably "the city Rēhōbatis, Rēḥōbatis"; the Rēbit, the second of the cities built by Asshur in Ninua (RV by Nimrod) in Assyria (Gen 10 11). Unlike the other three, the exact equivalent of this name is not found in Assyriq literature. P. Delitzsch points out (Wo lag das Paradies? 2004) that Rēhōbatis is the equivalent of the Assyrian rēbīte, "streets," and suggests that the site referred to may be the Rēbit Ninua, "streets of Nineveh," mentioned by Sargon of Assyria in connection with the selection of this place as the residence of Ashur-hadda (Asshur-bani, or Dūr-Sarrukin; see Nineveh), and it was through this tract that Esar-haddon, his grandson, caused the heads of the kings of Kundi and Sidon to be carried in procession when he returned from his expedition to the Mediterranean.

Though the probabilities in favor of Rēbit Ninua are great, it is doubtful whether a suburb could have been regarded as a foundation worthy of a primitive ruler, and that a very important city, Assur, the old capital of Assyria, would rather be expected. One of the groups expressing its name composed of the characters Šag-uru, or, dialectically, Šāberi, the second element being the original of the Heb 'br. As the "center-city," Assur may have been regarded as the city of broad spaces (rēhōbatis)—its ruins are of considerable extent. The German explorers there have made many important discoveries of temples, temple-towers, palaces and streets, the most picturesque anciently being the twin tower-temples of Anu and Adad (Hadad). These ruins lie on the Tigris, about 50 miles S. of Nineveh. It practically ceased to be the capital about the middle of the 8th cent. BC. See Nineveh.

T. G. PINCHES

Rehum, rēˈhum (רֶהֵם), rēhām or ṛēˈham, ṛēˈham: (1) One of the twelve heads of the Jewish com-
REIGN, rān: The Heb word מָלַךְ, mālākh, may be rendered "kinghood," "royal dignity," "kingdom," "government" ("reign"). The vb is מָלַךְ, mālakh, "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 γειτναία, kingly power, basileia, basileia, basileia, basileia, basileia. The word is used, either as a noun or as a vb, of Jeh (God), the Messiah (Christ) and men (kings, etc); then of such terms as sin, death, grace; of the woman in Rev and, conditionally, of the Christians; once, ironically, of the Corinthians referring to the time of reigning occurs in 1 K 6 1 (Solomon); 2 K 24 12 (Nebuchadnezzar); 1 Ch 4 31 (David; cf 1 Ch 29 30); 2 Ch 36 20 ("until the reign of the kingdom of Persia"); Neh 12 22 (Darius); Est 2 16 (Ahasuerus); Lk 3 1 (Tiberius Caesar). More often occurs the vb, "to reign," מָלַךְ, mālakh, basileuēin. It is applied to: (1) Jeh at the close of the song of Moses (Ex 15 19); "Jeh reigneth" (1 Ch 16 31; cf Ps 93 1; 96 10; 99 1; Rev 19 6); "God reigneth over nations." (Ps 47 7); "Jeh of hosts will reign in mount Zion." (Isa 24 23; cf Mic 4 7); "Thy God reigneth." (Isa 62 7); "Thou hast taken thy great power, and didst reign." (Rev 11 17, meaning, probably, "thou didst assume thy might"); (2) the Messiah (Christ) as a just and righteous king (Zec 16 5); an eternal king (Lk 1 33; cf Rev 11 15); punishing and subduing His enemies (Lk 19 14 27; 1 Cor 16 25).

(3) Men (kings, etc), in regard to the source of their power ("by me [i.e. the wisdom of God], they reign") (1 Ch 22 33); meaning "to have power or dominion." (Gen 41 42); in regard to the essential characteristic (Isa 14 1); in connection with the covenant of Jehovah and David (2 Sam 24 21); the word is used in Lk 1 30, in which the angel reminds the children of Israel of their demanding a king of him (cf ver 14); of Saul (1 S 13 1; cf 11 12); of Saul's son Ish-bosheth (2 S 2 10); of David (2 S 5 4; cf 1 S 31); of Adonijah (1 K 1 1); of all kings of Judah and Israel (in the Books of K and Ch); of the kings of Edom (Gen 36 31); of Bab, king of Canaan, Hazor (Josh 11 15); of Abimelech, the son of Jotham's fable (Jud 9 8 15); of Hanun, king of the Ammonites (2 Sam 10); of Rezin and his men in Damascus (1 K 15 24); of Hazael and Ben-hadad (2 K 8 8 13); of Esar-haddon, king of Assyria (2 K 16 7 17); Hezekiahu, king of Persia (Est 1 1); of Arbeela (2 K 22).

(4) In the NT the term basileuēin, "to reign," is used to illustrate and emphasize the power of sin, death and grace (Rom 5 14 17 21 and 6 12). Sin, the vitiating mental factor, is to be looked upon as being constantly and resolutely bent on maintaining or regaining its hold upon man, its power being exercised and reinforced by the lusts of the body. Death, the logical outcome of sin, at once testifies to the power of sin and its inherent corruption, while grace is the restoring spiritual factor following up and combating everywhere and always the pernicious influence of sin. It strives to dothrones sin, and to establish itself in man as the only dominating force. (5) In describing the future glorious aspect of the NT, the NT speaks of the power of God, the NT uses the expression of those who endure in faith; of 2 Tim 3 10 12; the NT speaks of "the purchase of the blood of the Lamb" (Rev 5 10); of those partaking in the first resurrection (Rev 20 6); of the servants of God, "they shall reign for ever and ever" (22 5); on the other hand, it teaches us not to anticipate the privileges of heaven, as all our Christian life is anything but satisfactory (1 Cor 4 5), and Rev 17 18 shows us the terrible fate of the woman, the great city (the corrupt church), "which reigneth over the kings of the earth." See further KINGDOM.

WILLIAM BAUR

REINS, rānāz (רָנָּם, rānām; נְפֹרָים, nephōrām; נְפָרֶהַד, nephārēhan, nephārēhan, nephārēhan, nephārēhan; words promiscuously tr4 "heart," "inward parts," "kidneys" or "reins." The latter word, which is derived from Late reines through Off. reins, has given place in modern Eng. to the word "kidneys" [see Sket, 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 all the passions 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; 18 10; 20 12; 24 13 "inward parts" found but once (Ps 139 13). In one passage AV has tr4 the Heb בִּלְגָד ("loins") with "reins" (Isa 11 5), where the RV has rightly substituted "waist" (q.v.). The Gr word nephros (which is etymologically allied to the Middle Eng. nere, Ger. Niere; see Sket, ibid., 231, s.v. "Kidneys") is found in 1 Mac 24 22; Rev 23 22. See KIDNEYS.

H. L. E. LURINGO

REKEM, rē'kem (רֵקֶם), rekhem, "friendship").

(1) One of the five kings of Midian slain by the Israelites under Moses (Nu 31 8; Josh 13 21 [B, Pā'ak, Rhā'kem, A, Pā'ak, Rhā'kem]). Like his companions, he is called a "king" in Nu, but a "prince" or "chiefest" in the passage in Josh. The two references are hardly related; both are based on an earlier tradition.

(2) Eponym of a Calebite family (1 Ch 4 33 [Pā'ak, Rhā'kem]). 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, rō-lā'shun-ships, FAMILY:

I. Consanguinity.

1. In General.
2. Parents and Children.
3. Brothers and Sisters.
4. Uncles, Aunts, Cousins, Kinsmen.

II. Affinity.

1. Husband and Wife.
2. Father-in-Law, etc.
3. Brother-in-Law, etc.

III. Other Domestic Relations.

1. Foster-Father.
3. Host and Guest.
4. The Dependent Stranger.

The family or domestic relations of the Bible include (1) those of consanguinity or blood relationship, (2) affinity or marriage relationship, and (3) legal convention. Those of consanguinity may be divided into lined and collateral groups; the former are those of parents and children, grandparents and grandchildren, and ancestors and descendants in general; the latter are those of brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts in relation to nephews and nieces, cousins of various degrees, including mere tribesmen and even remoter kindred. The relations of affinity include besides that of husband and wife or concubine, relations among rival wives, and their children, those of father-in-law and mother-in-law in relation to son-in-law and daughter-in-law, and those of brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law.

The domestic relations based on legal convention are either legal actions or the results of agreement: among the former we must include those of fosterfather or mother and foster-children; among the latter the relations between master and the various classes of servants and slaves held by the ancient Hebrews, those between host and guest, esp., where they became covenant brothers, and between the citizen and the stranger who bad attached himself to him for his protection.

I. Consanguinity. Genealogies were carefully kept by the ancient Hebrews (cf those of Gen, Nu, Ch, Ear, Neh, Mt, Mk), 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 certain degrees depended 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, e.g., 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 remoter ancestors. The wishes of a great-grandfather are respected long after his death as the wishes of a father (Jer 35 16).

The father (ΖΗ, 'abh; σάρφη, patr) was the head of the family (mishāḥāth) or household (be-Ḥiv), which was a religious (1 S 20 62) Ex 12 3; Job 1 5) as well as and a social and political unit, consisting Children usually a combination of families in the modern sense. As long as polygamy prevailed, the family would include at least the several groups of children of the wives and concubines. The Bible represents the Hebrew father as commanding (Gen 50 18; Jer 35 6 ff; Prov 6 20), instructing (Prov 1 8; 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 108 13), and blessing his household (Gen 27 41), rejoicing over its triumphs (Prov 10 1; 15 20), or grieving over its fortunes (Gen 37 35). The mother, too (2S, 'ēm; μητέρ, nētēr), naturally displays love and care (Gen 25 28; Prov 4 3; Isa 49 15; 66 13). To the Hebrew woman chilavness was considered the greatest of fortunes (1 S 1 10 ff, of Hannah; Gen 30 23, of Rachael). Children were looked upon as a blessing from God (Ps 127 3) and the defenders of the house (vs 4.5). In early life a child was more directly under the control of the mother than of the father; the mother was its first teacher (Prov 1 8). Thereafter the father was expected to direct the training of the son (2S, bēn; υἱός, ἱστερ, ἱκόν) (Gen 18 19; Ex 12 20; 13 8 14 7; Dt 6 7), while the daughter (ēh, bath; θυγατέρ, thygáter) probably remained with the mother until her marriage (Mic 6 7). 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 5), obedience (Gen 8 12; Lev 19 18; Dt 18 18 ff, of parents); (Ps 18 19; 30 7-8), and love (1 K 19 20; Prov 28 21; 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 21 16 ff; Fach 5 5), and never into a leper's house (Lev 20 29); they could chastise children (Dt 8 5; 21 18; Prov 13 21; of Ceclus 30 1-13), and in the early days even exerted the power of life and death over them (Gen 22; Jos 11 30; Lev 18 21; 20 2-5; 2 K 23 10; Ps 150 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, glutinous and disobedient son to a mere right of complaint to the proper authorities (Dt 21 18-21), who were put to 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 4 1). 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 23 20). A widowed daughter might return to her father (Gen 30 11; 38 17), and be restored (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 Shammamite woman; Tob 1 8, Tobit's grandmother; of the position of the mother of Jesus). This was esp. true of the queen mother (rēḇērēh), whose name is usually given in the accounts of the kings of Judah (1 K 11; 2 19, where a throne at the king's right hand was set for the king's mother, 11; 20, 14 21 15 2 10 18 22 22; 2 K 8 26; 10 13 14 2 15 23 18 2 21 11 23 21 31 36 24 8 12 15 18 2 Ch 22 2; Jer 13 18 22 26; see Queen Mother). While it is true that the position of the widowed mother depended to some extent on the will of her son (1 K 2 18 ff), it must be remembered that the sense of filial duty was highly developed among all classes in Pal (Josh 2 13 18 6 23 1 S 22 3 2 S 19 37; 1 K 19 20). The rebellion of children marked the apex of social degeneration (Mic 7 6; prov 30 11). Even the other children do 'great day', according to Malachi (4 5 [Heb 3 23]) is one of conciliation of parents and children.

The terms "father" (ΠΑ, 'abh; ἀδέλφος, adel-fōs) and "sister" (μῆτρα, abhē; adelphē, adelphē) apply to children of the same father and mother (Gen 4 2), and also to children of one father (Gen}
THE Lev (Gen 43 7; Lev 18 9; 20 17). The brother as well as the father was the natural protector of the honor of his children. Thus, the end of Jacob's speech (Gen 30 8) The Law strictly forbids the intermarriage of brother and sister, whether of the same father and mother or not. Whether born at home or born abroad, as a "disgraceful thing" (hezakah, a different word from hizqah, "kindly, good" (Gen 19 9, 11, 17). In earlier times marriage between half-brother and sister was allowable (Gen 20 12; cf 2 S 13 13). In fact, we are expressly told that the laws against incest were not obeyed by the Egyptians or the Canaanites (Lev 18 6 f; 20 23). Brotherly sentiment was highly developed (Gen 40 20; Josh 2 13; Prov 17 17; cf Lev 26 35; Dt 16 11 f; 25 3); the dwelling of brothers together in unity is considered good and pleasant (Ps 133 1). Brothers were ever ready to protect or avenge each other (2 S 3 27). By the law of the people, recognized though not necessarily approved in the Bible, that the brother or next of kin, the go'el, is expected to avenge a death (Nu 35 19 ff; Dt 19 6; Josh 20 3; 2 S 14 11), and no punishment is imposed (Lev 19 19), unless it occurs in a refuge-city. A brother was also expected to ransom a captive or slave (Lev 25 48; Ps 49 7). Half-brothers were of course not so near as brothers of the full blood (cf Joseph and his brothers), and it is not surprising that speak of a wife desiring and driving out the son of a harlot (Jgs 11 1, Jephthah). The words "brother" and "sister" are used frequently of more distant relationships (see below) and figuratively of a friend.

The Heb יֻדָּה, dohah (Lev 10 4, "uncles"; Nu 36 11, "cousins"; 1 S 14 50), coming from a primitive caressing word, possibly indicating "dandle," "fondle," "love," means both "uncle" and "beloved." Cousins, It is used of the father's and also of the mother's brother, and the correspond- ing fem. form יָדָה, dohah is used of the father's sister (Ex 6 20; cf Nu 26 59) and even of the father's brother's wife (Lev 18 14; 20 20). Intermarriage between nephew and aunt (i.e. father's sister, mother's sister, or father's brother's wife, or, in general, uncle's wife) was pro- hibited (Lev 18 12 14; 20 19 20); though nothing is said of intermarriage between uncle and niece nor between cousins (cf Nu 36 11). On the relations between uncle and nephew compare the Bible accounts of Jacob and Laban, Abraham and Isaac, David and Josiah, etc. In a more general sense the word dohah is used of kinsmen, Am 6 10 (where the dohah, "even he that burneth him" מָשָׁרָפָה, perhaps "maternal uncle"); Jev Enc, s.v. "Cremation," takes charge of a dead body; ben dokh is used of cousins (cf ben dokh "son of the brother of his mother," etc) and both dohah of a female cousin. For other relations of this and remoter degrees the word for brother is loosely used (e.g. of nephews, Gen 13 8; 14 14; etc; of tribesmen, Lev 21 10; and of more distant relatives, Dt 2 4 8; 20 17).

II. Affinity. — The husband (תִּשְׂבָּה, 'ish; cf תִּשְׂבָּה, ba'al, Hos 2 16; אֲבַרְיָה, 'abir), though in a sense leaving father and mother for his wife

1. Husband (תִּשְׂבָּה, 'ishahb; יִבְרָיָה, gudh) (Gen 2 and Wife 24), under normal conditions remained a member of his father's family. If such passages as Gen 2 24; 21 10; 24 5 67; 30 8;

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 children. Thus, the end of Jacob's speech (Gen 30 8) The Law strictly forbids the intermarriage of brother and sister, whether of the same father and mother or not. Whether born at home or born abroad, as a "disgraceful thing" (hezakah, a different word from hizqah, "kindly, good" (Gen 19 9, 11, 17). In earlier times marriage between half-brother and sister was allowable (Gen 20 12; cf 2 S 13 13). In fact, we are expressly told that the laws against incest were not obeyed by the Egyptians or the Canaanites (Lev 18 6 f; 20 23). Brotherly sentiment was highly developed (Gen 40 20; Josh 2 13; Prov 17 17; cf Lev 26 35; Dt 16 11 f; 25 3); the dwelling of brothers together in unity is considered good and pleasant (Ps 133 1). Brothers were ever ready to protect or avenge each other (2 S 3 27). By the law of the people, recognized though not necessarily approved in the Bible, that the brother or next of kin, the go'el, is expected to avenge a death (Nu 35 19 ff; Dt 19 6; Josh 20 3; 2 S 14 11), and no punishment is imposed (Lev 19 19), unless it occurs in a refuge-city. A brother was also expected to ransom a captive or slave (Lev 25 48; Ps 49 7). Half-brothers were of course not so near as brothers of the full blood (cf Joseph and his brothers), and it is not surprising that speak of a wife desiring and driving out the son of a harlot (Jgs 11 1, Jephthah). The words "brother" and "sister" are used frequently of more distant relationships (see below) and figuratively of a friend.

The Heb יֻדָּה, dohah (Lev 10 4, "uncles"; Nu 36 11, "cousins"; 1 S 14 50), coming from a primitive caressing word, possibly indicating "dandle," "fondle," "love," means both "uncle" and "beloved." Cousins, It is used of the father's and also of the mother's brother, and the correspond- ing fem. form יָדָה, dohah is used of the father's sister (Ex 6 20; cf Nu 26 59) and even of the father's brother's wife (Lev 18 14; 20 20). Intermarriage between nephew and aunt (i.e. father's sister, mother's sister, or father's brother's wife, or, in general, uncle's wife) was pro- hibited (Lev 18 12 14; 20 19 20); though nothing is said of intermarriage between uncle and niece nor between cousins (cf Nu 36 11). On the relations between uncle and nephew compare the Bible accounts of Jacob and Laban, Abraham and Isaac, David and Josiah, etc. In a more general sense the word dohah is used of kinsmen, Am 6 10 (where the dohah, "even he that burneth him" מָשָׁרָפָה, perhaps "maternal uncle"); Jev Enc, s.v. "Cremation," takes charge of a dead body; ben dokh is used of cousins (cf ben dokh "son of the brother of his mother," etc) and both dohah of a female cousin. For other relations of this and remoter degrees the word for brother is loosely used (e.g. of nephews, Gen 13 8; 14 14; etc; of tribesmen, Lev 21 10; and of more distant relatives, Dt 2 4 8; 20 17).

II. Affinity. — The husband (תִּשְׂבָּה, 'ish; cf תִּשְׂבָּה, ba'al, Hos 2 16; אֲבַרְיָה, 'abir), though in a sense leaving father and mother for his wife

1. Husband (תִּשְׂבָּה, 'ishahb; יִבְרָיָה, gudh) (Gen 2 and Wife 24), under normal conditions remained a member of his father's family. If such passages as Gen 2 24; 21 10; 24 5 67; 30 8;
less-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 nephews, lit. ‘breath’ (Rev ‘rivals’). Lev 18 18; 1 S 1 6, AV ‘adversary’; cf Eclesiu 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). Or the other hand so strong was the desire of a Heb mother for children that the chosen wife welcomed the children of a maid-servant born to her husband as her own (Gen 30 1–2, etc.).

In normal Heb society, for reasons already explained, the relations of a family with the husband’s parents (eph, hōthān, fem. eph, hōthāneth; tāḇēšāt, hāḇēšāt, ephēšāt, ephēšāt), were closer than those with the wife’s in-Law, etc parents (ēphēšēr, hāḇēšēr, fem. ephēšēr, hāḇēšērēneth; tāḇēšāt, ephēšāt, ephēšāt). Where under special conditions a man remained with his wife’s tribe after marriage, as in the case of Jacob, serving out his mōbar, or Moses fleeing from the wrath of the Egyptians, or the sons of Elimelech deposing 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 family, 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 I ought 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 hōthān (Gen 21 50 55; 24 3). Brother- 11 ff). Naturally, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law would be considered too closely related to intermarry (Lev 18 16 18; 20 2). Nevertheless the husband’s brother (ēphēšēr, hāḇēšēr) was 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 redemption of land mentioned in Lev 25 23–26 was called part of the land law of Pal (Ruth 4 1–12; cf Jer 32 6 f). 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 devolved 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 kindred friendship (David and Jonathan, 1 S 18 3; 2 S 1 26) and petty jealousies (in the matter of Moses’ wife, Nu 12 1).

III. Other Domestic Relations.—The Heb āḇēn, ‘father’, āḇēnām, fem. āḇēnāh, ‘beneath’ (participle of ‘āman), ‘father-in-law’, āḇēnāth, ‘father’, hōthēn, ‘father’, ‘nourishing’, ‘nursing’, ‘nursing mother’ (Nu 11 12; Isa 49 23), ‘nursing’ (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 Absalom’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 (Sanhedrān 190). Adoption in the Rom sense was, however, hardly to be expected in a polygamous society where the childless father could remarry. Nevertheless, Jacob adopts Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen 48 5), and so the first sons 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 (vōkhtēs, kaiotōthea, 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 nāṣirēt is connected with the word shiphāhā, ‘maid-servant’, and the Li family and Servants for a discussion of the various classes of servants and slaves, Heb and foreign, male and female, see SLAVERY.

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 (of Gr. zōnia), which bound host and guest by sacred ties. In the light of this principle the act of Jacl, who receives Sisera as a guest, and then betrays him, becomes startling and capable of explanation only on the basis of the innate hatred existed 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 brāthūtān, or covenant of brothers. In legal terms, those of a kind, those 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 HOSPITALITY.

The ġēr or stranger (as indicated by the expression “stranger” [Ex 20 10; Lev 25 6; Dt 5 14; 29 11; 31 12; cf of 1 16], Heb 4 The De- ħērōt, lit. “his stranger”) attached himself to an influential Hebrew for Stranger protection. Thus we read of a “sojourner of the priest” (Lev 22 10, tōshāb; 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 49; 20 10; 22 21 f; 23 8; Lev 19 33; Dt 1 16; 10 18; 14 21, etc; Ps 146 9) and even with love (Dt 16 14; Lev 19 34). See STRANGER.

NATHAN ISAACS AND ELLA DAVIS ISAACS

RELEASE, rē-lēs’;—(1) The forgiveness of a debt (Ps 53 6; hēmīlāth [Dt 15 1.2 9; 31 10; see JUBILEE YEAR], with vb. shāmā, “to release,” vs 23. (2) To exempt from taxation (Ps 56 7; ḥāḇēshāh, “release,” “rest” [Est 2 18]). Some would render “granted a holiday.” (3) To set a prisoner or slave at liberty (āḇōḏāh, apōbōth, “to let go free” [Mt 27 15 | Jn 19 10], etc).

RELIGION, rē-lij’un; “Religion” and “religious” in Elizabethan Eng, were used frequently to denote
the outward expression of worship. This is the force of ἐφησεῖα, ἐφησκέλα, τρία, "religion" in Acts 26:5; Jas 1:26.27 (with adj. ἐφήσκος, "religious"), while the same noun in Col 2:18 is rendered "worshiping" (NIV) or "would give (the exact meaning). And in the same external sense "religion" is used by AV for ἀληθεία, ἐπιστρεπτ., "worship" (so RV), in 1 Mac 1:43; 2:19.22. Other "Jews' religion" (or "religion of the Jews") appears in 2 Mac 2:15; 8:14, 38; 13:14 ("Ἰουδαϊσμός, Ἰουδαϊσμὸς, Judaism"); and "an alien religion," in 2 Mac 2:24 (ἐξωφύσεως, ἀλοφύσεως, "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, rē-män'dēr (יני), yëdhar, "to be left," ג'נין, shĕ'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 25:34).

REMAILAH, rem-a-lēh (רמайлה), a city in Judah, whose name has been identified with an ancient village in the Negeb, situated in the territory of Issachar named with En-gannim (Josh 19:21). It is probably identical with "Ramah of Judah" (1 Ch 2:57, and Jarmuth of Josh 21:29). It is represented today by the village er-Rameh, 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 Issachar was, roughly, the southern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, the possessions of the tribes seem sometimes to have overlapped. See JARMUTH; RAMOTH.

REMISSION, rē-mish'ūn, OF SINS (ἀφέως, ἀφάτης, παρείς, παρεία): The two Gr. words, of which the latter occurs only in Rom 3:25, were τρία by the same Eng. word in Av. In Rv, παρεία is τρία "passing over." It is contrasted with the other term as precession with remission. Remission is the exemption from the consequences of an offence, forgiveness; precession is the suspension of the penalty (Philippi, Elliott, Trench [Synonyms, XXXIII]), Weiss; cf Acts 17:30). Cramer (Lexicon of NT Gr) regards the meaning of the two words as identical, except that the one refers to the OT and the other to the NT. Sins are remitted when the offender is treated as though the offence had never been committed. Remission is restricted to the penalty, while forgiveness refers more particularly to the person, although it may be used also of the sin itself. Remission is also used of offences against God's law; forgiveness, against other Divine or human law. See ABDUCTION; FORGIVENESS. H. E. JACOBS

REMMON, rem'ōn (רמון), rimmôn, Josh 19:7). See REMMON.

REMMON-METHOAR, rem'ōn-meth'ō-ar, rem'ōn-mā-thōār (רמון מצוה, רמוןحا תרתואר) [Josh 19:13]). See REMMON, (3).

REMNANT, rem'ānt: Remnant is the tr of יב, yécher, "what is left over" (Di 3:11; 25:54; Josh 12:4, etc; of ננט, "remnant" in the AV of 3 S 8 AV; Isa 10:20.21.22; 11:16, etc; Zeph 1:8); more frequently of ג'נין, shĕ'érith, "residue," etc (2 K 19:4.31; 2 Ch 31:9; Ezr 9:14; Isa 14:30, etc). As the tr of the last-mentioned two words, "remnant" has a special significance in the prophecies of Isaiah, as denoting "a holy seed," or spiritual kernel, of the nation which should survive the impending judgment and become the germ of the people of God, being blessed of God and made a blessing (of Mic 2:12; 4:7; 5:7; 7:8; 7:15; also Zep 2:7; 3:13; Hag 1:12.14; Zec 6:8; Joel 2:32), Paul, in Rom 9:27, quoting from Isa 10:28f, ("the remainder of the house of Jacob," shall be saved"); cf also Rom 11:5 (where the word is ἐκκεννᾶ) with 2 K 19:4. Several other Heb words are less frequently tr "remnant": ἀθάνατον, "after"; yădhar, "to be left over," etc; in the NT (AV we have also laiptos, "left," "remaining" (Mt 22:6; Rev 11:3, etc).

For "remnant" RV has "overhanging part," (Ex 26:12), "rest." (Lev 14:18, etc); on the other hand, gives "remnant," "posterior," (Gen 45:7), for "rest." (Josh 10:20; 1 Ch 4:43; Isa 10:19), for "residue" (Hag 2:2; Zec 8:11, etc).

REPHAN, rem'fān. See REPHAN.

RENDING, ren'ding, OF GARMENTS. See BURLAP, IV; DRESS.

RENEW, re-nō': The word is used in various senses: (1) of material things, e.g. Ps 104:30; here it means to give a new appearance, to refresh, to restore the face of the earth; (2) in 1 S 11:14, of 1 Ch 5:20, etc, to establish more firmly the kingdom by reestablishing King Saul; (3) in 2 Ch 16:8, to rebuild or repair the broken altar; (4) in Lam 5:21, "renew our days," restore the favors of former days; (5) in Isa 41:1, 'let them gather together, or marshal their strongest arguments for answer;" (6) in Ps 103:5,
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 sánás, rhádis, "new."—G. H. GERBERING

REPAIR, ré-pár (τεντέρ, maphēgh, "refuge"); in Joel 3:16, for AV "The Lord will be the hope of his people!" AVm renders "place of repair," or, "hut of repair." RV gives "refuge." Other words are ἔστρωμα, ἀσίλος, "to strengthen, to harden," "fix" (2 K 12:5 and often; Neh 3:1); ῥάπα, ῥαφάθ, "to heal" (1 K 18:30); ἄμαθα, ἀμάθαθ, "to cause to stand still" (Ex 9:9); ἱαύα, ἱάυα, "to revive" (1 Ch 11:5); τῇ σάβαρ, "to close up" (1 K 11:27).

In RV Apoc for ἀναθάφηκα, ἀναπράττω, "to patch up" (Sir 50:11); ἀνακαταστάλη, ἀστάθεσθαι, "to get ready" (1 Mac 12:37). In 1 Mac 14:34 occurs "reparation" (modern Eng. "repairs") for ἀπαρρίπτω, ἀπανθέσθαι, "straightening up."—M. O. EVANS

REPENTANCE, ré-pen'tans:

I. OT Terms
1. To Repent—"to Pant," "to Sigh." To Repent—To Turn; or "to Change.
2. NT Terms
1. To Repent—"to Care," "to Be Concerned"
2. Repent—"to Change the Mind"
3. Repent—"to Turn Over" or "unto"

III. The Psychological Elements
1. The Intellectual Element
2. The Emotional Element
3. The Volitional 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.

1. OT Terms. In the Heb word הַנָּחַם, nāham, is an onomatopoeic term which implies difficulty in breathing, hence "to pant," "to sigh.
2. Repent, "to groan." Naturally it came to "to Pant," signify "to lament," or "to grieve," "to Sigh" when the emotion was produced by the desire of good for others, 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 adapt to our understanding, God is represented as repenting when a threatened penalty is at last to be inflicted, or when threatened evils have been averted by genuine reformation (Gen 6:6; Jon 3:10). This word is twice "repent" about 40 in the OT, 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 terminates 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 ἀμαθή, 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 "to Turn" radical change in one's attitude toward or "Return" sin and God. It implies a conscious, moral separation, and a personal decision to forsake sin 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 (Acts 2:38). When RV has "return" it has reference either to man, to God, or to God and man (1 S 7:3; Ps 50:13 [both terms, nāham and shabb]). Isa 21:12; 66:7). Both terms are also sometimes employed when the twofold idea of grief and altered relation is expressed, they are τῇ "repent" and "return" (Ezk 14:6; Hos 12:6; Jon 3:5).

II. NT Terms. The term μετανοεῖν, metamoeik, literally signifies to have a feeling or care, concern or regret; like nāham, 1. Repent, it expresses the emotional aspect of "to Be repentance. The feeling indicated by Careful" or the word may issue in genuine repent. With" or may degenerate into mere remorse (Mt 21:29; 27:3). Judas repeated 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 μετανοέω, metamoeik, 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; Lk 3:13). 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 3:19); also 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 (Mt 28:19; Mk 1:4; Lk 3:3; Acts 2:38; 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, epistrepthō, 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 but not the 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 agire). The Eng.
word "repent" is derived from the Lat. *repens*iter, 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.*—Repentance 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 an offender and standing below the requirements of a holy God (Job 42:5-6; 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 to action mainly 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 necessary 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 is 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 consciousness of sin in every repentant man and a 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 Ps 51:1, 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 "repent." 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; Mk 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 exterior cause for the internal change. 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 4:6).

Repentance 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 pitiable 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 6:26; Acts 2:38; 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 deterring pride, 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.


B. BYRON H. DEMENT

REPETITIONS, rep-e-tish-‘unz: In Mt 6:7 only, "Use not vain repetitions, for the Father is *batholôgos* (so N), a word found nowhere else and spelled variously in the MSS, *battolôgos* in KL M, etc., *batalôgos* in FG, *battalogos* in D (probably influenced by the Lat *batero*, "talk idly"); presumably connected with *bateros*, *battieros*, "stammer," and perhaps formed under the influence of the Aram. *bat* (*ba*), "speak carelessly" or *batel*, "useless." Whether, however, *battalogos* means the constant repetition of the same phrase or the mechanical recitation of a long series of obscure or meaningless formulas (if, indeed, a distinction between the acts was thought of) cannot be determined. Either practice is abundantly evidenced as a "heathen" custom of the day, and either can be classed as "much speaking." See PRAYER.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

REPHAEL, ref-a-’el, ref-’a-el (מִ買った, Rphah). The eponym of a family of gatekeepers (1 Ch 26:7). The name occurs in Tob and En ("Raphael"); it probably belongs to a group of late formations. See Gray, *HPN*, 226, 311.

REPAH, re-’a (מִ جهة), rephah (the form is corrupt); Pádôn, Rhaphád: The eponym of an Ephraimite family (1 Ch 7:25).

REPHALAH, re-fal’-a, re-fal’-ya, re-fa’-a (מִ جهة), r’pháyyeh, probably "Jeh is healing"; LXX *Páfáda*í, *Rho- pháda*í. (1) In David's family, LXX also *Rhiphát* (1 Ch 3:21). (2) A captain of Simeon (1 Ch 4:42). (3) A grandson of Issachar, LXX also *Riphárd* (1 Ch 7:2). (4) A descendant of Saul (1 Ch 9:43; in 8:37 called "Raphah" (*Rph‘eh*); LXX also *Raphai*). (5) One of the repairers of the wall under Nehemiah (Neh 3:9).

REPHAIM, re-fa-im, re-fa’-im (מִ جهة), r’phá’im, "a terrible one," hence "giant," as in 1 Ch 20:4, נְפֶרָיִים, y*télh há-á-rápháyy, "sons of the giant"; AV *Rephaims*: A race of aboriginal or early inhabitants E. of the Jordan in Asherith-karnaim (Gen 14:5) and in the vale of Rephaim S.W. of Jerusalem (Josh 16:8). They associated with...
other giant races, as the Enim and Anakim (Dt 2:10-11) and the Zaanamim (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 36:15; Ps 68:10; Prov 2:18 m; 9:15 m; 21:16 m; Isa 14:9 m; 26:14.19 m). In these instances the word is derived from שָׂרֵפָה, šarphē, "weak," "powerless," "a shadow" or "shade."

H. Porter

REPHAIM, VALE OF (עֵֽגֶּר, ʿeğer, ʾemek ʾr-phāḥim; ʾemek ṝ-ʾēḇāḇ, ʾemek ṣ-ʾēḇāḇ). This was a fertile vale (Isa 17:5), to the S.W. of Jerus (Josh 15:15 8; 18:16; AV "Valley of the Giants"), on the border between Judah and Benjamin. Here David repeatedly defeated the invading Philistias (2 S 5 18; 22; 23:13; 1 Ch 11:15; 14:9). It is located by Jos between Jerus and Bethlehem (Ant, VII, iv; i, xii, 4). It corresponds to the modern el-Bīḵō, which falls away to the S.W. from the lip of the valley of Hinnom. The name in ancient times may perhaps have entered a larger area, including practically all the land between Jerus and Bethlehem, where the head-wateras of Nahr Rūbān are collected. W. Ewing

REPHAN, rēʿfan: A name for Chiu, the planet Saturn. See Astrology, 7:20m.

REPHIDIM, rēʾphīdim (רַפְּהִדִּים, ʾr-phēḥīdim; ʾreḥēḏīm; ṣ-rēḥēḏīm). A station in the Wanderings, between the wilderness of Sin and the wilderness of Sinai (Ex 17:1,8; 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, 158ff) states cogent reasons for identifying Rephidim with Wady Farān. 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, bulbuls flitted from branch to branch, "blessing with their sweet notes.”, The camp was pitched at "the mouth of Wady el-Aleyd, a large open space completely surrounded by steep, shelving mountains of gniss, 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 monastic city of Parun. 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 incursion by 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 Jobel Ṭaḥānēh, "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-roō-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 these cases it has the sense of "not-received," adokimos. The same Gr word, however, is found with other renderings in Isa 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 reprobate mind," must be understood on this principle: the noise of the idolatrous heathen is permitted by God to fall into such extreme forms of evil as to meet with the universal rejection and reprobation of men. Wettstein's interpretation, "an unfit mind," i.e. incapacitated 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 (οὐκ ἐδοκιμασαντο), and "God gave them up to a reprobate (=unacknowledged, adokimao) mind." Even Tit 1:16, "unto every good work reprobrate," 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. dokimao, "to try," "test," has suggested the notion of "being tried," i.e. "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 acknowledged or rejected, hence not rejected, but not approved 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 or actually were 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 in the last-named passage: "rejected and nigh unto cursing."


REPROOF, rē-prōo-fē. REPROVE, rē-prōvē: "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 Mac 4:33 for ἔλεγξα, ἔλεγξα, and θερμω, ἔλεγξα, words that have very much the same amilities of meaning. Hence a fairly easy rendition 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 reprover words?" (Job 6:23,25 ARV) is virtually incomprehensible. The meaning is, approximately: "What do your rebukes prove? Are you quibbling about words?" In Jn 16:8 no single word in modern Eng. will translate ἔλεγξα, and "reprove" (AV), "correct" (The VR), "counsel" (RV) are all unsatisfactory. The sense is: "The Spirit will teach men the true meaning of these three words: sin, righteousness, judgment." Burton Scott Easton
REPTILE, rep'til, -tiil: Vug in Mic 7 17 has "rephtil for zohdil, "crawling things," ARV "worms of the earth," AVm "creeping things." See LEVIathan; LIZARD; SERPENT; TORTOISE.

REPUTATION, rep-ū-tā'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 δόξα, dōkā, "seen," 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 τιμή, timē, "honor," but RV retains "reputation in Super ven 44. AV's "made himself of no reputation" in Phil 2 7 is a gloss. See KENOSIS. On Eccl 10 1 see the commentaries.

REQUIRE, rē-kwīr: "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; Ecc 3 15; Ezr 8 22; 1 Cor 4 2), and RV has made little change.

REWARD, rēr'wōrd. See REARWARD.

RESAIAS, ré-sā'yas, ré-sā'as (Psyrhos, Rhēzalas; AV Reesaias): One of the "leaders" with Zerubbabel in the return (1 Esd 5 8) as "Reelahah" in Ezr 2 21. "Reemiah" in Neh 7 7. The name is apparently duplicated in 1 Esd 5 8 in the form "Reelaisa.

RESEN, rē'sen (ע'צי), rezen; LXX Δαεος, Dæsēn, Δασις, Daisen): The Gr forms show that the LXX translators had "dē, for ḫ, r, 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 Rēš-tini, "fountain-head." The only town so named in the inscriptions is one of 18 mentioned by Sennacherib in the Babylon inscription as places from which he dug canals connecting with the Tigris. It is 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.

The Boeotian Resin is site lying between Nineveh and Calah (Kouyunjik and Nimroud), it is generally thought to be represented

2. Possibly by the ruins at Selamiyah, about 3 miles N. of the latter city. It is noted Selamiyah worthy that Xenophon (Anab. iii.4) mentions a "great" city called Larissa as occupying this position, and Bochart has suggested it is that same place. He supposes that when the inhabitants were asked to what city the ruins belonged, they answered "La Resen," to "Resen," which was the name by the Greeks as Larissa. 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; NINVEH, 10. T. G. PINCHES

RESERVOIR, res'er-voor, -vwar (رأي), mīḥ-

vōd; AV ditch (Isa 22 11). See DITCH; CISTERNS; POOL.

RESH, resh, rāsh (ם): The 20th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as r. It came also to be used for the number 200. For name, etc, see ALPHABET.

RESHEPH, ré'shef (רֶשֶׁף), resheph, "flame" or "fire-bolt": Personal name found in Phoen as a divine name. In the OT the name of a descendant of Ephraim, the eponym of an Ephraimite family or clan (1 Ch 7 25).

RESIDUE, res'i-dū. See REMNANT.

RESPRECT, rē-spekt', OF PERSONS: The phrase פָּרָשָׁה בַּעֲרָידה, nāṣīth pārāshā, means lit. "lift up the face," and, among other tr, is rendered indifferently "accept" or "respect the person" in AV (contrast Prov 18 11; 25 4 23). As applied to (a prostrate) suppliant, the phrase means generally "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 translation is given ἐλεηθεροποιεῖ, ἐλεηθεροποιήσασα (Sir 35 13 32 16); Lk 20 21; Gal 2 6, with the noun προσωπολογία, προσωπολογήσασα, "face-taking" (Rom 2 11; Eph 3 13; Col 3 25; Jas 2 2). It is rendered uniformly "respect of persons" in RV. A noun προσωπολογισμός, προσωπολογημένος, "respect of persons," and a vb. προσωπολογίζω, προσωπολογήσασαι 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 (גָּנַח, גָּנָה, מִנָּה), mānah, "cessation from motion," "peace," "quiet;" etc. בַּעֲרָידה, מַעֲרָידה, מַעֲרָידה אֵשֶׁת (מַעֲרָידה אֵשֶׁת): The 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 23 2; Ps 132 8 14); as resting in His love among His people (Zeph 3 17; RV "Heb, 'be silent'"). The 7th day was to be one of rest (Ex 16 23; 31 15; see SABBAT); the land also was to have its rest in the 7th year (Lev 25 4). Jeh promised His people rest in the land He should give them; this they looked forward to and enjoyed (Dt 12 9; Josh 11 23). "To rest" often means to come upon, as in the Spirit of Jeh (Nu 11 25 f.; Isa 11 2), of wisdom (Prov 14 33), of anger (Ecc 7 9). There is again the "rest" of the grave (Job 3 13 17 18; Isa 66 2; Dn 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 1 ff. 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" (sabbatianos, 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-tū'shun, RESTORATION. See PUNISHMENTS.

RESTORATION, res-tōr-ā'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 fulfillment of this hope, the Messianic era was projected into the future. By the time of Jesus the concept of the Messianic had been reduced to one 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 considered as granted 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 fulfillment 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 (τονο-γενεσία, palingenesia) of the world 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 ἀνακατάστασις πάντων, apokatástasis pánthōn, and is viewed as a fulfillment 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. Under such 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 therefore bound to the reconstruction 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 the benefits of regeneration 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.
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RESURRECTION, res-u-rek'shun (in the NT ἐκατάστασις, anastasis, with vbs. ἀναστήσω, anistēmi, "stand up," and ἐκρήξις, ekrous, "raise.") There is no technical term for the OT, but in Isa 26:19 we found the vbs. ἐκάτ, ἑκάθι, "live," ψπαθι, καθηρ, "rise," ὤτο, κηρ, "awake").
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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 man 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 life (a trichotomy appears to be post-Bib., despite 1 Thess 5:23; see Psychology). In the individual nephesh and ρύθη seem to be fairly synonymous words, meaning primarily "breath," as the animating principle of the flesh (so for the lower animals). But nephesh came to be used to denote the "inner man" or "self" (Dt 12:20, etc.; see Heart), and so in EV is usually rendered "soul." But there are only a very few cases where nephesh is used for the seat of the personality (a future life death (Ps. 115:17; Isa. 38:17; Job 33:18), 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. 19:28; Nu 6:2; 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," ρύθηδια (Job 26:5, 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. 115:17-18; 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 137:3).

3. Religious Danger

Concerning nations 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 from the Hellen past that such beliefs could be considered on their own merits. Hence it is not surprising that the prophets virtually disregard the idea that Eccl denies any immortality doctrine categorically.

The second, with a fuller knowledge of God, wider experience, and deeper reflection, the doctrine was bound to come. But it came slowly. Individualism reaches ex-

4. Belief in slowly. Individualism reaches ex-

Immortality plied in statement in Ezek 14, 18, 33 (cf. 29 20; Jer 31 31 39), but the national point of view still made the rewards and punishments of the individual matters of this world only (Ezek 14 14; Ps 37, etc.), a doctrine that had surprising vitality and that is found as late as Sir (1 13; 11 26). But as this does not square with the facts of life (Job), a doctrine of immortality, already hinted at (11, 1, below), is inevitable. It appears in force in the post-Maccabean 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 Macc 10 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, so the body was 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 St. Paul himself shudders at the thought of "the quick and the dead" (I Cor 15 51, II Thess 2 18). The rewards and punishments were uncertain quantities, and even the NT has no consistent terminology for the immortal part of man ("souls," Rev 6 9; 30 4; "spirit," He 12 23; 1 Pet 3 19; St. Paul avoids any term in 1 Cor 15 18, but is not explicit.

Yet the "souls" view is the only one 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 hidden, however, can be predicated, pure soul-immortality is found (cf Wis 8 19 20; 9 15 but Wis'ds true teaching is very uncertain; En 102 Concepts 4 105; 108; Slav En; 4 Macc; Jos, and esp. Philo). According to Jos (BJ, 11, v), the Eze is the core of this doctrine, but as Jos gracizes the Pharisaic resurrection into Pythagorean soul-migration (II, viii, 14; contrast Ant, XVIII, i, 3), his evidence is doubtful. Note, moreover, how Lk 6 9; 9 25; 12 4 5 hasrewarded Mk 3 4; 3 55 6; 4 56; 5 6; 8 56; 9 61; 10 50; 13 41-42, while it is commonly held that the souls in the intermediate state can enjoy happiness, a statement first appearing in En 22 (Jub 23 31 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 commentaries. Of course no exact dating of these Ps passages is possible. With still higher probability the Resurrection shall be described in Job 19 25-29, but again alternative explanations are just possible, and, again, Job is a notoriously hard book to date (see Jos, Book on Ps). The two certain passages are Isa 26 19 m and Dnl 12 2. In the former (to be dated about 395 B.C.) it is said that the "righteous" shall fall on the earth and the "righteous" shall die never. But this resurrection is confined to Pal and does not include the unrighteous. For Dnl 12 2 see below.

In fact, resurrection for the righteous only was thought of much more naturally than a general resurrection. And still more naturally

2. The for resurrection of martyrs was thought Resurrection of, such simply receiving back what they had given up for God. See En 90 33 (prior to 107 BC) and 2 Macc 7 9 11. 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 forms exist. Early passages are En 91 10 (perhaps pro-Mac-

3. The Un- reservoir for , a motive for the idea in I Macc 12 13, for such men the 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. There is no such motive in the NT; there is not very common, and XII P, Test. Benj. 10 7 8 (Gr text); Bar 50 2; En 51 1; Sob Or 4 178 90; Life of Adam (Gr) 10, and 2 Esd 6 45; 7 32; 14 35 about account for all the unequivocal passages. It is not in the Talmud and Rabbis were uncertain.

4. Complete It is esp. interesting that the very Denial spiritual author of 2 Esd did not think it worth while to modify the categorically 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 £; Acts 23 8), with an extreme conservatism often found among aristocrats.

III. Teaching of Christ.—The question is discussed extensively for the first time in Mk 12 18 27; Mt 22 23 33; Lk 20 27 38. 1. Mk 12: The Sadducees assumed that resurrection means that a person's soul is a single entity, and in the intermediate state soul, without a body. Hence there follows not only the truth of the resurrection, but a resurrection to a state so far above the sexual sphere that this and the angels. (The possibility of mutual recognition by husband and wife is irrelevant, nor is it even said that the resurrection bodies are sexual.) Luke (20 36) adds the explanation 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 in the Sermon on the Mount.

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 13:22; 16:25. But, as a feature in the Judgment, the resurrection of all men is taught. Then the sedom, Tyre, Nineveh appear (Mt 11:22-24; 12:41-42 | Lk 10:14; 11:32), and those cast into Gehenna, are represented as having a body (Mt 9:43-47; Mt 25:30; 10:28; 18:9). 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 pious with their whole heart, they alone are able to conquer the impulses of the flesh, believing patriarchs who, as men, Isaac, Jacob and the patriarchs (16:25). It is distinctly possible that God's love works 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 ruled out; more probably the passages in 4 Mac influenced Luke's Gr phraseology. See Maccabees, Book of, IV.

IV. The Apostolic Doctrine. — For the apostles, Christ's victory over death brought the resurrection doctrine out of the realm of speculative eschatology. Henceforth it is a fact of experience, basic for Christianity. Direct references in the NT are found in Acts 2:17; 18:32; 23:6; 24:15; 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; Col 1:18; 1 Thess 4:13-18; 2 Tim 2:18; He 6:2; 11:19.35; Rev 20:5 (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 the believer so that every resurrection follows from His (esp. Doctrine Rom 6:5-11; Phil 3:10.11). Every deliverance from danger is a foretaste of the resurrection (2 Cor 4:10.10). 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 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 15:38-41). 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 in its sowning and after it is grown! (Lk 12:17.) Just so, I am "seed" or "sown" in the world (probably not "buried") with one kind of body, but my resurrection will see me with a body adapted to my life with Christ and God (vs 42-44). If I am still alive at the Parousia, this new body shall be clearly mine (vs 53-55; 2 Cor 5:2-4). otherwise 1 shall be raised in it (ver 52). This body exists already in the heavens (2 Cor 5:1.2), and when it is clothes upon me the natural functions of the present body will be dispossessed (1 Cor 13:12). But, a mark for refraining from impurity is to keep undressed the body that is to rise (1 Cor 13:14).

The relation of the matter in the present body to that in the resurrection body was a question St. Paul never raised. In 1 Cor 13:14 it appears that he thought of the body as something more than the sum of its organs, for the organs perish, but the body is raised. Nor does he discuss the eventual fate of the dead body. The imagery of 1 Thes 4:16.17; 1 Cor 15:52 is that of leaving the graves, and in the case of Christ's resurrection, the type of ours, that which was buried was that which was raised (1 Cor 15:4). Perhaps the thought is that the touch of the resurrection body destroys all things in the old body that are unadapts to the new state; perhaps there is an idea that the essence of the old body is what we might call "non-material," so that decay simply anticipates the work the resurrection will do. At all events, such reflections are "beyond what is written.

A parallel to the idea of the resurrection body being already in heaven is found in Slav. En 22.8:9, where the soul "receives whatever is laid up for it" (cf Aoe. 7:22-25, especially Rev 6:11). But Christ also speaks of a reward being already in heaven (Mt 5:12). A more important question is the time of the clothing in 2 Cor 1:1-5. A group of scholars (Heinrici, Schmoller, Haermann, Clemens, Charles, etc.) consider that St. Paul has here changed his views from those of 1 Cor; that he now considers the resurrection body to be assumed immediately at death, and that translate vs 2:3 "we groan [at the burdens of life], longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven": because, when we shall be clothed with it, we shall have no more nakedness to experience (Weizsäcker's tr of the NT). But 2 Cor would have been a most awkward place to announce a change of views, for it was written in part as a defence against inconsistency (1:17, etc.). The willingness to be absent from the body (5:8) loses all its point if another and better body is to be given at once. The grammatical reasons for the interpretation above (best sustained by Heinrici) seem to leave the text to read the verse something that simply is not there. Consequently it is far better to follow the older interpretation of Meyer (B. Weiss, Bousset, Lietzmann, Bachmann, Mezies, etc; Bachmann is esp. good) and the obvious sense of the passage: St. Paul dreads being left naked by death, but finds immediate consolation at the thought of being with Christ, and eventual consolation at the thought of the body to be received at the Parousia. (In Phil 1:21-24 this idea is expressed in the thought: 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 after death and is with Christ.

1. NT Data But it is lacking in something that will make this body a body like to that of Christ. 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: 25) and the process of nutrition (1 Cor 6: 11). 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 unrighteous are raised for the final vindication of God and the defeat of the Adversary. Two 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 also Last Judgment.

2. Interpretation. 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 a consequence, opponents have almost always concentrated their attacks, and Christians have centered their defense, upon it. It is therefore of the utmost importance to give attention to the subject, as it appears in the NT. There are several converging lines of evidence, and none can be overlooked. Each must have its place and weight. The issues at stake are so serious that nothing must be omitted.

The first proof is the life of Jesus Christ. It is always a disappointment when a life which commenced well finishes badly. We have this feeling even in fiction; instinct demands that a story should end well. Much more is this true of Jesus Christ. This perfect life characterized by Divine claims ends in its prime in a cruel and shameful death. Is that a fitting close? Surely death could not end everything after such a noble career. The Gospels give the resurrection as the completion of the picture of Jesus Christ. There is no real doubt that Christ anticipated His own resurrection. At first He used only vague terms, such as, “Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.” But later on He spoke plainly, and whenever He mentioned His death, He added, “The Son of man . . . must be raised the third day.” These references are too numerous to be overlooked, and, in spite of difficulties of detail, they are, in any proper treatment of the Gospels, an integral part of the claim made for Himself by Jesus Christ (Mt 12: 38–40; 16: 21; 17: 9.23; 20: 19; 27: 63; Mk 8: 31; 9: 33.1; 10: 34; 14: 58; Lk 9: 22; 18: 33; Jn 2: 19–21). His victory is at stake if He did not rise. Surely the presentation as a word of such value, that it was a testiment of itself. This is of the utmost weight. We are therefore compelled to face the facts that the resurrection of which the Gospels speak is the resurrection of no ordinary man, but of Jesus—that is of One whose life and character had been unique, and for whose noble death no proper explanation was conceivable (Deane, Jesus and the Gospel, 122f.). It is possible that, in view of His perfect truthfulness of word and deed, there should be such an anti-climax as is involved in a denial of His assurance that He would rise again (C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection, 30)? Consider, too, the death of Christ in the light of His perfect life. If that death was the close of a life so beautiful, so remarkable, so Godlike, we are faced with an insoluble mystery—the permanent triumph of wrong over right, of evil over good, of falsehood over truth or justice in the world (C. H. Robinson, op. cit., 36). So the resurrection is not to be regarded as an isolated event, a fact in the history of Christ separated from all else. It must be taken in close connection with the previous events; and the solution of the problem is to be found in that estimate of Christ which “most entirely fits in with the totality of the facts” (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 14).

Another line of proof is the fact of the empty grave and the disappearance of the body. That Jesus died was buried, and that the tomb in the morning was empty, is not now seriously
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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 placed Empty before it. 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 Christ's 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 of the hair of the body and the 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 (compare IV of Foundations, 216; Tertullian, On Christ, 14, 64; Strauss, The Resurrection Master; Expos T, XIII, 293 f; XIV, 510). How, too, is it possible to account for the failure of the Jews to prove the resurrection? Not more than seven weeks afterward Peter preached in that city the fact that Jesus had not been taken away; the grave-clothes were easier or more conclusive than for the Jews to 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 (Pourtau, Resurrection, 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 we are still left to accept a mystery. And 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 when 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 should have had such a vivid 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 appearance 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 are left with the theory 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. Psychological 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 and obvious. If Jesus, even though we are quite sure that He who died now lives and reigns. It is sometimes said that faith is not bound up with holding a particular view of the relations of Christ's present glory with the body that was recorded when we are told that He 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 facts, and it would be "agnostic" about the historical facts of Christian faith to be "agnostic" with regard to the facts about the empty tomb and the risen body, which are so prominent in the NT, and which form an essential part of the apostolic witness. The attempt to set faith and historical evidence in opposition to each other, which is so marked a characteristic of modern thought, will never satisfy general Christian intelligence, and if there is to be any real belief in the historical character of the NT, it is impossible to be "agnostic" about facts that are so large and obvious 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 empty tomb is not adequate and accepted by all. And so we come again to the insuperable barrier of the empty tomb, which, together with the apostolic witness, stands impregnable against all the attacks of vision-al and apocalyptic theories. It is becoming more evident that these theories are entirely inadequate to account for the records in the Gospels, as well as for the place and power of those Gospels in the early church and in all subsequent ages. The force of the evidence for the empty grave and the disappearance of the body is clearly seen by the explanations suggested by various modern writers (those of Oscar Holtzmann, K. Lake, and A. Meyer can be seen in Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, ch. viii, and that of Revile in C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection of Christ, 69; see also art. by Streeter in Foundations). Not one of these is tenable without doing violence to the Gospel story, and also without putting forth new theories which are not only improbable in themselves, but are without a shred of real historical or literary evidence. The one objection which baffles all these writers is the empty grave.

Others suggest that resurrection means a real objective appearance of the risen Christ, without implying any physical reanimation, that "the resurrection of Christ was an objective reality, but was
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 identical appearance as that which was seen in the tomb, 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 evidence? They evidently recognized their Master, and this recognition must have been due to some familiarity with His bodily appearance. No difficulty of conceiving of 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 insurmountable 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 transcend our experience (as the two similes 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 blood” (Acts 13:31) may suggest that the resurrection body was not constituted upon a natural basis through blood, but that it possessed “all things pertaining to a rational 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 first appearances of the body of Christ. We only seek for 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 in the same body which had been placed in the tomb was disposed of. Does not this theory demand a new miracle of its own (Kneen, 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 incredulous but convinced, 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 thoughts and characters. Three days afterwards a legend to spring up which should affect them. There 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 because they were in the tradition 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.

4. Fourth Proof: "There is no doubt that the church of Existence of the apostles believed in the resurrection the Primitive History and Its Transmission, 74.) Church of their Lord" (Burkitt, The Gospel may be admitted on attention that the church of Christ came into existence as the result of a belief in the resurrection of Christ. When we consider its commencement, as recorded in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, we are not surprised that the Christian society was gathered together by preaching; (2) the substance of the preaching was the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was put to death on a cross, and would therefore be rejected by Jews as an accursed God (De 21:23). Yet multitudes 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 2:23), for nothing short of it could have brought the Jewish adversaries of 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 their own will and gave an 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 uncertain about 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).

One man in the apostolic church must, however, be singled out as a special witness to the resurrection. The conversion and work of Saul of Tarsus is one of the next line of proof must be first called to the evidence of his life and writ- ing in relation to the resurrection. Some years ago an article appeared (E. Medley, Expos, V, 359), inquiring as to the conception of the resurrection which would be suggested to a heathen inquirer by a perusal of Paul. It is most extant writings. The point at least would stand out clearly—that Jesus Christ was killed (15; 4 14) and was raised from the dead (4:14). As this Ep. is usually dated about AD 61—that is, only about 22 years after the resurrection—and as the same Ep. plainly attributes the conversion of God in relation to men (1:16; 2:23; 3:11), we can really see the force of this testimony to the resurrection. Then a few years later, in another Ep., which was accepted as one of St. Paul’s, we have a much fuller reference to the event. In the well-known passage (15:3-11) where he is contrasted to Paul (not Christ’s resurrection, but) the resurrection of Christians, he naturally adds Christ’s resurrection as his own testimony to the former. I give 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 delivered unto you first of all that you might receive that Christ was found for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he was seen of them after that he (2 Cor 15:3 f.) raised from the dead 40 days according to the scriptures (1 Cor 15:3 f.). This, as it has often been pointed out, is our earliest authority for the appearance of the resurrection. It is part of the teaching which he taught that ‘Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he was raised again the third day according to the scriptures’ (Kennett, Interpreter, V. 267). And this passage, if I may say so, is a line of testimony to which we have a right to draw the same conclusion. That within a very few years of the time of the crucifixion of Christ, and to the evidence of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, we have in the mind of at least one man of education, absolutely irrefutable (Kennett, op. cit., V. 267).

Besides, we find this narrative includes one small but significant statement which at once recalls a very definite feature of the Gospel tradition—the mention of the "third day." A reference to the passage in the Gospels where Jesus Christ spoke of His resurrection will show how prominent and persistent was the mention of "third day." Why, then, should St. Paul have introduced it in his account of the Resurrection? Part of the teaching which he taught was that He ‘rose again the third day according to the scriptures’. It bears absolute testimony to the empty tomb? From all this it may be argued that St. Paul believed the story of the resurrection to be a "date when the collection fresh, when he could examine it for himself, when he could make the fullest possible inquiry of others, and when he himself was interested in seeing that it was made impossible for the adherents of Jesus Christ to maintain that that was not absolutely true. "Surely common sense requires us to believe that for which he was so passionately convinced beyond the possibility of doubt" (Kennett, op. cit., V. 271).

In view, therefore, of St. Paul's personal testimony to his own interview with those who had seen Christ on earth before and after His resurrection, and the prominence given to the "third day" in the Gospels, we may very reasonably address ourselves to the evidence for the resurrection. It is well known to Dr. Lyttelton and to Dr. Gibert West that Oxford University at the close of one academic year, certain drawing up again to give attention respectively during the long vacation to the conversion of St. Paul and the resurrection of Jesus, in order to prove the baseness of both. They met again in the autumn and compared experiences. Lord Lyttelton had become convinced of the truth of St. Paul's conversion, and Gilbert West of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If, therefore, Paul's 25 years of suffering and service for Christ were a reality, his conversion was true, for everything he did began with that sudden change. And if his conversion was true, Jesus Christ rose from the dead. Paul was saved and he attributed to the sight of the risen Christ.

The next line of proof is that in the Gospels of the appearances of the risen Christ, and it is the most important as to the primary and major evidence. We must get behind them if we are to appreciate fully the force and variety of the evidence. It is for this reason that, following the proper logical order, we have rejected the last observation of the post-resurrection appearances of the risen Christ as given in the Gospels. The point is one of great importance (Demney, Jesus and the Gospel, 111).

Now, with this made clear, we proceed to the consideration of the accounts of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ. Modern criticism of the Gospels during recent years has tended to adopt the view of Swinburne, and that it is the source of our present evidence. It is not a question of the "one solid result" (W. S. Stone, "The Resurrection," 1CC, Preface, viii: Burkitz, The Gospel History, 37) of the literal criticism of the Gospels. If this is so, the question of the records of the resurrection is a different problem from the problem about the supposed lost ending of Mk, which, according to modern criticism, would thus close without any record of the appearances of the risen Christ. In this period, however, two things may be said at the present juncture:

(1) There are some indications that the entire question of the criticism of the Gospels is to be opened (Ramsey, St. Luke the Physician, ch. II: "The Evidence of Jesus, 63f."). (2) Even if the current theory be accepted, it would not seem the case that the intrinsic value of the records of the appearances of the risen Christ be undermined. Mark does not invent or "doctor" his material, but embodies the common apostolic tradition of his time (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 62).

We may, therefore, meanwhile examine the record of the appearances without finding them essentially affected by any particular theory of the origin and relations of the Gospels. There are two sets of appearances and altogether in Galilee and beyond. In each, the number and their amplitude and weight of their testimony should be carefully estimated.

While we are precluded from space from examining each appearance minutely, and indeed it is unnecessary for our purpose if we 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 far as the former is concerned it carries with it, as great literary critics have pointed out, the deepest inward evidences of its own literal truthfulness. For it narrates the intercourse of a 'risen God' with commonplace men as to set natural and supernatural modes of witness, for these are made impossible. To do this has always been the difficulty, the despair of imagination. The alternative has been put reasonably thus: St. Luke was either a greater poet, a more creative genius, than Shakespeare, or—he has not been a poet at all. He had an advantage over Shakespeare. The ghost in Hamlet was an effort of laborious imagination. The risen Christ on the road was a fact supreme, and the Evangelist did but tell it as it was" (Bishop Moule, Meditations for the Church, Year, 108).

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 two facts which are shown in 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 of 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 likely that the account might have been rejected for lack of support. It is well known that the weight of eyewitnesses is often very strong, 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 has shown the difficult problem of the "lost ending" of Mk, which, according to modern criticism, would thus close without any record of the appearances of the risen Christ. In this period, however, two things may be said at the present juncture:

"..."
7. Summary and Conclusion

The prima facie view of the evidence afforded by the New Testament suggests a miracle and that the miracles 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).

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 resurrection is "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. "A false Personality would be a miracle in time." A rising out of this, Christianity itself was unique, inaugurating a new era in human affairs. No Christian, 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 a priori view is impossible. Are we to refuse to allow to God at least as much liberty as we possess ourselves? Is the spontaneity of action on the part of God impossible? 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 Babylonian 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 in their work of historical and worthy of the charge. The whole idea is arbitrary and baseless, and prejudiced by the attitude to the supernatural. There is no hint of 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 expression of Christianity today is the resurrection of Christ. Thomistic and Humean critics (G. F. Wells), 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 hammering of criticism has never 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 of the Resurrection

affords a strong confirmation of the fact itself, for it seems incredible that such varied and important truths should not rest on historic fact. The doctrine may briefly be summarized:

1. evidentiary. The resurrection is the thing which provides the atoning character of the death of Christ, and of His Deity and Divine exaltation (Rom 1:4); (2) evangelistic: the primitive gospel included testimony to the resurrection as one of its characteristic features, thereby proving to the hearts and consciences 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 and experience springs from, or is ratified thereby (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 fulness of NT teaching concerning the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ.

LITERATURE.—OTT. The Resurrection of Jesus, 1908; W. J. Sparrow Simpson, The Resurrection and Modern Thought; Webster's, The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection. Very full literary references in Bowen, The Resurrection in the NT, 1911, which, although negative in its conclusions, sets forth with careful consideration of many negative arguments.

W. H. GIFFORD THOMAS

RETAIL, ré-tāl'—Several Heb words are thus transliterated: ἄπειρον, ἀπέλευσα, "to hold fast" (Jgs 7:8; 19:4; Job 2:9 AV "hold fast"); Mic 7:18; τήρῳ, "to shut up" (only in Dn 10:8; 11:6); τήρου, τάρακ σα, "to hold" (Prov 3:18; 4:27; 11:16 AV "obtain"); in one case κατά, "to hold" (Dcr 8:8). In the NT πάρειν, krateō, is used in Jn 20:23 of the "retaining" of sins by the apostles (see Retention of Sins); in Rom 1:28, AV has "refused to have," m "G·, did not approve," for AV "did not like to retain" (echō); and in Philm ver 13, substitutes "fain have kept" for "retained" (katebēō). Sir 41:16 has "retain" for diaphulassō, "keep."

RETAILATION, ré-tāl-lā'shun, ré-tā'—See Law in the NT; Punishments; Retribution.

RETENTION, ré-tên'shun, of SINS (κρατης, krateō, "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 unauthorised 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, there must be an assurance, given by the minister in the personal dealing of a pastor with a communicant, preparatory to the reception of the Lord's Supper. As the abolition is properly an assurance by an individual forgiveness, so the retention is an assurance of individual moral condition and the retention is exercised by the ministry. Not as an order, but as the representatives of the congregation of believers to whom grace is given, may we open it, with the advice given by Alford in his Test. on above passage. See also Malmuthon, Appendix to the "Schmalkald Articles." H. E. JACOBS

RETRIBUTION, ret-ri-bu'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 Orbit and Ormon
7. Instances of Use of Greek Words for "Vengeance"
8. Words Used with Confidence
9. Judgment Implies Retribution
10. Moral Sense Demands Vindication of God's Righteousness
11. Scripture Indicates Certainty of Vindication

LITERATURE

The word as applied to the divine administration is not used in Scripture, but undoubtedly the idea is commonly enough expressed. The word means which God's wrath is "righteous" attributed to God; ἐκδίκεω, ἐκδίκης, ἐκδίκησις, ἐκδίκω, ἔκδίκωσις, and ἔκδικος, ἔκδικησις, "punishment"; besides στίγμα, κτίσω, κτίσα, 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 judgment the righteous judgment 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 sternest 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 infirmity 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 come into the light of natural theology, we find that all deductions from the particular fections of God, as revealed in His works, combined with a consideration of man's sin and want of harmony with the covenant, lead 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 habits which it is a matter of keeping 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 grace. 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 grace does not come to all, in the same degree of saving grace. 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 in their sins, with the added guilt of rejecting the offered grace. "Except ye believe that I am he," said 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 suggestive power that the Hebrew word 'awon 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. And, due consideration of the case, the fact 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 within the sphere of the Divine wrath. For in 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.

6. In the Scriptures applied to the doom of sinners all imply Divine displeasure, punitive action, retribution. The two outstanding Gr words for "wrath," ἐρήμωσις and θυμος, are both freely applied to God. Ἐρήμωσις indicates settled displeasure, whereas θυμός is rather the burning out of the 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 sinned 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 men" ( Jn 3 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 the same passage Paul has quite a characteristic; 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 this 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 the day and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom 2 3-5). God "visiteth with wrath" (1 Th 1 10).

In Rom 4 15 the apostle shows that "the law worketh wrath" (i.e. brings down the Divine displeasure), while in 6 9 he shows that believers are saved from wrath—undoubted wrath of God. The other two instances are in 2 29 when men are "the children of wrath" ( Eph 2 3); surely not "wrathful children," but liable to the wrath of God, and because of evil deeds cometh "the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience" ( Eph 5 6; Col 3 6). Christ "delivereth us from the wrath to come" (1 Thes 1 10); wrath has come upon the opposing Jews (2 16); but believers are not appointed unto wrath (6 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 "Paul teaches that; hence the only way for him out of the difficulty is to reject Paul's teaching as unauthoritative. Other references to the "wrath of God" are in He 12 13; 4 13; 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. Θυμος 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 unanswerable, the blazing forth of the wrath; in the last two passages it is in passages in combination with ἐρήμωσις, and is rendered "fierceness," the fierceness of His wrath.

Ερήμωσις, which means to avenge, is twice used of God (Rev 6 10; 19 2); and ψαλίδωμα, "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: ἐρήμωσις, "wrath," is used in application to God (1 Thes 4 6); δίκαιος, "judgment" or "vengeance" is twice used of God (2 Thess 1 9; Jude ver 7). All of these terms shows that the punishment inflicted on sinful men is simply punishment upon the vindicatory 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 affliction 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 παρεισπάντης and πανικωδής, and they are frequently used of the "chastisement of earners, but not of the impenitent. It is often claimed that the word κακοσμίας used in Mt 26 46 carries the idea of chastisement of the chaste for the removal of the offender, but although Aristotle in comparing poison to wine, "there is no reason to suppose that it is meant for the removal of the offender (what he really says is that it is not given to the sick, but to the living" it "has the punished one in view," whereas Aristotle in toxic is "harsh and severe but moderate" "the punishment of the living" "he may be satisfied")", the usage even in classical Gr is predominantly against making the supposed distinction. Reasons given by the leading classical authors, including Aristotle himself, and it is certainly clear that the thought of betterment can be in question, while all admit that in Hellenistic Gr the distinction is not maintained, and in any case ἐρήμωσις 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 26 27: "The Son shall glorify Me 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 amazing rightness of God's righteous conduct. 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 unhappy; and sometimes 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 the natural, 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 13:73; the Psalmist has before him all the puzzling elements of the human problem; the sporadic, isolated, and aggressive propensity of the wicked, the non-success, the oppression, the misery of the righteous; he is well-nigh overwhelmed by the contemplation, and nearly loses his footing on the eternal verities, until he carries the whole problem into the light of God's presence and revelation, and then he understands that the end will bring the true solution.

Some such sadder and more somber ruminations of the Prescher upon the contradictions and anomalies and mysteries of human life, "under the sun," close in the reflection which throws its searchlight upon all the blackness: "This is the end of the matter: . . . Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Eccl 12:13). In the light of the same truth, the apostles labored, believing that when the Lord comes He "will bring both to light the counsels of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts" (1 Cor 4:5). The more fully the subject is considered, the more we must feel that for the vindication of righteousness, the justification of the Divine procedure, the rectification of the spirit of the age, the vindication of mysteries, the reward and triumph of the righteous and the confession and punishment of the wicked, a great final, retributive judgment is Scriptural, necessary, necessary.

Literature.—See acts. or Penitent, Everlasting Judgment; Sheol, etc. and works cited there.

Archibald McCaig

Reu, ru'ân (רָעָן), rû'ân; Ru'ôn; Reuôn: A son of Peleg, a descendant of Shem (Gen 11:18 ff.; 1 Ch 1:25; Lk 3:35).

Reuben, rōôben, rû'ûn (רֹעֶן), rû'ûn; Reôwûn, Rhôâbôn: The eldest son of Jacob, born to him by Leah in Padan-aram (Gen 19:39). It is the Eldest Son two derivations of the name. As it stands in MT it means "beloved of a son"; but the reason given for so calling him is "the Lord hath looked upon my affliction," which in Heb is ru'ôn, "he hath looked on the bane." In 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 Num 1:52, 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 brothers (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 chivalrous qualities. Jacob seems to have appreciated these, and, perhaps, therefore all the more deeply lamented the lapse that spoiled his life (Gen 49:3). 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 asked 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 (46:1ab).

The incidents recorded are received 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 cohesion 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 2. Tribal History.

The Reubenite among the spies was Shammus ben Zaccur (13:4). It is possible that the conspiracy against Moses organized by Reuben, Simeon and Gad, 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 (Deut 1:11). Mention of mysterious "the reward and triumph of the righteous and the confession and punishment of the wicked, a great final, retributive judgment is Scriptural, necessary, necessary.

2. Tribal History. NUMEROS. The standard of the camp of Reuben was that of the family of Shem, the first son, in the tabernacle; and with him were Simeon and Gad; the total number of fighting men in this division being 151,450. Tg Pseudojoh 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). The prince of the tribe was Elizur ben Shedeur, whose oblation is described in 7:30 ff. The Reubenites among the spies was Shammus ben Zaccur (13:4). It is possible that the conspiracy against Moses organized by Reuben, Simeon and Gad, 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 (Deut 1:11). Moses' "mind be traced in his "blessing," wishing for the continuance of the tribe, indeed, but not in great strength (Dt 33:6)? This was a true forecast of the tribal history.

When the high plateau E. of the Dead Sea and the Jordan fell into the hands of the Israelite invaders, these spacious pastoral uplands irresistibly attracted the great flock-masters of Reuben and Gad, two tribes destined to be neighbors during succeeding centuries. At their earnest request Moses allowed them their tribal possessions here subject to one condition, which they loyally accepted. They should not "sit here," and so discourage their brethren who went to war beyond the Jordan. They should provide for the security of their cattle, fortify cities to protect their little ones and their wives from the inhabitants of the land, and their men of war should go before the host in the campaign of conquest until the children of Israel should take possession. The conditions of inheritance (Nu 32:1-27). Of the actual part they took in that warfare there is no record, but perhaps "the stone of Bohan the son of Reuben" (Josh 15:6; 18:17) marked some memorable deed of valor by a member of the tribe. At the end of the campaign the men of Reuben, having earned the gratitude of the western tribes, enriched by their share of the spoils of the enemy, returned with honor to their new home. Along with their brethren of Gad they felt the dangers attaching to their position of isolation, cut off from the rest of their people by the great cleft of the Jordan valley. They reared therefore the massive altar of Ed in the valley, so that in the very throat of that instrument of severance there might be a perpetual witness to themselves and to their children of the fate that befell the Reubenites. But many tribes misunderstood the action and, dreading religious schism, gathered in force to stamp it out. Explanations followed which were entirely satisfactory, and a threatening danger was averted (Josh 22).

It is possible that the tribal history of Reuben, which, as subsequent history was to prove, the Jordan valley was but one of many causes of sundering. The whole circumstances and conditions of life on the E. differed widely from those on the W. of the river, pastoral pursuits and life in the open being contrasted with agricultural and city life.
The land given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben reached from the Arnon, Wady el-Mo'ib, in the S., to the border of Gad in the N. In Nu 32:34 Gad gave to Reuben a tract which lay far S., Aroer being on the very top of the Arnon; but they probably were probably to be taken as an enclave in the territory of Reuben. From Josh 13:15ff 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 is itself the western boundary, and it marched 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 Aroer was in the hands of the Reubenites, "and even unto the entrance of the wilderness from the river Euphrates" (1 Ch 5:8f). 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 5:15ff). Already apparently the sunsetting influence was taking effect. They are not excepted, however, from "all the tribes of Israel" that 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 invasions 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 Jeth 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" (5:19ff). Along with Gad and Maassah they sent 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" (12:37f). Among David's mighty men was Adish'az, 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" (26:22). Perhaps in spite of the help given to David the Reubenites had never quite got over their old loyalty 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 Mesopotamia, and cut 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 causes 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 northem tribes, and were numbered as suffering in the invasion of Hazael during the reign of Jehu (2 K 10:32f). 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 Hara, and to the river of Gozan" (1 Ch 5:25f).

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 march of Israel is taken by Judah, a fact referred to in the blessing of Jacob (Gen 48:6). Ezechiel finds a place for Reuben in his picture of restored Israel (48:6). He appears also—in this case preceded by Judah only—in Rev 7:5.

REUBENITES, רְוֶּבֶן-יִשְׂרָאֵל (טֹּם־יֵשָׂרֵאֵל), כֹּחַ־רְעָה־כָּנָה; שְׁעֹלָה פַּעַמְיָה, דֶּנְמוֹ רַבּוּבָה: 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, רֵוְעֵל (רֵוֶּעְּל), רְעֵאל, "God is his friend"; LXX Παυσόφης, Ραγουόλ: (1) In the genealogical system Reuel is both a son of Esau by Basemat (Gen 36:4; 10.13; 17; 1 Ch 1:35); and the father of the father-in-law of Moses, Hobab (Nu 10:29). In the account of the marriage of Zipporah to Moses (Ex 2:16-21) Jethro seems to be called Reuel (of Hobab). 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," "HCO," and Hobab is a member of the clan ("son") of Reuel (Nu 10:29 AV reads "Raguel"). (2) The father of Eliasuaph, the prince of Gad (Nu 2:14), called (by some copyists' mistake) "D'uel" in 1:14; 7:42-47; 19:29. LXX has uniformly Ragouol.

(3) A Benjamite (1 Ch 9:8).

REUMAH, רְוֶּמָה (רַם), רִעֲמָה: The confluence of Nahor (Gen 24:24).


LITERATURE I. The Nature of Revelation.—The religion of the Bible is a frankly supernatural religion. By this 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 history by means of which man might be rescued from his sin and brought to the end destined for him. 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 (Deut 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 Jeh had chosen it, not it Him, and that Jeh'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 Jeh; 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; cf Rom 4:13), the bringing together again of the whole earth under the glorious reign of Jeh, and the reversal of the curse under which the whole world lay for its sin (Gen 12:3). Meanwhile, however, Jeh was known only in Israel. To Israel God showed His word and made known His statutes and judgments and after this fashion He dealt with no other nation; and therefore none other knew His judgments (Ps 147:19f). 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, manifestly, as the religion of 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 presents itself as 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, but He has also to come to Him 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 He 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 the hardness of their sin-disposed hearts (Rom 3:19,20), 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 been thus held down to the utmost ignorance and have refused to have God in their knowledge (so it is intimidated); 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 communicates to men. Revelation openly makes to all men: by it His essence and Divine attributes are known. And there is the revelation which He makes exclusively to His chosen people: through it their saving grace is made known. Both species or stages of revelation are insisted upon throughout the Scriptures. They are, as we have seen, 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 1-4). "The law of Jeh is perfect, restoring the soul" (ver 7). "Thy word is more precious than gold, more than choice gold" (ver 8). Each of these provides its own revelation, and that divine revelation which is provided for the chosen people in the OT, in the Psalms, is brought forward in appropriate terms in the NT, and is indeed, as the Apostle Paul teaches us, the beginning here from the praise of the glory of God, 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 easy, however, to arrive at the more full-throated praise of the mercy of Jeh, 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 exultation: "O Jeh, my rock, and my redeemer" (ver 14). "The heavens, components Lord Bacon, "indeed tell of the glory of God, but not of His will according to which the poet prays to be pardoned and sanctified." In so concluding, Lord Bacon touches the exact point of distinction between the two species or stages of revelation, which is 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 intimate knowledge of 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 disarmed sinners from their sin and its consequences. By grace through the blood of Jesus Christ, who delivered them from 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 interaction. 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 species 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 new mode of revelation was an entire break, a complete and unqualified introduction, 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 was created. 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 here distinguish revelation as the many-sided, all-embracing, all-inclusive doctrine of God, His being, and His attributes, as a single fact; and revelation as special revelation, as a particular presentation of one of the 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 fundamental knowledge of the mighty, good 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 itself 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 clearness of vision, and lived with Him in the untroubled depths of his heart with a trustful intimacy of association, inseparable from sinners. Nevertheless the revelation of God in Eden was not merely “natural.” Not only does the proposition of the forbidden fruit involve man's redemption (Rom 5:15-21; 1 John 1:2-4; 2:1), but the whole history implies an immediacy of intercourse with God which cannot be set to the credit of the picturesque, swift, and spontaneous 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 entered with Him immediately, and by a mediatory communion. In that case, we may understand that if man had not fallen, he would have lived in Redemption, in the presence with God, and that the cessation of this immediate intercourse is due to sin. It is not the “iniquity” from which man is rooted in sin, but, if we may be allowed the expression, the specialness of sin and its consequences which is represented as the fallen, lost, helpless man would have continued to lie about him through all his history, as it lay about his infancy; even man himself having had it in himself from the very beginning of speech with Him. Man having fallen, 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 darkness in order to reveal the guidance of the way of life. By slow steps and gradual stages He at once works out His saving purpose and molds the world for its reception of Him, of His new man, and of His new life for the world. He talked with Adam and Eve until the enforcement of those hard laws, and He talked with Abraham until 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 that He abandoned His world and left it to foster 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 effects in every age, as to constitute an 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 required;" 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 attain under the providence of Nature, 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 world 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 and new, and very different, 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 moeks and corners of the heathen world, conditioning and vitalizing the natural revelation of God all accessible, we have no means of estimating. Neither is it easy to measure the extent of God's special communication to His people upon men outside the bounds of Judaeism, but coming into contact with, this chosen people, or sharing with them a common natural inheritance. Lot and Ishmael and Esau can scarcely have been wholly ignorant of the word of God which came to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and of the part of the covenant whose bonds God wrenched His people with a mighty arm fall to learn something of Jeh, any more than the mixed multitude who witnessed the ministry of Christ could fail to infer something from His gracious walk and mighty works. Not natural light gave them a conception of the nation which was intimately associated with Israel's life could remain entirely without the supernatural light by which what whatever impressions were thus conveyed reached apparently individuals only: the heathen which surrounded Israel, even though ignorant of the word of God, the heathen which remained heathen; they had no revelation. In the special instance of the case when the word of God and its object, its natural communication—such as the dreams sent to Abimelech (Gen 20) and to Pharaoh (Gen 40, 41) and
to Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2:17) and to the soldier in the camp of Midian (Jgs 7:16)—it was in the interests, not of the heathen world, of the chosen people that they were sent; and these instances derive their significance wholly from the fact that they remain, no matter how the marvelous figure of Melchizedek, perhaps also of Jethro, and the strange apparition of Balaam, who also, however, stood in the sacred narrative only in connection with the history of God's dealings with His people and in the unexplained apparition occasioned by their acts; in any event avail to modify the general fact that the life of the heathen peoples lay outside the supernatural revelation, and that the prophets were suffered to walk in their own ways (Acts 14:16).

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 Bible 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 given only to a select few, thus 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 general, natural revelation as thus to give the true idea of the progressive and methodical way in which God grafts itself in His grace only progressively; or, to be more explicit, through the process of a historical development. Such is, however, the ordinary mode of the Divine working: it is so that God makes the world know Him, by the grace which He bestows on 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 almost impossible not to connect the thought of as simply their reflection 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 Bible 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 from the beginning sufficient to enable people to live by it. Revelation. The series of the redemptive acts of God, accordingly, can properly be designated "revelation" only when and as far as they are contemplated as adapted and designed to produce knowledge of God and of His redemptive method. No less 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 grace, to lead men to the experience of the Divine grace, which is one of the means by which this main design of the redemptive acts of God is attained. But this only renders it the more necessary that the proximate result of producing knowledge should not fail; and it is doubtless for this reason that the series of redemptive acts of God has not been left to explain itself, but the explanatory word has been added to it. Revelation thus appears, however, not as the mere reflection of the redemptive acts of God, but as a factor in the redemptive work of God, a component part of the series of His redeeming acts, without which that series would be incomplete and so far imperative for its main end. Thus the Scriptures represent it, not confounding revelation with the series of the redemptive acts of God, but placing it among the redemptive acts of God and giving it a function as a substantive element in the operations by which the world is saved. It must either have been made even a more constant accompaniment of the redemptive acts of God, giving their explanation that they may be understood. It occupies a far more independent place among them than this, and as frequently to give the revelation in such a way as it accompanies or follows them to interpret their meaning. It is, in one word, itself a redemptive act of God and by no means the least important in the series of His redemptive acts.

This might, indeed, have been inferred from its very nature, and from the nature of the salvation which was being wrought out by these redemptive acts of God. One of the most grievous of the effects of sin is the deformation of the image of God reflected in the human mind, and there can be no recovery from sin which does not bring with it the correction of this deformation and the reflection in the soul of man of the whole glory of the Lord God Almighty. Man is an intelligent being; his superiority over the brute is found, among other things, precisely in the direction of all his life by his intelligence; and his blessedness is rooted in the true knowledge of his God—for this is life eternal, that we should know the only true God and Him whom He has sent. Dealing with man as an intelligent being, He may be said to do so by means of a revelation, by which he has been brought into an ever more and more adequate knowledge of God, and been led ever more and more to do his part in working out his own salvation with fear and trembling as he perceived with ever more and more clearness how God is working it out for him through mighty deeds of grace.

This is not the place to trace, even in outline, from the material 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 Development, at the gate of Eden—to its completion by the advent and work of Christ and the teaching of His apostles; a steadily advancing 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 God's grace and the sake of human 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 of His redemptive method. No less series of unexplained acts can be thought, however,
which is the whole object of revelation. Three distinct steps in revelation have been discriminated from this point of view. They are distinguished primarily by the increasing independence of revelation of the deeds constituting apocalyptic as distinguished from 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 said to imply an exact interfacing, three generally successive stages of revelation 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 up as this Patriarchal age is characterized essentially as "the period of Outward 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. . . . 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, and by the downward way, 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; of pp. 12-14, 164 ff.) This internal method of revelation reaches its culmination in the NT period, which is predominantly 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 apostolic mode of 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 revelation, (2) internal suggestion, and (3) concrescent operation.

III. Modes of Revelation.—Theophany may be taken as the typical form of external manifestation; but by its side may be ranged the three modes of Revelation, as He 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 condition, (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 "concrescent operation" may be meant that form of revelation constituted in an inspired psalm or other history, in which no human activity not even the control of the will—is superceded, but the Holy Spirit works in, and through them all in such a manner as to communicate to the product qualities distinctly surpassing the human in their composition. It is thus the religion 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 of the revelations themselves. At the same time 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 human speech (even those we 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 that dreams rise from the natural relation to the fulness of the engagement of the mental activity of the recipient in her reception. But we should bear in mind that the intellectual or spiritual quality of a revelation is not derived from the recipient's previous spiritual excitation. 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 divers portions and in divers 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 prama facie view it may indeed seem likely that a difference of mode of giving the messages would inevitably obtain between revelations given through dreams and those through other organs. The completely supernatural character of revelations given in theophanies is obvious. He who makes His gracious purposes toward him, 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 men and things there is deeply seared, a purely supernatural communication. In these communications we are given accordingly just a series of "natural" forms of prophecy, and although the Patriarchal age were all revelations given in theophanies or objective communications. This is true of visions and visions, and revelations without explicit intention 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 Moses spoke to him's word when manifest, 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 it has seemed good to Him, to impress them in objective speech. Nevertheless, it is expressly made the characteristic form of the Prophecy 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 fulfilment of His promise (Dt
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Revelation 18:18), put His words in the mouths of His prophets and gave them His commandments to speak, Yet it would seem that the employment of men as instruments of revelation that the words of God given through them is, in effect, the same as His direct speech, but their minds and hearts as well—the play of their creative processes of the logical reasoning, or the tenacity of their memories, as, say, in a psalm or an epitome, or a history—the supernatural element is there. It may easily seem to retie itself farther into the background. It can scarcely be a mere formula will but as a revelation, has been raised as to the relation of the natural and the supernatural in such revelations, and, in many current manuals of the prophetic, the completeness of their supernatural has been limited and curtailed in the interests of the natural methodologies employed. The plausibility of such reasoning rests on the more necessary that we should observe the unvarying emphasis which the Scriptures place upon the absolute supernatural revelation in all sabbatical 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 instruments (Dt 18:18), and they are the greatest possible emphasis that the Divine word delivered through men is the pure word of God, diluted with no human admixture whatever.

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 point of dignity and favor, no suggestion whatever is made of any inferiority, in either the directness or the mouthpiece the purity of their supernaturality, 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 that the people 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 thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I 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 prophets therefore spoke 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; 59:21; 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 (2Sa 3.11), though, of course, the question may remain open as to the exact processes by which this 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 time of Jehovah did Moses declare that He 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 Hebrew name for "prophet" (nabi), whatever may be its etymology, means throughout the Scriptures just "spokesman," though not "spokesman" 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: That the mouth of Jehovah has spoken (for the brief "Jehovah said," see above). 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 forbears to prophesy, not according to his own will but the will of Jehovah: (Ezk 3:20.1) and creates for him the fruit of the lips (Isa 57:19; of 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 all that he proclaims is the pure word of Jehovah.

The fundamental passage does not quite leave the matter, however, with this general declaration. It describes the characteristic manner of the prophetic revelation (see below). Neither visions in the technical sense of that word, nor dreams, appear, however, to have been the conventional mode of revelation 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 sense "a vision, and a spoken word." 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 Jehovah, as is denounced as the "word of Jehovah." That it should be announced by the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," is, therefore, on that very ground that we expect to find for such a description of its process as: Jehovah ... wakens the ear to hear and the eyes to see open mine ears." (Isa 50:5). But this is not the way of speaking of their messages which is most usual in the usual. Rather is the whole body of prophecy cursorily presented as a thing seen. Isaiah places at the head of his book. "The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz ... as he saw." (Isa 29:10-11; Ob 1:2). And then proceeds to set at the head of subordinate sections the remarkable words, "The word of Jehovah came to me in visions of Jehovah's. His messages to His prophets as through the medium of visions and dreams.

4. Prophetic Form.
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views is the good one of doing full justice to the objec-
tive character of these revealed messages. Prophets;
and, indeed, we can see that these revelations took place entirely externally to the pro-
hets, that they stood off and contemplated them, or if they were impelled to verify them,
so violent as not only to supersede their mental activity but (for that very reason) to annihilate it—would be
quite clear that they came from a source other than the prophets’ own minds. It is undoubtedly the funda-
mental truth of the prophetic message that the whole activity has been given through them not their own but wholly God’s. The spirit that speaks through the prophecies is that same
spirit that speaks through the holy prophets (Ezk 13 3—17; or, to draw the anathema sharply, that
they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the heart of the Spirit of God). But then, extreme
views fail to do justice, the one to the equally
important fact that the gift of prophecy goes
through the prophets, comes as the pure and undistorted word of God not merely to, but from, the prophets; and the other to the equally obvious fact that the intelligence of the prophets is alert throughout the whole process of the
reception and delivery of the revelation made through them (see INSPIRATION; PROPHETY).

That which gives to prophecy as a mode of revelation 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 are conditioned by something extraneous to the subject’s will, or rather, that 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
consciousness 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 10 610; 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 poured upon them (Isa 61 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 (2 K 3 15; Ezek 1 3;
3 14 22; 33 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 moved; is put into conditions, or subjected to the will of 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 borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God’ (2 Pet 1 20 21).

What this language of Peter emphasizes—and what is emphasized in the whole account which the
prophets give of their own consciousness—is, to speak plainly, the passivity or passivity
of the prophets with respect to 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’ (φησε, φέρειν) is not the same as to be led (ἀνέχεται), which
means (ἐφησεν, ἐφέραν): 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 overdrawn. 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 prophets achieved by what 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 God. God speaks through them, not as 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—instuments capable of being used profoundly and zealously proclaiming them.

There is, no doubt, a not unnatural hesitancy abroad in thinking of the prophets as exhibiting only such mercy
and fertility as the natural minds of any personality to
which they are assigned. If this were the case then we are asked not to represent God as dealing mechani-
cally with them, pouring His revelations into their souls
but merely to receive and to be moved by them in the same way as they were received by the
prophets—merely to be moved by God’s word, but not to have it in any sense its “passivity”
see INSPIRATION; PROPHETY.
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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 a power which profits to raise strange noises out 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 and 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 human tongues, are only a partial clue to 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 apprehensions, not by the exercise of the human soul, 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 this 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 "concursive 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 in, with a superintendence of, 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 accomplishment 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 the product very properly from 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 through it; and yet 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). See Inspiration.

It is supposed that all the forms of special or redemptive revelation which underlie and give its content to the religion of the Bible 7. Complete may without violence be subsumed under Revelation; of the other three modes of God—external manifestation, internal sag in Christ, and concursive operation. All, that is, except the culminating revelation, not through, but in, Jesus Christ. As in His person and work, so also in His Spirit, the 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 summed up in itself, and that alone 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 Jeh; from Him as His Son, Jeh has no secrets, but whatsoever the Father knows that the Son knows also. Whatever truth men have been made partakers of by the Spirit of truth and of the power thereof (the Father hath are His) 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 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 supplementing the travail 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 common words for a common idea, and their meaning is passively, making known, manifest, applied with more or less heightened significance to supernatural acts or effects in kind. In the Eng. Bible (AV) the vb. "reveal" 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 יד, gālah, or its Aram. equivalent גָּלָה, 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 "apokaluptō" is always used with the singular exception of Lk 2:50 in the rendering of a Gr term ἀποκάλυπτω, apokaluptō (but in 2 Thess 1:7; 1 Pet 4:13 the corresponding noun ἀποκάλυψις, apokalupsis), which has a very similar basic significance with ἀποκάλυπτη (nu). 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." On the face of the Eng. Bible, the terms "reveal," "revelation" bear therefore uniformly the general sense of "disclose," "dislosure." 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. εἰδοὺ, phanerō, with the general sense of making manifest, manifesting, is the most common of these. It differs from ἀποκάλυπτω as the more general and external term from the more special and inward. Other terms also are occasionally used: ἐστών, epiphanēs, "manifestation" (2 Thess 2:8; 1 Tim 6:14; 2 Tim 1:10; 4:1; Tit 2:13; cf. ἐπιφάνεια, epiphānēs, Tit 2:11; 3:4; ὁσιότατος, ὁσιότατος (Rev 1:1; 17:1; 22:16.8; of Jas 1:16; 1 Tim 4:15); ἐπιφανής, epiphanēs (Jn 1:18), of which, however, one only perhaps—χρηστοτης, χρηστοτης (Mt 2:12.22; Lk 20:1 Acts 10:22; He 8:5; 11:27; 12:25); χρηστοτης, χρηστοτης, χρηστοτης (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" (בָּאָרְךָ, rā'ēh) is used in its appropriate stems, with God as the subject, for "appearing," "showing": "the Lord appeared unto..." "the word which the Lord spake unto..." And from the vb. not only is an active substantive formed which supplied the more ancient designation of the official organ of revelation: רָאֶה, rā'ēh, "seer"; but also objective substantives, רָאֶה, rā'ēh, רָאֶה, rā'ēh, 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, יָרָא, רָאֶה. Its active derivative, יָרָא, רָאֶה, רָאֶה, was a designation of a prophet which remained in occasional use, alternating with the more customary נָבִיה, נָבִיה, long after יָרָא, rā'ēh, had become practically obsolete; and its passive derivatives רָאֶה, רָאֶה, רָאֶה, תָּהָר, רָאֶה, כָּלַּח, provided the ordinary form for the substance of the revelation or "vision." The distinction between the two sets of terms, derived respectively from רָאֶה and רָאֶה, while not to be unduly pressed, seems to lie in the direction that the former suggests external manifestations and the latter internal revelations. The rā'ēh he to whom Divine manifestations, the rā'ēh he to whom Divine communications, have been vouchsafed; the rā'ēh is an appearance, the rā'ēh and its companions a vision. It may be of interest to observe that mar'ēh is the term employed

in Nu 12:6, while it is hazon which commonly occurs in the headings of the written prophetic books 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 trace by the hazon of Dn 8:15 and the mar'ēh of the next verse. The ordinary vb. for "knowing," ייִהוּה, ייִהוּה, expressing in its causative stems 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, of not merely uncovering to observation, but making to know. Accordingly, it is paralleled not merely with יד, יד (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 יד, יד (Ps 26:4: "Make known to me thy ways, O Lord: teach me thy paths"). This vb. ייִהוּה-forms no substantive in the sense of "revelation" (cf. יד, יד, dothah, 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 Jehovah," and the term commonly rendered in the EV by "law." The former (ד'バー יַהוּא, ד'バー יַהוּא, ד'バー יַהוּא, ד'バー יַהוּא, ד'バー יַהוּא, ד'バー יַהוּא) occurs scores of times and is at once the simplest and the most colorless designation of a Divine communication. By the latter (ד'רְאָה, ד'רְאָה), 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 Jehovah, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law [in "teaching" ] of our God, ye people of Gomorrah;" or Isa 2:3:4; Mic 4:2: "For out of Zion shall go forth a word, and his declaration shall pass over the rivers. And he shall utter his words against the sea, and against all the people of the isles." 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, one could have come to fall more on the graciousness, and of the other more on the authoritiveness 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, as is its written word, or one of its versions.

3. "The Scipures" 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 Divinely 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, 'It is written in the authentically inspired written 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 sense in which we give the term, "the Scriptures." These "Scipures" 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 in the sense of the conception of this Canon of Scripture as the very 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 real variance of speech concerning the Scriptures, emphasizing their authority in legal language, which goes back to and rests on the Bible, 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 Scripture's own usage of τοῦθα, "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 themselves not merely as normative authority, and there the record of revelations—"words of God," τοῦθα—given by God, but as themselves, in all their extent, a revelation, an authoritative body of gracious instructions from God; and, since they alone, of all the other books that God may have written, are authentic—rather as the Revelation, the only "Word of God," accessible to men, in all their parts "law," that is, authoritative instruction from God.


Benjamin B. Warfield

REVELATION OF JOHN:

I. TITLE AND GENERAL CHARACTER OF BOOK

1. Title

The oldest form of the title would seem to be simply, "Apocalypse of John," appended with the designation "the Divine" (θεόλογος, theologos, i.e. "theologian") not being older than the 4th cent. (cf. 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 En, the Apocalypse of Bar, the Apocalypse of Ezev; see Apocalyptic Literature), but it is doubtful if the word here bears this technical sense. The divinity at the end is implied in the NT Apocalypse with these others, and attributable to it the same kind of origin as theirs, viz., in the unbridled play of religious pantocy, clothing itself in unreal visual form.

But there is a wide distinction. These other works are propositional, fictitious; on the face of them products of imagination; but betraying that this is their origin in their crude, confused, unfounding character. 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 Neo-theory, to which most recent expositors give adherence, 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; 22:18), and has or will have sure fulfilment. Parallels here and there are sought in the Book of En or the Apocalypse of Ezev. 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 that it was written by John himself. The book was quoted by Muratorius (c. 170 AD), one of the churches of 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 author is John meant. Andreas of Capadocia (5th cent.) states that the Apocalypse is a work of the 2nd century (HE, IV, 26); was used by Theophilus of Antioch (c 185 AD) and by Apollonius (c 210 AD); HE, V, 25). In these cases being cited as the Apocalypse of John, it is included in the works of John's in the Canon of Muratori (c 200 AD). The Johannine authorship (apocalyptic) 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 obscure sect of the Alogi (end of 2nd cent.), which, with Caius, a Rom presbyter (c 205 AD), attributed it to Cerinthus. More severely criticized by 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 a holy man and Apocalypse of John. 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 (Chrysoostome, 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 later date (cf Westcott; also Bousset, Die Offen. Joh., 28). On the other hand, the book is acknowledged by Methodius, Pachomius, 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 any event it is the claim of the book itself. It proclaims itself to be the work of John (1 1.4.9; 22 8), who does not, indeed, name himself 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 consentant church tradition. The alternative view, first suggested as a possibility by Eusebius, and largely favored by him, 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 authority given the Apocalypse in the Asian churches, and the pathetic testimony above cited connecting him with the apocata, 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 apocata.

One cause of the hesitancy regarding the Apocalypse in early circles was dislike of its millenarianism—"that is, with much critical skill by Dionysius 3. Objec- tions to John. Two Gospel works so diverse in character—the Gospel calm, spiritual, mystical, abounding in characteristic sayings as "life," "love," etc, written in idiomatic Gr, the Apocalypse abrupt, mysterious, material in its imagery, inexact and barbarous in its idioms, sometimes employing solecisms—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 Dialects; or, secondly, to seek a different author for the Apocalypse—John the presbyter, or another: thus not a few reverend scholars (Bleek, Neander, etc); or, third, with most moderns, to deny the Johannine authorship of both. The Gospel, at least, seems to be the "presbyter" as the author of the latter (Har- nack, Bousset, 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 (Gogel, Luthardt, Allford, Salmon, etc), but has as yet been more freely acknowledged. As instances among many may be noted the use of the term "Logos" (19 13), the image of the "Lamb," figures like "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 con- structions in the full accuracy of the 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 to the short 1-8, to the every be the composition proof, of traditional in 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 later part of the 1st cent. of our era. Domitian Ireneaus (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, 9). This tradition is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria (who speaks of “the tyrant”), Origen, and later writers. Epiphanius (4th cent.), indeed, puts (Haer., l.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 (decadence 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 the desire to give the later composition of the Gospel, 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 of the two books. The Apocalypse, if not the first, will be immediately, 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 apocalyptic writing of which the chronology of 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 the irrefutable 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 Nero (Cæsar) in Hebrew letters. 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—which a number which Ireneaus 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 for this. This is to happen within the space of 3½ 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 fall in three years and a half, and will then reappear 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; 3½ 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 could have been intended (see the form of the 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: meanwhile 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 the Christian Theory has given place to a more Babylonian Theory. The Dietrich (c 1822) of the book, as a book of Christian origin, was desire to give the later composition of the Apocalypse, 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 apocalyptic writing of which the chronology of 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 the irrefutable 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...
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. 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. Principles 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 and 13), and, after the 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 Jerusalem (chs 21, 22). The theme of the book is the conflict of Christ and His church with the great powers of evil (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 tenth, after the new seal, 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 (11:16), as yet only in 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" (15:17), 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 overthrowing of all his adversaries (vs 18–21), the great conflict is finished; 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 3½ years of the Nero-interpreters sink into insignificance in its crowded panorama of events. The symbolic numbers chiefly are "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, corners of earth, winds, etc); 3½ years—42 months—"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)

2. Detailed
2.1 Vision of Jesus and Message to the Seven Churches of the Province of Asia (vs 9–20)

3. The Letters to the Seven Churches (chs 2–3)

(1) Ephesus (2:1–7)
(2) Smyrna (2:8–13)
(3) Pergamos (vs 12–17)
(4) Thyatira (vs 18–20)
(5) Sardis (3:1–6)
(6) Philadelphia (vs 7–13)
(7) Laodicea (vs 14–22)

II. The Things to Come. First Series of Visions: The Seals and Trumpets

1. The Vision of Heaven
(1) Adoration of the Creator (ch 4)
(2) The 7-sealed Book: Adoration of God and the Lamb (ch 5)

2. Opening of Six Seals (ch 6)
(1) The White Horse (vs 1–2)
(2) The Red Horse (vs 3–4)
(3) The Black Horse (vs 5–6)
(4) The Pale Horse (vs 7–8)
(5) Seals under the Altar (vs 9–11)
(6) The Wrath of the Lamb (vs 12–17)

3. Interludes (ch 7)

4. Opening of Seventh Seal: Under This Seven Trumpets, of Which Six Were Sounded (chs 8, 9)
(1) Earth and Fire on Earth (8:7)
(2) Burning Mountain in Sea (vs 8–9)
(3) Burning Star on Rivers and Fountains (vs 10–11)
(4) One-third Sun, Moon, and Stars Darkened (vs 12–13)
(5) Woe—Trumpets to vs 13
(6) The Fallen Star—Locusts (vs 13)
(7) The Angel—Loosed from Ephraim—Horses of War (vs 14–16)

5. Interludes

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. Interlude (ch 14)
(1) The Lamb on Mt. Zion: the 144,000 (vs 1–5)
(2) The Angel with "an Eternal Gospel" (vs 6–7)
(3) Second Angel—(Anticipatory) Proclamation of Fall of Babylon (vs 8)
(4) Third Angel—(Proclamation) of the Three Witnesses (vs 9–10)
(5) Blessedness of the Dead in the Lord (ver 13)
(6) 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 19)—the Outpouring (ch 16)
(1) On Earth (16:2)
(2) On Sea (vs 5)
(3) On Rivers and Fountains (vs 4–7)
(4) On Sun (vs 9)
(5) On Seat of Beast, (vs 10–11)

5. The Last Judgment
(1) The Wrath of the Beast: Har-Magedon (vs 12–16)
(2) 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") and His Army—Lamb, Dove, and Beast, False Prophet, and Their Followers (vs 11–21)

V. The Millennium—New Heavens and New Earth (chs 20–22)
1. Satan Bound: First Resurrection and Reign of Saints for 1,000 Years (20:1–6)

2. Loosing of Satan and Final Conflict—Doom of Adversaries and of the Devil (vs 7–10)

V. Principles of Interpretation.—As a book intended for the consolation of the church under future afflictions, the Apocalypse 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, an accurate interpretation upon many of its symbols, till the time of their actual fulfillment. The book relates to “things which must shortly come to pass” (1 1)—in their beginnings at least—and the divergent interpretations since put upon its prophecies are the best evidence of the difficulties attaching to them. Schemes of interpretation have generally been grouped into praetriterist (the prophecies being regarded as already fulfilled), futuristic (the fulfilment being thrown wholly into the future), and the historical (the fulfillment being looked for in the continuous history of the church from the beginning to the end). (1) The older praeterist view may be taken as represented by Moses Stuart, who finds the fulfillment of chs 6–11 in the destruction of Jeus (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 futuristic 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 voo-trumpet), the Turks (second voo-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, Ellicott. Apocalypticæ, A. Barnes.

These older schemes are largely horizon-oriented by the newer theories, already alluded to, in which the Apocalypse is explained out of contemporary conditions, the legend of the returning Nero, Jewish apocalyptic and Babylonian influence. These are praeterist theories also, but 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 Jersus, it will be felt that it will not do to give these expressions too restricted a temporal significance. The 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 (see above). 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 most lust under Galley, 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 Jersus, 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 overstepped. “The Tribulation” in the OT and elsewhere may be associated with widespread oriental ideas, but the definite symbolism of the Apocalypse in ch 12 has no provable connection with Bab myths. There is the widest disagreement among the theories of the seven heads of the beast (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 119–22 (c 80 AD). Augustine mentions the idea (City of God, xx.19, 3), but without connection with the Apocalypse. By Domitian’s time, however, it was perfectly certain that Nero had not returned and there was no longer, on this interpretation, any apposition in speaking of a “head” the “deathstroke” of which was healed (13 3), which became the “eighth head” of 17 11—if, indeed, the apostle could be conceived capable of being informed by such a later interpretation, as the book was written in the past tense, being evidently, still in the future. It may be added that neither Irenæus, nor any early interpreter, seems to have heard of the connection of 666 with “Nero.” Irenæus himself suggests the solution Latinus (cf. Salmon, ut supra).

It is not proposed here to attempt the lines of a positive interpretation. If it is once recognized that the Apocalypse is a book of true prophecy, that its symbols stand for things unborn at the time of its writing, it is not to be limited to a brief period in the future.

3. The True Prophecy Book a statement that credits the Apocalypse like 31 years, the way is opened, not, indeed, for a reading into it of a series of precise historical occurrences, but still for doing justice to the book in which lies at the basis of the historical interpretation, viz. that the prophetic schemes figure 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); successes 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 contrast to the analogy of Dan, for seven individual emperors, and that “the image of the beast,” which has life given to it and “speaks” (13 14.15), is the statue of the emperor; or that such tremendous events as the fall of the Rom Empire, or the rise of the papacy—with which, however, no number is connected—and the new 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 of the great truths that lie behind the Book, Christ, man, sin, redemption, the teaching of the Apocalypse does not vary essentially from the great types in the Ep. 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 and essentially the same as in the body. It is thought unwise not necessarily to be acknowledged," says Reuss, "that Christ is placed in the Apocalypse on a par with God" (op. cit., I, 397-98; cf Rev 4 17; 2 3; 5 5-14; 22 13, etc). Not less striking are the correspondences with the teaching of Pâmos and 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 Plei- derer; 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, so far as it is necessarily contradicting, the earlier stage of thought.

LITERATURE.—Mostly Stuart, Comm. on Apocalypse; Al- ford, Gr Test, IV, "The Revelation"; S. Davidson, Intro to the NT (3d ed), 176 ff; G. Salmon, Intro to the NT (3d ed), lects xiii, xiv; Elliott, Horae Apocalypticæ, with litt. the treatises of Conze, Schilling, D. Schlabach, etc; Schopfung und Schicksal Gott, etc; Milligan, Discursions on the Apocalypse; H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos; W. Bouisset, Die Offen- nung Johannes und die "Apocalypse" in EL, I; C. Anderson Scott, "Revelation" in Century Bible; J. M. Robinson, "Revelation" of the NT (6th ed), 4 (cf also "Revelation" in Expositor's Bible; Truch, Eph. to the Seven Churches: W. M. Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches; H. B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John.

JAMES OOK

REVELLINGS, rev'el-ing (rêv'ə-lîngg; rêv'ə-lîng; rêv'ə-lîng). The word is found both in AV and in RV in Wisd 14 23 (RV "revels," orgiastic heathen worship is in point); 2 Macé 6 4; Gal 5 21; 1 Pet 4 3. In Gal 5 21 it is classed with fornication, uncleanness, lust, 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 13 RV has "reveling" instead of AV "rioting," and in 2 Pet 2 13, "revel" replaces "riot" in AV. In Am 6 7, "revelry" replaces "banquet." The obvious meaning of the word is excessive and boisterous intemperance and lustful indulgence. G. H. GEBBERDING

REVENGE, rë-vən', REVENGER, rë-vən'ér. The same Heb and Gr words are used to express the idea of "to avenge" and "to revenge" (גֶּדֶר, náášam, or derivative; δικαιό, dikéeá, or derivative). In Eng. these words are synonymous in that they are both used to express the infliction of punishment upon the person or thing that has offended. They both "to take revenge" may also imply a hateful, wrong or malignant spirit. In the latter case RV preserves "revenge" (cf Jer 20 10; Ezek 25 15; 26 17 it is an anthropomorphism, but, wherever it is synonymous with "avengeance," this word is used (cf Nu 31 23; Ps 79 10; Nah 1 2; Jer 13 20; Rom 3 4; 2 Cor 7 11; 10 6 RV; AV has "revenge" in all these cases). In Dt 32 42, AV "avenger" is a wrong tr. Read with RV "from the head of the leaders of the enemy" or RVm "the hairy head of the enemy." Cf Avenge, Avenging, Blood, Géél.

A. L. BREBACH

REVENUE, rev'ə-nú: (1) כִּמֵּה, app'țhóm, "revenue or income" (Exr 4 13 AV); (2) סִיָּרָּה, t'há'dáh, "increase," "revenue" (Prov 8 19; 18 6; 21 3; Jer 12 13); παροδο, προδο, "income" (2 Mac 3 5; 4 8 [RV "fund"]; 9 16).

REVERENCE, rev'er-ens: In the OT, "reverence" occurs as the tr of two Heb words, yárdé, and šădlóh. The root idea of the former is "strain," 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 sought under another who is considered superior, as in 2 S 9 6 AV; 1 K 3 1 AV; Est 3 2 5. The group of ideas here, therefore, is "honor," "obedience," "reverence." In the NT "reverence" occurs as the tr of three Gr words, αἵλος, phóbémon, and entrepómaí. In the first, the idea is "modesty" (He 12 28; cf 1 Tim 2 9). In the second, "fear" (Eph 5 3 3 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 5). In the third, the idea of the self-cost of inferiority," and so sets forth an attitude toward another of doing him honor (Mt 21 37; Mk 12 13; Lk 20 12). Is 12 0 3.

In the Apoc entrepómaí occurs in Wisd 2 10; Sir 4 22. In addition, proskowné, "make obeisance," occurs in Jth 10 23; 14 7; thauámdó, "wonder," Sir 7 29, and aischnomón, "be ashamed," Eze 4 16.

REVEREND occurs in the OT in Ps 111 9, of the name of God (yárdé), and in the Apoc in 2 Mac 15 12, "a man revered (aidbhôn, "modest") in bearing," and in the NT RV has "reverent in demeanor" (hieroprepis) in Tit 2 3 and "reverend" in Phil 4 6 (sánmos). E. J. FORREST

REVILE, rë-vil. See Crimes; Punishments.

REVIVE, rë-viv, REVIVING, rë-viv-ing. "To revive" is the tr of ἀναζω, hýghō, "to live," "cause to live," used of restoration to life (Gen 45 27; Jgs 16 19, etc); of rebuilding (Neh 4 2); of restoration to well-being (Ps 56 6 [RV "quicken"]; 138 7; Isa 57 15; Hos 5 2; 14 7); of Jeh's gracious work for His people (Hab 2 2, "revive thy work in the midst of the years, etc); "reviving" is the tr of ἀναζω, hýghō, "preservation," or "means of life" (Ezr 8 9). "Revive" occurs in the NT as the tr of ἀναζω, ἀναζω, "to live again" (Rom 7 9, 14 9, AV "revived both died and rose, and revived, RV "ruminating and rose") "Christ died and lived again," zóo).

In 1 Mac 13 7 7 RV we have "And the spirit of the people revived," ἀναζω, ἀναζω, "to stir or kindle up as a fire," the same word as in 2 Tim 1 5 7, 6 "stir up the gift of God, which is in thee," n. Gr "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, rë-wûrd: In modern Eng. (except when influenced by the Bib, forms) a "reward" is something given in recognition of a good act. In RV, however, "reward" is used quite generally for anything given, and the term covers the recompense of evil (Ps 1 11 8; Proverbs 1 18 AV, "reward" (Mic 7 8), 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 sys-tematically.
REZEH, ré-séf (ראש), reseph; B, 'Páuev, Rhá-
pheis, 'Páuev, Rháphes, A, 'Páuev, Ráphäth
_forms (ISA 37 12); Vulg Reseph the name
[2 K 19 12], Reseph [ISA 37 12]): one
of the places referred to by Senna-
cherib's Rabshakeh when delivering that
together with Hiszekiah demanding the surrender
and only the fact of its existence and loss remains
(Schrad, _COT_, 1, 252, 253).

Literature—Schrad, _COT_, as above; Driver,
Authority, 99 ff.

T. NICOL

REZON, re-zö'n (רֶזון), rezôn; 'Páuev, Rhá-
dson, son of Eliakah, and a subject of Hadadezer,
king of Zobah (1 K 11 20). It is often used to be
given as 'Rezón (?), kezôn; 'Atis, Hazein (1 K
15 18; see Hezon), where he is the father of Tab-
rimon, whose son Ben-hadad I is known through
his league with Assa, king of Judah. When David
conquered Zobah, Rezon renounced his allegiance
to Hadadezer and became powerful as an independ-
ent chief, capturing Damascus and setting up as king.
Along with Hadad, the noted Edomite patriot,
his son, as a thorn in the side of Solomon, the one
making himself obnoxious in the S., the other in the N.,
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 Hezon (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, Tabrimon, Ben-hadad I, and Ben-hadad II.

Literature—Burney on 1 K 11 23 and 18 in
_Notes on Books of Kings_, Wickers, Allen,
Untersuchungen, 60 ff.

T. NICOL

RHEGIUM, ré'ji-um: This city (Ῥήγιον, Ῥῆγιον
[Acts 28 13], the modern Reggio di Calabria) was
a town situated on the east side of the Sicilian
Straits, 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.106–9, 111, 112). The city never
entirely recovered from this blow, which 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 untrustworthy. 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; Orosius 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 xxii.30; xxv.1;
xvii.12; xxviii.9). At the time of the Social War
they were incorporated with the Roman state,
Rhegium becoming a municipality (Ciceron Verr.
v.60; Pro Archía, 3).

The ship in which Paul sailed from Melita to
Puteoli encountered unfavorable winds after leaving
Syracuse, and put in anchor by means of <tack-
ing. 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, re'âr (Ῥησά, Ῥῆσα): A son of Zeru-
babel in the genealogy of Jesus according to St.
Luke (Lk 3 27).
RHINOCEROS, rī-nōs'ĕr-ōs: This word is found in AV in Isa 34 7 ("rhinocerots") for "unōn," re'emim, AV "unicorns," RV "wild-oxen." The word is quite inappropriate to the passage, which refers to the Edomites. The one-horned rhinoceros, Rhinoceros unicornis, is confined to India. Other rhinoceroses 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, rō'da (Po'sō, Rhōđe, "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 ff.).

S. F. HUNTER

RHODES, rō'dēs (Pāsōe, Rhōđaios). An island (and city) in the Aegean Sea, W. of Crete and N. of Italy, the ruins of which are on the tip called the Camirus or Lycia (Rhodes). The Tlepolemus, Carians. The Colossus of Rhodes, was a 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 it. In that sense, however, this conception is based seems to have no foundation.

The statue was destroyed in 223 BC by an earthquake. It was restored in 187 AD. The Saracens sold the ruins to a Jew. The quantity of metal was so great that one could fill the cars of a modern freight train (900 camel loads).

The most ancient cities of Rhodes were Ialisus, Ochryma, 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) Aethaenaeides. Lindus, Ialisus 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 (Sol), in Cilicia (Gage), and in Lycia (Corydalla). The island was the birthplace of Antiochus and 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 "Vic-tory" that is the counterpart of the "Winged Vic-tory" which commands the unbounded 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 Antiochus in 189 BC. As a reward for her loyalty she received Caria. In 108, however, only a small portion of this territory remained under Rhodian sway (Pera, or the Chersonese). In 42 BC the island was devastated by Cassius. Later it was made a part of the Rom province of Asia (44 AD). Strabo says that he knows no city so splendid in harbor, walls and streets. When the Rom 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 Sollman in 1522 the Knights of St. John moved to Malta (now called the Island of Rhodos). It remained uninterruptedly a possession of the Sultane 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 delightful 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 Mace 15 23 we are informed that it was one of the states to which the Romans sent letters in behalf of the Jews.
RHODEUS, rod'kus (ῬΩΘΟΣ, Rhodótos): A Jewish traitor who disclosed the plans of Judas to the Roman (Papætor) (2 Macc. 13:21) 102 BC. Of his fate nothing more is known.

RIB (ריב, ṭâb,タル, ṭâlib; Aram. ṭâbî): The Heb words designate the "side," "flank," hence the "rib." They are found thus only in connection with the creation of Eve: "He [Jeh] took one of his [Adam's] ribs, and closed up the flesh else-where: and the rib, which Jeh God had taken from the man, made he [in "built" him into"] a woman." (Gen 2:21,22). The Aram. word is only found in Dn 7:5.

Twice the RV uses the word "rib" in a figurative sense of two beams or rafters built into the ark of the covenant and the altar of incense, on which the golden rings were fastened (Ex 30:4; 37:27).

A curious mistr has crept into AV, which here follows Jewish commentators or etymologists, in four passages in 2 S (2:29; 3:27; 4:6; 20:10), wherein mentions of "rib" are placed as the name of the body under which spears or swords are thrust, so as to cause lethal wounds. The Heb word hâmôš, which indeed means "fifth," is here a noun, derived from a root meaning "to be staunch," "stalwart," "stout," "flabby," "obese" (of עוג, hâmôsh, "armed," "equipped soldier"); Arab.

RIBAL, rîbâl, rîbâl (ריבל, ṭâbî): LXX Ροθά, Rethêd, with variants): A Benjamite, the father of ÍTÁI (q.v.), one of David's "mighty men" (2 S 23:29 | 1 Chr 11:31).

RIBBAND, rîbînd, rîbîn (ריבן, pâthîl [Nu 15:38 AV]): See Colson, (2); Coam, (4).

RIBLAH, rîbîla (ריבלה, ṭâblâh): LXX Ῥιβαλά, Rhéblathâd, with variants):
(1) Riblah in the land of Hamath first appears in history in 606 BC. Here Pharaoh-nechoh, after defeating Josiah at Megido and destroying Kady-tis or Kadeshe 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 23:31-35). In 583 BC Nebuchadnezzar, 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 with rib by the chief prisoner to Babylon (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 Riblah, 35 miles N.E. of Baalbek, and the situation is the finest that could have been chosen by the Egyptians for 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 forage 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 officers. Riblah commanded the chief 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 strategic point between North and South Syria. Riblah should probably be read for Dibalh in Ezk 14:6; Hân 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 Purrer found to be named nôbel Arbâl.

W. M. CHRISTIE

RICHERS, rich'ez, rich'iz: Used to render the following Heb and Gr words: (1) ὀσχή, which should, perhaps, be considered the most general word, as it is the most often used (Gen 31:16; Ecc 4:8; Jer 9:23). It looks at riches simply as riches, without regard to any particular feature. Alongside this would go the Gr φαρόν, ploûtos (Mt 13:22; Eph 2:7). (2) ὧσμος (Prov 27:24; Jer 20:5), ὧσμα (Gen 36:7; Dn 11:13,24 AV) look at riches as things accumulated, collected, amassed (6). ὧσμα looks upon riches as earnings, the fruit of toil (Ps 119:14; Prov 8:18; Ezk 27:27). (4) ἠδικός regards riches as 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 "richness" of many, or being in multitude (Ps 37:16 AV).

(5) ἡγιάλ regards riches as power (Ps 62:10; Isa 8:4; 10:14). (6) Yīthrah means "running over," and so presents riches as abundance (Jer 46:36 AV). Along with this may be placed ἄκρα, which has the idea of a hill, and so of abundance (Job 36:19 AV). (7) Κύπριλδ regards riches as a creation, something made (Ps 104:24; cf m); (8) χρύσα (chêrûm) looks at riches as useful (Mk 10:23 f.). Like the NT, the Apoc uses only ploutos and chêrûm.

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 Chr 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 MAM-MON; TREASURE; WEALTH. E. J. FORRESTER

RID, rid, RIDDANCE, rid'dans: "Rid" 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.
RIDDLE, rî’dl, ḫinhā ( ḫdhāh; ʿalwyna, ʿal wynā). See GAMES.


RIGHT, rît (רח, yāshêr, ṭērâvi, mishpâhî; ḫēkîōs, ḫēkãs, ēthûs, ēthûs). Many Heb words are trd “right,” with different shades of meaning. Of these the two noted are the most important: yāshêr, with the sense of being straight, direct, as “right in the sight” of Jeh (Ex 15 20; Dt 12 25; etc), and ṭērâvi, “right paths” (Prov 4 11 AV); and mishpâhî, “judgment,” “cause,” etc, 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 ḫēkîōs, ṭēḥēk, ṭēḥāhāh, ordinarily trd “righteousness,” are in a few cases rendered “right” (2 S 19 28; Neh 2 20; Ps 9 4; 17 1; 119 75; Ezek 18 5, etc). In the NT the chief word is ḫēkîōs, primarily “even,” “equal” (Mt 20 4; Lk 12 57, etc); more generally the word is rendered “just” and “righteous.” Euthus, used by LXX for ḫāshêr (1 S 12 23; Hos 14 9), occurs a few times (Acts 8 21; 13 10; 2 Pet 2 15); so orthôs, “straight,” “upright” (Lk 10 28). “Right” also represents Heb yāshêr, and kindred forms (Gen 48 13 14.17; Ex 15 6, etc); the Gr, in this sense, is δικαιος (Mt 6 3; 20 21, etc).

RV, among other changes, has “right” for AV “truth” in Job 27 2; 34 5, and for “right” in AV substitutes “straight” in Ezr 8 21, “akin” in Ecc 4 4, m “successful,” etc. In Jn 1 1 12 RV reads, “the right to become children of God” for AV “the power” (ἐξουσία); in Mt 20 7.15 “right is qualified with the larger part of the verse. In 2 Tim 2 15 “rightly dividing” (orthotomeó) is changed to “handling aright,” with m “holding a straight course in the word of truth.” Or, rightly dividing the word of truth.” W. L. WALKER

RIGHTEOUSNESS, rî’th woman (רֵחַ, ḫâdith, adj., “righteous,” or occasionally “just”; ḫâdîth, noun, occasionally “righteousness,” occasionally “justice”; ḫēkîōs, ḫēkãs, adj., ḫēkîōson, ḫêkûson, ḫêkâsion, noun, from ḫîq, ḫîk, 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: Obligation of Faker 4. Righteousness as Inner 5. Righteousness as Social 6. Righteousness as Growing in Content with Growth in Ideals 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 (Mt 23 23); 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 course, who 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 exactations. 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. For the basis of fear in the minds of the individuals of the group have come all our later 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 moral way 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 23). The meaning of all of these rites was that there was a fundamental demand 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 perfection 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 had 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 61 3); and prohibitions which would indicate that morality, at least in its plainer decrees, 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 to a sense of the inner life in relation to 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, in our thought of God, find what we might expect to find in the Hebrews. We need not, as it were, go back to the beginning of the Hebrews started, but from the very beginning we see clearly that the moral life of the Hebrews was largely a God of War, but it is to be noticed that His enmity 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 marvellous also of Hebrew history is in their compelling to the very morbidly immoral surroundings 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 God of the Hebrews as 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 deceptions upon which the moral 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, the real standards of moral behavior. (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 8-23). There was increasing realization also of what God, as a moral Being, is obliged 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 alike. 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 or). The movement of the Scriptures is all the way from the thought of the people who were larger for the thought of a who receives in Himself the heaviest shocks of that battle that 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 8 31).

The ideas at work throughout the course of Heb and Christian history are, of course, at work today.

Christians Christians deepen 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 an important part of 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 (Lt 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, for instance, that man needs to be set free from the moral demands 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 direction of righteousness of that life, however, we must remember the essentially Christian conception that man does not live through outer 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 stress laid by the social service. This does not mean that

5. Righteousness as Inner Christianity is to lose sight of the righteousness worth of the individual in himself. 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 the lives of individuals have meaning 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-
defined the system of things as being responsible for much human misery which we now see can be traced to the sin of individuals. The employer, the day-laborer, the public servant, all these have large responsibilities for the life of those around. The unrighteous individual has a power of contaminating other individuals, and his sinfulness we have just begun to understand. All this receiving new emphasis in our present-day preaching of righteousness. While our social relations are not ends in themselves, they are mighty means for reaching individuals in large numbers. The Christian conception of redeemed humanity is that of a new creature existing on its own account, but that of individuals knotted very closely together in their social relationships and touching one another for good in these relationships (1 Cor 1 2; Rev 7 9,10). If we were to try to point out the line in which the Christian doctrine of righteousness is to move more and more through the years, we should have to emphasize this element of obligation to society. This does not mean that a new gospel is to supersede the old or even place it in the old. It cannot mean that the righteousness of God and the teaching of Christ and the cross, which are as ever the center of Christianity, are to find fresh force in the thought of the righteousness of the Christian as binding itself, not merely by commandments to do the will of God in society, but in the 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 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 talk in a spirit of godliness, 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 insistent upon material things such as sanitary 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 we are called upon to 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 of maintaining the life of man in a present future Kingdom of Heaven. Present-day emphasis has not ceased to think of the life beyond this, but the life beyond can now 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 seeds who have understood Christ's tianity 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 immanence 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 is existing on the sphere of the righteousness of God and of man is 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 of the Christian, but even those terms are not to be used in the abstract. There is an abstract conscientiousness which leads to barren living: the life gets out of touch with things that are real. There is an experienced conscience which exhausts itself in criticism. Both conscience and love are to be kept close to the earth by emphasis upon the actual realities of the world in which we live.


FRANCIS J. McCONNELL

RIMMON, rimmon: (1) The rock Rimmon (דִּמְנָם, qdl. rimmon; שַׁעַרְוָּא יֵשָׁמָה, Sh. Rimmon; 'Pemâw, hê pêtra Rheomôn); The place of refuge of the 600 surviving Benjamites of Gibeah (Jeffo) who "fanned and fled to the wilderness unto the rock of Rimmon, and abode in the rock of Rimmon four months" (Jgs 20 45.47; 21 13). Robinson's identification (RB, I, 440) has been very generally accepted. He found a conical and very prominent hill some 6 meters high, which he thought stood upon which stands a village called Rimmon. This site was known to Eusebius and Jerome (OS 146 6; 287 95), who describe it as fifteen Roman miles from Jerus. Another view, which would locate the place of refuge of the Benjamites in the large cove on the south of the Wady Suweint, near Jeba, is strongly advocated by Ravnsby and Birch (see PEF, III, 131-48). The latter connects this again with 1 Sm 14 2, where Saul, accompanied by his 600 horsemen in the uplands of Gibeath under the pomegranate tree (Rimmon).

(2) (דִּמְנָם, rimmon; 'Rimmon, Eremon, or 'Pemâw, Rheomôn); A city in the Negeb, 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 Judea—"from Geba to Rimmon, S. of Jerus."

In the earlier references Rimmon occurs in close association with 'Ain (a spring), and in Neh 11 29, what is apparently the same place, 'Ain Rimmon, is called En-rimmon (q.v.):

(3) (דִּמְנָה, rimmon; Josh 19 13, 'Rimnah, rimmonah, in some Heb. MSS רַמְנָה, rimnah; see also Dan 7

Josh 21 55), and רָמַנָה, rimmonah (1 Ch 6 77)).

In AV we have often met with the life of Rimmonah in future Kingdom of Heaven. Present-day emphasis has not ceased to think of the life beyond this, but the life beyond can now 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 seeds who have understood Christ's righteousness 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 immanence of God in this present world. This does not mean that there may not be other worlds, or are not other worlds, but that God is not also in those worlds; but the immediate revelation of God to us is in our present world. Our present world is existing on the sphere of the righteousness of God and of man is 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 of the Christian, but even those terms are not to be used in the abstract. There is an abstract conscientiousness which leads to barren living: the life gets out of touch with things that are real. There is an experienced conscience which exhausts itself in criticism. Both conscience and love are to be kept close to the earth by emphasis upon the actual realities of the world in which we live.


FRANCIS J. McCONNELL
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 (רִימְמֹן, rīmmono, "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 in the house of the Syrian god, Rimmon, when his master goes into the house to worship leining 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 Damascus. He has been identified with Rammunu, the Assyrian god of wind, rain and storm. The name appears in the Syrian personal names Hadadrimmon and Tabbarrimmon (q.v.) and its meaning is dubious (ramānu, "to thunder") (?).

(2) A Benjaminite of Beeroth, whose sons Bannah and Rechab assassinated Ish-bosheth (2 S 4 2 5 9).

Nathan Isaacs

RIMMON-PEREZ, r-pē’rez (רְמְמוֹן הָפְּרֶאצ, rimmon perez; AV Rimmon-parez); A desert camp of the Israelites (Nu 33 19 f), unidentified. Gesenius translates rimmon as "pomegranate," the place deriving its name from the abundance of pomegranates. But Conder derives it from rāmon, "to 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 HING, "ring"); The word renders (ARV) two Heb words (in AV and ERV three) and two Gr words. μαλακτές, tābba’eth, the principal Heb word, is from בַּבָּא, "sink," either because the ring is something "cast" or molded, or more probably, 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, tābba’eth, "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 28 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 Ahasuerus gave Haman (Est 3 10); with it the royal missive was sealed (Est 3 12; 8 8 hos 10). It was also 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-
trisic value, or both, rings were used as gifts for sacred purposes from both men and women: "brooches, ear-rings, and signet-rings" (Mo "rose-rings") (Ex 22 22); "bracelets, rings (ARV "signet-
rings"), ear-rings" (Nu 31 50 AV). כְּנֵי, hōthām, "signet," mentioned in Gen 38 18 25; Ex 28 11. 21.36; Ex 39 614 30; 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 round the neck. It was not only an identification, but served as a stamp for signature. וְלָל, gādāl, "circle" (cf "Galleı̇e," "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: לָל, lehōsh, "amulet"; so RV. The "rings" of the wheels in Ezek 1 18 (AV) are מֹמְibilidad, gādāl, "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, δακτυλίων, "fingerring," is a token of means, position, standing: "put a ring on his hand!" (Lk 15 21) which so far it included the right to give orders in his father’s name. To be χειροδακτυλιον, chrusodaktulios, "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 Channel

RINGLEADER, ringb‘ld-er: In Acts 21 5 the τριστήραρχος, ἐπιστολιστής, "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 (b);10.12 for תָּפְּק, tāqādāh. In the context of 30 35, etc, tāqādāh certainly denotes defective coloring of some sort, but the exact meaning of the word is uncertain. The tr "ringstreaked" ("marked with circular bands") comes from connecting the word with the suffix, "tāqādāh, to bind" (Gen 22 9), but this connection is dubious.

RINNAH, rin’a (רִינָנָה, rimnah, "praise to God"); LXX B, ἀνή, ἀνὴ, Α, Παννα, Ραββαν; A Judahite, according to MT a son of Shimon (1 Ch 4 20). But LXX makes him a son of Haman (B, Phond, A, Andna) by reading "ben" in the next name (Ben-hanan) as "son of."*

RIOU, ri’ut: Properly, "unrestrained behavior" of any sort, but in modern Eng. usually connoting mob action, although such phrases as a "rural 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 ἀντροσία, ἀνθοῦσα, ἀναρατησία, ἀνάρατος, "having no hope of safety," "profligate." In Prov 23 20; 28 7 RV has preferred "gluttonous," "gullet," in Rom 13 13, "revelling," and in 2 Pet 2 13, "revel.

Burton Scott Easton

RIPHATH, ri’fath (ריפח, ri’phath); A son of Gomer, the eldest son of Japheth (Gen 10 3; 1 Ch 1 6), where MT and RV read Dufath (q.v.). Jos (Ant, vi, 1) identifies the Riphathans with the Paphlagonians, through whose country on the Black Sea ran the river "Rhebas" (Pliny, NH, vi.4).

RISING, ri’zin (רָאשׁ, sō’eth, "a tumor," "swell-
ing" [Lev 13 2 10, etc]. See Leprosy.

RISSEAH, ris’a (רִיסָא, risā, "dew"): A camp of the Israelites in the wilderness wandering between
RITHMAH, rith'ma (רִיתָם, rithmah), "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 נְחָר, nāḥār (Aram. נֶחָר, nēḥār, nāḥār [Ezr 4 10, etc.], used of the rivers of Eden (Gen 2 10-14), often of the Eufrates (Gen 15 18, etc.), of Ararat and Pharpar (2 K 5 12), the river of Gozan (2 K 17 5), of the river Chabor (Ezr 1 1), the rivers (canals?) of Babylon (Ps 137 1), the rivers of Ethiopia (Isa 18 1; Zeph 3 10). Cf נַחֲלָה, nahlāh, the common Aram. word for "river." (2) נָחַר, yə'ār, according to BDB from עַר, 'aro, "watercourse," often of the Nile (Ex 1 22, etc.). In Isa 19 6, for יְרָח, yērāch, yə'ārē māqōr, AV "brooks of defense," RV has "streams of Egypt." In Isa 19 7-8, for yə'ār, AV "brooks," and Zec 10 11, AV "river," RV "Nile." In Job 28 10, AV "He cutteth out rivers among the rocks," RV "has channels," AV "ravines," (3) There are nearly 100 references to נְחָר, nāḥār. 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 Jabbok" (Dt 2 37; Josh 13 2); the stream issuing from the temple (Ezek 47 5-12). RV has "brook of Egypt," i.e. el-'Arṭuh (Nu 34 5; Josh 15 17; 1 K 8 65; 2 K 24 7; 2 Ch 7 8; Am 6 14, "of the Arabah"); "brook of the river of Kanah" (Josh 16 18); "valley [AV "river"] of the Arnon" (Dt 2 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 (Joel 3 18). EV has "brooks": Besor (1 S 30 10), Kidron (2 S 23 16), Gash (2 S 23 30), Cherith (1 K 17 3); also the fem. נְחַרָה, nāḥārāh, "brook [AV "river"] of Egypt" (Ezek 47 19; 48 28). The torrent-valley (עֵדֶּיה, vedēḥ) is often meant.

(4) נָחַל, nāḥal, with fem. נָחַלָה, nāḥalāh, ποηγός, AV "river," is in RV τῆς "stream," except EV "river in [Ps 66 9]; streams of water" (Ps 1 3); Prov 5 15; Lam 4 6); "stream of his bones" (Job 20 17); "streams of oil" (Job 29 6). (5) נֶחַל, nēḥal, AV "river," is in RV τῆς "stream," except EV "water-brooks" (Ps 42 1), is in RV "watercourses" (Ezek 6 3; 31 12; 32 6; 34 14; 35 8; 36 4.6), "water-brooks" (Cant 5 12; Joel 1 20). (6) נָחַל, nāḥal, yēḥelah, EV "river" (Jer 17 8). נָחֲלָה, and נָחְלָה, nāḥalāh, "brook, EV "river" (Dn 6 2.3.6). (7) וַרְאָה, pā'āḥa, pā'āḥā, of the Jordan ( Mk 5 5): Euphrates (Rev 9 14); "rivers of living water" (Jn 7 38); "rivers of water of life" except EV "water-brooks" (Ps 42 1), is in RV "watercourses" (Ezek 6 3; 31 12; 32 6; 34 14; 35 8; 36 4.6), "water-brooks" (Cant 5 12; Joel 1 20). See BUCH; STREAM; VALLEY.

ALFRED ELY DAY

RIVER OF EGYPT. See Book of Egypt.

RIVER OF EDEN. See Eden (1).

RIZIA, rìz'-ə (רִיצָא, rïzā; pēsh., pēshā; A.V. Rizia, Rizia): An Asherite (1 Ch 7 39).

RIZPAH, rìz'-pā (רִיצָפָה, rïzōfāh, "hot stone"); Jos, Pā'āch, Phēthoph): In 2 S 3 7 the subject of a coarse slander. 2 S 21 contains the pathetic story of Rizpah'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 Jeh he gave up to the Gibeonites the two sons of Saul, Mephibosheth and Armoni, as well as Saul's five grandsons (whether by Michal or Merab; see MEHAB). These sons were hanged at Gibeath. Rizpah watched 5 months over their exposed bodies, while meanwhile the famine did not abate. Word was brought to David of Rizpah'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 uncared-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 Rizpah 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 W. WALLACE

ROAD, rōd (INROAD) AV (1 S 17 10; of 23 27). See RAID.

ROAD (WAY). See Roman Empire and Christianity, II, 6; Way.

ROAST, rōst. See Food.

ROBBER, rob'ər, ROBBERY, rob'ə-rē: "Robber" represents no particular Heb word in the OT, but in the Apoc and the NT is always a tr of λαθρεύω, λαθραίος (see Thier). In AV Job 5 5; 18 9, "robber" stands for the doubtful word ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπον, RV "hungry" in 5 5 and "snares" in 18 9. The meaning is "robber," and perhaps "slave," "thievish" 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; Dn 11 14; Nah 3 1 are obvious. In Phil 2 6 AV reads "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." ERV has "a prize," while ERVm and ARv read "a thing to be grasped," ARv wording "counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped." The Gr here is ἀνθρωπόμως, a word derived from ἄνθρωπος, "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 AVv's "robbery." The verse speaks of the man 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 ἀνθρωπόμως the sense of "thing grasped," as in RV. Usually Eng. commentators take "grasped" as meaning "clung to"—"did not think equality with God should be clung to tenaciously"—but "to cling to" seems unknown as a tr of ἀνθρωπόμως. Hence render "a thing to be grasped at"—"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.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

ROBBERS OF TEMPLES (ἰπποδότοι, hierosoloi, "guilty of sacrilege"): A term used by the town clerk of Ephesus (Acts 19 38) for the 'chaplains of churches'). As the temple of Diana had a great treasure-chamber, the offence might not be unknown among them; cf Rom 2 22.
ROBE, ráb. See DUES, 1, (3).

ROBOAM, rō-bō'am (Ρωμᾶς, Rhodobam). AV; Gr form of "Rhobos" (thus RV) (Mt 1:7); successor of Solomon.


1. Names [Job 30:6; Jer 4:20; cf Kykkēs, Kykkēs, "Cynapsis" = Ἡρός, Pyros, "Peter" [In 1 42 AV and RVm]; [5] πέτρα, pētra]: ēr 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. 2596

2. In 2 Mach. 4:12 AV the epithet "church-robb'er" (RV 'author of the sacrilege') is applied to Lystima-cus (q.v.).

3. Rock 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 Asia.

(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. In 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 Jauālān 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 Leje' (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.

ROCK OF AGES. See AGES, ROCK OF; ISAIAH, VII.

ROCK-BADGER, r-baj'ér: This term is found in RVm for "coney," הָרָקֶפָן, ḥāşphān (Lev 11:5; cf Dt 14:7; Ps 104:18; Prov 30:26). It is a tr of klip das, the name given by the Boers to the Cape hyrax or coney. See Coney.

ROD (דָאָב, makābēl, ṣāleb, ṣāleb, ꜱẖēḥḥet; ṣābeṣ, ṣābās): Little distinction can be drawn between the Heb words used for "rod" and "staff." Makābēl is the word used in Gen 30:37ff for the twigs of poplar put by Jacob before his sheep, and in Jer 11:11 of the "rod of an almond-tree." Makābēl is used of a rod in the hand, as the "rod" of Moses and of Aaron (Ex 4:2ff; 7ff, etc). Ṣẖēḥḥet is used, but sometimes also ṣāleb, of the rod used for correction (Ex 21:20; 2 S 7:14; Prov 10:13; 13:24; Isa 10:5, etc). In Ps 23:4 "Their rod and their staff, they all together; however, ṣẖēḥḥet 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 ṣāleb is used of a rod of correction (1 Cor 4:21), Aaron's rod (Ex 4:20). It is a measure of iron (severity, as in Rev 2:27; 12:5; 19:15), a measuring rod (Rev 11:1). See also ARMOR, ARMS.

JAMES ORR
RODANIM, rod'a-min: The reading of MT in 1 Ch 7 7 for the RODANIM (q.v.) of Gen 10 4, corresponding to the Pēšon, Rhōthoi of LXX in both passages. The Rodanim are generally identified as inhabitants of the island of Rhodes (q.v.), well known to the ancient Phoenicians (Romer's Ḥiād).

ROE, rō, ROEBUCK, rō-buk: AV has "roe" and "roe-buck" for אָבָק, כַּבָּק, כָּבָּק, כָּבָּק. 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 (dorkas). RV has "roe-buck" for אָבָק, כַּבָּק, כָּבָּק, כָּבָּק. See Deer; Gazelle. ALFRED ELY DAY

ROGELIM, rō-gē-līm, rō-gē-līm; Ρόγελιμ, ρόγελιμ: The place whence came Barzillai the Gileadite to succor David in his flight from Absalom (2 S 17 27; 19 31). It probably lay near the path followed by David, but it is not identified.

ROHGAH, rō-ga (Κ'θῆθι ῥογᾶ, ρόγος, K' rōgā, roghah): A name in the genealogy of Asher (1 Ch 7 34).

ROIMUS, rō-imus (Ῥώιμος, Rhéimos, A, Ρ'μος, Rhomous): One of the leaders with Zerubbabel in the return (1 Esd 5 8) = "Rehuma" in Ezr 2 2, of which it is the Gr form = "Nehum" in Neh 7 7.

ROLL, rōl (SCROLL): The usual form of book in Bib. times. It had been in use in Egypt for perhaps 2,000 years at the time when, according to the Pent, the earliest Bib. books were written in this form. The Bab tablet seems to have been the prevailing form in Pal up to about 1350 BC, but by 1100 BC, at least, the roll had been in established use for some time as far N. as Byblos. Two Heb words, גיליון, m'gillah, one Aram., שפופר, and one Gr word, βιβλίον, are so tr in AV: "scroll" (Ezr 6 1, RV "archives," m "books"), with the corresponding Heb form שפּהֶר, is the generic word for any whole work large or small, but as a book form (Isa 30 19) it may mean "roll," and, according to Blau (pp. 37, 45, etc), it never does mean anything else. Both the other words seem to be connected with גָּלָל, "roll," which is the technical term for open-
of singer in David's time (I Ch 25:4.31). See JOSHBEKASHAH.

ROMAN, rō′man, ROMANS, rō′manz. See ROME, III, 2; CITIZENSHIP.

ROMAN ARMY. See Army, Roman.

ROMAN EMPIRE, en′pîr, AND CHRISTIANITY.

I. OUTLINE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

1. Roman Empire a Result of Social Conflict
   2. Empire of Monarchy
      (1) Extermination of Parties
      (2) Inability of Either Aristocracy or Democracy to Hold Equilibrium
      (3) Precedents
      (4) Withdrawal from Public Life: Individualism
   (5) Industrial
   (6) Military
   (7) Imperial Interests
   (8) Influence of Orient

II. PREPARATION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE FOR CHRISTIANITY

1. Political
   2. Cosmopolitanism
   3. Ecclesiastical
   4. Protests for Greek Culture
   5. Linguistically
   6.智力上
   7. Tolerance
   8. Pattern for a Universal Church

III. AGGREGATION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE TO RELIGIONS

1. Roman Religion
2. Non-Roman Religions—religiones licites and religions illicitae
   (1) Judaism a religio licita
   (2) Why Christianity Was Alone Proscribed
   (3) Two Empires: Causes of Conflict
      (a) Confusion of Spiritual and Temporal
      (b) Church had advanced Christianity
   (c) Christianity the Newest Religion in the Empire
   (d) Intolerance and Exclusiveness of the Christian Religion and Christian Society
   (e) Obstinacy
   (f) Aggressiveness against Pagan Faith
   (g) Christians ad iudices: Public Calamities
   (h) Odium generis humani

4. The Roman Empire Not the Only Disturbing Factor

IV. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY

1. Beginning of Christianity till Death of Nero, 68 AD
2. The Antonian Period, 68–96 AD
3. The Antonine Period, 96–192 AD
4. Changing Dynasties, 192–284 AD
5. Diocletian till Edict of Toleratio
   284–311 AD
6. Diocletian till Toleratio till Extinction of Western Empire, 311–476 AD

V. VICTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

1. Negative Causes
2. Positive Causes

LITERATURE

I. OUTLINE OF ROMAN EMPIRE.—The founding of the Roman empire was the grandest political achievement ever accomplished. The conquerors of Alexander the Great, Carthage, and Rome were a magnum and Napoléon seem small compared with the durable structure reared by Julius and his successor, Augustus. In one sense Julius Caesar 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 aspect to the Roman state. 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 plebeian, populus against plobr, the antagonism of oligarchy and democracy, the conflict against neglect and abuse. 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 kinsmen (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 autocratic

...
Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This, the best and longest lasting of the imperial governments, was the beginning of the end. In this era a dangerous centralization of authority; the senate practically became a side issue of minor importance, and a so-called "dictatorship" was established which culminated in bureaucracy under Hadrian. 

2. Coming of Monarchy.

(2) Exhaustion of parties. —The Roman world had for two generations been in a crisis, and at least one generation before the emperors. There was set up the inevitable necessity of one-man government or supreme power, and each political leader made it his ambition to grasp it. The civil wars ceased for a century with the death of Antony. But the struggles of Tibullus Gracchus and Scipio Africanus was the end of the republic.

2. Coming of Monarchy.

(2) Exhaustion of parties. —The Roman world had for two generations been in a crisis, and at least one generation before the emperors. There was set up the inevitable necessity of one-man government or supreme power, and each political leader made it his ambition to grasp it. The civil wars ceased for a century with the death of Antony. But the struggles of Tibullus Gracchus and Scipio Africanus. The Roman Empire.

3. Free of popular government could live under such conditions. Caesar said of the republic that it wore a name without any substance, and Cicero said that "it was a "van chimer." The law courts shared in the general corruption. The civil strife was one of the most bitter, and the laws between the senate and the knights was the best instrument for party interests, and enabled the holders (a) to receive large personal fortunes, (b) to take advantage of the gravity of the most flagrant injustices, and (c) to oppress other orders. In any case, the whole body of people was impossible. Effective assemblies refused to perform their proper functions because of extravagant bribery or the threat of assassination. Furthermore, the people were willing to forgo the prerogatives of election and participate in the despotism of a despotic authority. The whole people had become incapable of self-government and were willing—almost had to be—subjected to a monarch.
ambition could best meet their grievances. The senate had ruled with a rod of iron; the provinces could not possibly prosper under any form of central government. Besides, monarchy was more congenial to the provincials than a republic, which they could not comprehend.

10. Influence of Orient.—The Orientals had long been used to living under imperial and absolute forms of government, and of late years they had been drawn into the new conquerors. Besides, residence in the Orient had affected Rom military leaders with the thirst after another empire; and no other form was possible when the old city-state system broke down, and as yet federal government 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 than by a series of ever-changing administrations, just as the Austro-Hungarian and the British empires are probably held together better under the present monarchy than would be possible under a republican system. This survey may make clear to any student the history of the Orient 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 simultaneously with the planting of the 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 promoter, and in some ways the best ally 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 empire 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").

1. Pax Romana and Universalism of the World

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 wars 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 Antigonids having passed under the sway of Rome. The empire united Greeks, Romans and Jews all under one government. Rome thus blended the nations and assimilated them to Christianity. New for the first time we may speak of the world as universal humanity, the orbis terrarum, earthly man (Lk 2:1), the genus humanum. These terms represented humanity as living under a uniform system of government. All were members of one earthly state; the Roman empire was their commiss. omnium patriae.

This state of affairs contributed largely to the spread of cosmopolitanism which had set in with the Macedonian conqueror. Under the Romans all language barriers were removed; the great cities—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, etc.—became meetingplaces of all races and languages. The Romans were everywhere carrying their laws and civilization. Greeks settled thousands in all important centers as professors, merchants, physicians, or nobles; Orientals were to be found in large numbers with their gods and mysteries in Rome, "the epitome of the world." In the Roman armies soldiers from all quarters of the empire became companions. And many thousands of slaves of fine education and high culture were drawn among them as 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. Eclectic Christianity than this mixture of the Christian and non-Christian. Each person discovered how much he had in common with his 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 philosophic systems the emphasis had shifted from the city-state or the political or national to the 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 poet could say, "Whoever is good is a God." 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 devastated. It may be that the universal 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, gave rise to theAttempts of Chrysostom and Augustine to use the Stoic 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 failures 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: the use of reason and virtue to express the Greek and about God and man, selecting those elements that were universal and of lasting human value (see STOICISM).

The mind of the Roman empire was further prepared for Christianity by the Jewish Diaspora. The Jews, learning from Jews and Romans and Greeks, were creating a new Judaism and the Romans from both. The unification effected by Rom law and administration greatly aided the Diaspora. Jewish settlements became still more numerous and powerful both in the East and West. Those Jews bringing from the homeland the spiritual monotheism of their race combined it with Gr philosophy which had been setting steadily for monotheism. With the Jews the exclusively national element was subordinated to the more human and 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 that of the old Paganism, 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 setting them with their own Pantheon or identified them with Rom gods. In this way naturally the religious ideas of conquered races more highly civilized than the conquerors held on Rom minds (see DISPERSION).
Another inestimable service rendered to humanity and Christianity was the protection which the Roman power afforded the Greek civilization.

We must remember that the Romans were at first only conquering barbarians who had little respect for culture, but idealized the culture of Greece already then 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 surge of human progress 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 Greek 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 gifts of Greece. The kinship of man with the Divine, learned from Socrates and Plato, went forth on its wide evangel. This Greek civilization, philosophy and theology trained many of the great theologians and leaders of the Christian churches. That Clement of Alexandria said that Greek 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 Greek—much from Stoic thought. It is significant that the early Christian missionaries apparently went only where the Greek language was known, which was the case in all centers of Rom administration.

The state of the Roman empire linguistically was in the highest degree favorable to the spread of Christianity. The Greek republics by their enterprise, superior genius and commercial abilities extended their dialects over the Aegean Islands, the coasts of Asia Minor, Sicily, and Africa. The preeminence of Attic culture and literature favored by the short-lived Athenian empire raised this dialect to a standard among the Gr peoples. But the other dialects long persisted. Out of this babel of Greek dialects there arose a normal koine 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 Maccabean struggle affords ample evidence of the extent to which Gr culture and words with the Gr language were familiar to the Jews. There were in later days Hellenistic bodies of devout Jews in Jerusalem. Gr was recognized by the Jews as the universal language: the inscription on the wall of the outer temple court found among the doomed priests under penalty of death to enter was in Gr. The koine became the language even 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 the readers. "Isaiah Yahweh was the Bible of one people: the Bible whose God was kuros [kurios, "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. So they did what they had done 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 decree 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 Graecae eorundem motus linguas ("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 prevailing. The language of the eastern half of the empire was the Rom empire, of that 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 Aramaic. The gospel in order to become a world-evangel was tr into Gr. The early Gr Christians did not hesitate to use languages or patois 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 influence 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 Gaul—without a sign of Gr. 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 legions 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. Poets might not paint it; but the sea, and with the fall of Sextus Pompey no hostile maritime forces remained. The ships which plied 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 Chris-
tianity. The Rom empire was the first in principle a persecutor with a per-
manent court of inquisition. Strange cul-
ts 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 proselytize with 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 am-
bitition. It enlarged the vision of the church. Only a citizen (Paul) of such a uni-
versal religion for all humanity. If the Rom
Church sword could so conquer and unify the orbis terrarum, the militant church
should be provoked to attempt nothing less in the religious spirit of the empire.
A suggestion 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 empire and learned from them ag-
gressiveness, the value of thorough organization and of military methods.

9. Roman Law

Rom law in its origins was characterized by the nar-
rowest exclusiveness, and the first formal Rom code was that of the Ludi Romani, yet the Romans here as in so many other respects improved upon
what they had borrowed and became masters of jurisprudence in the antique world.
As their empire and conceptions expanded, they refined their laws to embrace 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 juris-
prudence. The Rom law played an equally important role 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 univer-
sal empire called for a universal re-
ligion, which Christianity alone could offer. Finally, not only by what Rome accomplished, but by what she
improved 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 reli-
gions 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 and dynamics
dynamism over other lives. Thus was felt the deep and unceasing demand for a new revelation, for a fresh vision or
knowledge of God. In earlier days men had be-
lieved that God had revealed Himself to primitive
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 phil-
osophic thought about the Divine, admitted the
need of a demon or omniscient to tell the secret
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 the 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 conso-
lations of Jesus. Others, losing all faith in any form
of religion, gave themselves up to blank despair and
accepted Epicureanism with its gospel of amni-
iliation 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 Lucius, the Charon of
Oriental 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 religions.

And even Seneca, who was almost a Christian
in some respects, speaks of immortality as a "beautiful dream" (belum somnium), though tribula-
tion later gave a clearer vision of the city of God. Servius Tullianus, writing to Cicero a letter of con-
solation on the death of his much-missed Tullia,
therefore had a sad "if" to offer about the future (Cic. Fam. iv.5). Nowhere does the unbelief and pess-
isimism of post-Christian days among the higher
classes strike one more forcibly than in the pensive
dialogue 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, pro-
poses life imprisonment, as death would only bring
annihilation and rest to these villains—no hereafter,
no reward or punishment (eam cuncta mortalium
mala dissolvere; ultra neque curae neque gaudii
nescum esse). The next speaker, a religious
man of his generation—in terms which can only
rebu”e upon Caesar's Epicureanism and material-
ism (ib. 52), Cicero (In Cat. iv.4) is content to
leave immortality an open question. The phil-
sophism of pre-Christian days, with the higher
classes, struck him as a "sore suspicion" (mors
nescum esse). Such was 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.

1. Roman Emperors

The history of Rom religion reveals a continuous
penetration of Italian, Etruscan, Gr, Egyptian, Chinese, and
State or State
Religion

almost unrecognized, and even the
antiquarian learning of a Varro could scarcely
discern the original meaning or use of
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many Rom deities. The Rom elements or modes of worship progressively retreated until they and the foreign rites with which they were overlaid gave way before the might of Christianity. As Rome expanded, her religion was developed and expanded. During the regal period Roman religion was that of a simple agricultural community. In the period between the Regium and the Second Punic War Roman religion became more complicated and the Rom Pantheon was largely increased by imports from Etruria, Latium, and Magna Graecia. The mysterious religion of Etruria first impressed the Rom mind, and from this quarter probably came the Trinity of the Capitol (Jupiter, Juno, Minerva) previously introduced into Etruria from Gr sources, thus showing that the Romans were not the first in Italy to be influenced by the religion of Greece. New modes of worship, non-Rom in spirit, also came in from the Etruscans and foreign elements of Gr mythology. Latium also made its contribution, the worship of Cybele and Diana coming from Aricia and also a Lat cult. Two Lat cults penetrated even within the Rom pomorum—that of Heracles and Castor, with deities of Gr origin. The Gr settlements in Southern Italy (Magna Graecia) were generous in their contribution, and were largely responsible for the later invasion of Gr deities. The Sibyls Book lines were early imported from Cumea as sacred scriptures for the Romans. In 493 BC during a famine a temple was built to the Gr Trinity Demeter, Dionysus, and Persephone, under the Lat names Ceres, Liber, and Libera—the beginning of distrust in the primitive Rom numina and of that practice, so oft repeated in Rom history, of introducing new and foreign gods at periods of great distress. In 433 and 427 the temples of the Gauls and Asclepius followed in 293 BC, and in 249 BC Dis and Proserpina were brought from Tarentum. Other non-Rom modes of approach to deity were introduced. Rome had been in this period very broad-minded in her policy of meeting the growing religious needs of her community, but she had not so far gone beyond Italy. A taste had also developed for dramatic and more aesthetic forms of worship. The period of the Second Punic War was a crisis in Roman religion, and the faith of the Romans waned before growing unbelief. Both the educated classes and the populace abandoned the old Rom religion, the former sank into skepticism, the latter into superstition; the former put philosophy in their place, the latter the more sensuous cults of the Orient. The Romans went abroad again to borrow deities—this time to Greece, Asia and Egypt. Gr deities were introduced wholesale, and readily assimilated to or identified with Rom deities (see Rom, III, 1). In 191 BC Hebe entered as Juventas, in 179 Artemis as Diana, in 138 Area as Mars. But the home of religion—the Orient—proved more helpful. In 204 BC Cybele was introduced from Pessinus to Rome, known also as the Great Mother (magnus mater)—a fatal and final blow to old Rom religion and an impetus to the wilder and more orgiastic cults and mysterious glamour which captivated the common mind. Baeus with his gross immorality soon followed. Sulla introduced Mā from Phrygia as the counterpart of Rom Bellona, and Egypt gave Isis. In the wars of Pompey against the pirates Mithra was brought to Rome—the greatest rival of Christianity. Religion now began to pass into the hands of politicians and at the expense of all religious feeling in their hands. Worship degenerated into formalism, and formalism culminated in disuse. Under the empire philosophic systems continued still more to replace religion, and oriental rites spread apace. The religious revival of Augustus was an effort to breathe life into the dry bones. His plan was only partly religious, and partly political—to establish an imperial and popular religion of which he was the head and centering round his person. He discovered the necessity of a modified religion. During his reign had long before been regarded as divine by their subjects. Alexander the Great, like a wise politician, intended to use this as one bond of union for his wide dominions. The same habit extended to the Diadochian kings, esp. in Egypt and Syria. When Augustus had brought peace to the world, the Orient was ready to hail him as a god. Out of this was evolved the cult of the reigning emperor and of Roma personified. This worship gave religious unity to the empire, while at the same time magnifying the emperor. But the effort was in vain: the old Rom religion was dead, and the spiritual needs of the empire continued to be met more and more by philosophy and the mysteries which promised immortality. The cult of the Genius of the emperor soon in its turn became an emperor himself on his deathbed jested at the idea of his becoming a god. The emperor-worship declined steadily, and in the 3d and 4th cents. oriental worship were supreme. The religion of the Rom empire soon became the Graecia with its cosmopolitan and eclectic type so characteristic of the new era.

The non-Rom religions were divided into religiones licites ("licensed worship") and religiones illicitae ("unlicensed"). The Romans divided these religions into different names, on account of earthquakes, pestilences, famine or military disasters, introduced non-Rom cults as means of appeasing the numina.

2. Religiones licites and religiones illicitae

This generally meant that the cults in question could be performed with impunity by their foreign adherents. It legalized the colegia necessary for these worship from which Rom citizens were by law excluded. But, generally speaking, any people settling at Rome was permitted the liberty of its own native worship in so far as the exercise of it did not interfere with the peace of the state or corrupt the morals of society. On one occasion (156 BC), by a decree of the senate, a severe inroad was made on the licit and illicit foreign rites which had caused flagrant immorality among the adherents. But Rome was never a systematic persecutor. These foreign rites and superstitions, though often forbidden and their adherents sentenced to death from the city, always retained a stronger hold than ever. Rom could never overcome the fascination of oriental and Gr mysteries, and devoted themselves to foreign gods while maintaining the necessary formalism toward the religion of the state. Very often too Rom citizens would be presidents of these religious brotherhoods. It should not be forgotten that the original moral elements had fallen out of Rom religion, and that it had become simply a political and military religion for the welfare of the state, not for the salvation of the individual. The individual must conform to certain prescribed rites in order to avert calamity from the state. This done, the state demanded no more, and left him a large measure of freedom in seeking excitement or aesthetic pleasure in the warm and more social foreign mysteries. Thus, while the Romans retained the distinction of religiones licites and illicitae, they seldom used severity against the latter. Many unlicensed cults were never disturbed. In fact, the very idea of empire rendered the toleration of these religions of the republic necessary. Theoretically, though not theoretically, the empire abandoned the idea of religiones illicitae, while it retained it upon the statute-book to use in case of such an emergency as the Christian religion involved. Not only the government was tolerant, but the different varieties of religions were tolerant and on good
terms with each other. The same man might be initiated into the mysteries of half a dozen divinities. The same man might even be priest of two or more gods. Some had not the slightest objection to worshipping Christ along with Mithra, Isis and Adonai. Men could conceive of Christianity as the presence of the Divine, and credited their neighbors with worshipping the One Unknown under different names and forms. Hadrian is said to have meditated the erection of temples throughout the empire to the Unknown God.

(1) Judaism, a "religio licita."—An interesting and, for the history of Christianity, important example of a religio licita is Judaism. No more exclusive and obstinate people could have been found upon whom to bestow the favor. Yet from the days of Julius Caesar the imperial policy toward the Jew and his religion was uniformly favorable, with the brief exception of the mad attempt of Gaius. The government often protected them against the hatred of the populace. Up to 70 AD they were allowed freely to send their yearly contribution to the temple; they were even allowed self-governing privileges and legislative powers among themselves, and thus formed an exclusive community in the midst of a city. Even the tumultuous events of 68-70 AD and the fall of Jesus did not bring persecution upon the Jew, though most of these self-governing and self-legislating powers were withdrawn and the Jews were compelled to pay a poll-tax to the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter. Still their religion remained licensed, tolerated, protected. They were excused from duties impossible for their religion, such as military service. This tolerance of the Jewish religion was of inestimable importance to infant Christianity which at first preferred to be no more than a reformed and expanded Judaism.

(2) Why Christianity alone was proscribed.—The question next arises: If such was the universally mild and tolerant policy of the empire to find room for all gods and cults, and to respect the beliefs of all the subject peoples, how comes the anomaly that Christianity alone was proscribed and persecuted? Christianity was indeed a religio licita, not having been accepted by the government as a religio licita, but this is no answer. There were other unlicensed religions which grew apace in the empire. Neither was it simply because Christianity was aggressive and given to proselytism and dared to appear even in the imperial household: infant Christianity was not aggressive toward the world and yet were tolerated. Nor was it simply because of popular hatred, for the Christian was not hated above the Jew. Other reasons must explain the anomaly.

(3) Two empires: cause of conflict.—The fact was that two empires were born about the same time so like and yet so unlike as to render a conflict and struggle to the death inevitable. The Christians were unequivocal in asserting that the society for which they were waiting and laboring was a "kingdom."

(a) Confusion of spiritual and temporal: They thought not merely in national or racial but in eccumenical terms. The Romans could not understand a kingdom of God upon earth, but confused Christian ambition with political. It was soon discovered that Christianity came not to save but to destroy and disintegrate the empire. Early Christian enthusiasm made the term "kingdom" a vote of "proving," pagana per targeta, for many, looking for the Parousia of their Lord, were themselves misled into thinking of the new society as a kingdom soon to be set up upon the earth with Christ as king. Gradually, of course, Christians became enlightened upon this point, but the harm had been done. Both the Rom empire and Christi-

ty 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 Romans, with their heritage of humanism and liberal spirit, aimed at universality 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 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 Christi-

tunity 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 from the East, as it were, at the stage when reason was not apparent to the Rom mind that Christianity had been spreading for a generation under the tolerance granted to Judaism (sub umbraclu licita Judaeo-

religio licita judaeorum Tert.), the same religious which "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 averse to mon-

archy (Dio Cassius li.36). A new faith appearing suddenly with a large clientele might be dangerous to the public peace (multitudo ingens: Tac. Ann. xv.44; πολλὰ πᾶρθοι: Clem. Rom.; Cor 1 9).

(4) Intolerance and exclusiveness of Christian religion and society: The marked way Romans contended for the tolerant effective spirit of the empire—the intolerance and exclusiveness of their religion and the exclusive-

ness of their society. All other religions of the empire admitted compromise and eclecticism, 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 of the stateless and of the outcast of society. But we shall not blame, when we recog-

nize that for their own life and for their own race, they must show itself at first intolerant. Many heathen would gladly accept Christ along with Mithra and Isis and all other religions, but Christianity demanded absolute separation. The Jesus cults could tolerate no rival; it claimed to be the absolute truth, and aggression was from the world. The Christian church was absolute in its demands; it would not rank with, but above, all wor-

ships. This spirit was of course displayed by the day which enabled rival cults to co-exist with the greatest indifference. Add to this the exclusive state of Christian society. No pious heathen who had purified his soul by asceticism and the sacraments of antiquity could be admitted into membership unless he denounced 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. Thyestes and the Agamemnon, incest, child murder, were among the charges provoked by their exclusiveness.

(c) Obstinatio: Add to this also the sullen obstinacy with which Christians met the demands of imperial power—a feudagio 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 in fact and recognized before Christian obstinacy. The martyr's courage appeared as sheer fanaticism. The pious Aurelia refers but once to Christianity, and in the words μὴ ἐπιταγής, μὴ παραδίκης, "sheer obstinacy," and Aristides apparently refers to it as "fanaticism, παραθυρία, "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 doctines of demons.
The imperial cult and worship of the Genius of the emperor were very unholy in their sight. Hence they fell under 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) Christianos 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 Roman 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 resented), and Nazarenes by the Jews. No nicknames were too vile to attach to them—Astinari (the sect that worshipped the ass’s head), Sarmentici or Semazeti. Rom writers cannot find epithets strong enough. Tacitus reckons the Christian faith among the “atrocious and abominable things” (atrocia aut pudenda) which flooded Rome, and further designates it superstes exitibus (‘benevolent superstition’) (Ann., xv, 44), Suetonius (Ner. 16) as novel and malefic (noveo ac malefice), 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. Their polemics were recast in the popular language of their time, with much exaggeration, which was often due to the ignorance of the heathen writers about their Christian opponents. (4) The Roman empire not the only disturbing factor.—Philosophy long maintained its aloofness from the religion of a crucified Galilean: the “wise” were 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 Neoplatonism (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 ally 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, 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 (solum ipse, Johnson) became a crime. The rise of 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 and adherents severing from the synagogue. Christians were only another of the Jewish sects to which a Jew might belong while adhering to Mosaic and Juda-ism. 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 exclusive Judaism, 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 were recognized in the Rom empire as 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 acquittal before the emperor Claudius, who “cared for none of those things” (Acts 18:12 ff), or recognized the innocence of the accused, as did both Felix (Acts 24:1 f) and Porcius Festus (25:14 ff). Thus the Romans persisted in looking upon Christians as a small sect of Jews on the who were bent upon 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 26:8). 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 encourage the emperor.

The first heathen persecution of Christianity resulted from no definite policy, no apprehension of danger to the holy polity, and no definite charges, but from an accidental spark which kindled the conflagration. This is clearly shown to this fact that 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 Jesus’ public ministry, crucifixion and resurrection of Christ closed too (Acts 37 AD) for allow any prominence 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 impulserint Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulsit: Suet. Claud., 25). Some would see in this an action against the Christians by interpreting meaning fire between Jews and Christians, in consequence of which some Christians were banished as Jews, but Dio Cassius (l.xi.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 incarnate god, to see the city burned 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 distress 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 [subdit deo] and inflected the most extreme sentences against them. For abominations [Magia] and called Christians by the populace. The originator of that name, Christians, had been banished by Tiberius, and the baneful superstition [exitiabilis superstition] put down for the time being broked out again, not only throughout Judaea, the home of this evil, but also in the City (Rome) where all atrocious and shameful [aevum] things were done. Those therefore who confessed [i.e. to being Christians] were first arrested, and then by the information gained from them a large number [multitudes ingens] were implicated [consecuti est MS reading, not consuci], not so much on the charge of incense to the abominable, as to the heathen kind of mankind [ado humani generis]. The victims perished in mills and mocking was text here uncertain, but the skins of wild beasts were torn to pieces by dogs; others impaled on crosses in order to be set on fire to afford light after death. Whence [after these cruelties] commiseration began to be felt for them..." But Tacitus does not say that these things were not from considered that, as “hatred of one person [Nero]."

This passage is 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 as being true, the emperor himself by writing subdidit reos at the beginning and santes at the close, another demonstration of how the effects of this condescension, but guilty from the point of view of the populace and deserving severe punishment for other supposed offenses. Tacitus regards the Christians as innocent, though he had not the slightest kindly feelings toward them. Qui [Tatianus] mutilat, nullius ("those who confessed to being Christians.") though Arnold argues that confessors to heathenism were word for professing a religion. But this would contradict both the sense and other evidence of the context, for it is not meant "confessed" to be brought to the notice of the emperor by such means. Christians should have been apprehended, and, further, this would have been a very good argument in favor of them, but not the case according to Tacitus. Some Christians were boldly asserting their religion, and the emperor, Gallicanus, went before it, and the word, which is not in the text. This had occurred either (1) through torture, or (2) for promised immunity, or (3) account of local rebellions. 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 plausible explanation which is much stronger and rendered almost certain by the words of Clement of Rome, who writing to the church of Corinth (c. 96) that during "the first generation after the persecution, and thus familiar with the internal history of the Rom ecclesia, twice asserts that a "true word" (multitus ingens) of the Roman Christians suffered (the Jews) (did) show" jealousy, etc. This is the most natural and obvious explanation, though it is "mutual or sectarian jealousy."

But those who do not like this fact explain it as God’s jealousy of the Jews, which is more easily refuted, for had it been the jealousy of the Jews Clement would not have hesitated one moment to say so. Those who are familiar with the Hebrew 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 an details the memory of which would be probably still bearing fruit, even in his day. Once more, the word, usually rendered, "arrested," is taken by Hardy as "put upon their trial." Emile argues that this is more in accord with Tactian usage. A "huge multitude" need cause us to distrust Tacitus. It is a relative term; it was a considerable number to be so inhumanly butchered. There is some hesitation as to whether the word "humani generis" is objective of "hatred of the Christians toward the human race" or "hatred of the human race toward the Christians." Grammatically it is possible but that may be the former there can be no doubt: it was of the nature of a charge against Christians (Ramsay). See persecution.

Some have impugned the veracity of Tacitus in this very important passage, asserting that the feelings and state of affairs of his own day (half a century later) into this early Neronian period. This early appearance of Christians in Rome is probably, and its "huge multitude" seem impossible to some. But Schiller has gone beyond anything in the case of those who as a body at Rome were persecuted, that the Christians being not yet distinct from Jews shared in the persecutions and suffered, not as a sect, but as the entire body. But Tacitus is too trustworthy a historian to be guilty of such a confusion of facts. And this conflict have been 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 crude persecution against those whom she had a leaning and who claimed her as a proselyte. Again, the Jewish faith was certe ficta 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.) sees "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 persecutory 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 *ingenia multisides* be rhetorical, the Christians were no doubt considered by Roman prejudiced 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 triumph of the kingdom of God in their lifetime. 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 them is transferred 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 rise of inquiry 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 Rom government: (1) the old view that persecution for the name, i.e. for the mere professed Christianity, began under Trajan in 112 AD—a view now almost universally abandoned; (2) that of Ramsay (Christianity in the Rom Empire, 242 ff, and three arts. in *Expos*, 1893), who holds that this 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 Rom Government, 77), Mommsen (Expos, 1893, 1-7) and Sandys (1893, 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 principles to 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* attaching to the profession and because the Roman police authorities had learned enough about the Christians to regard them as hostile to society. A trial still must be held and condemnation pronounced in the name 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 *odium humani generis* was not of the nature of a definite charge, but disaffection to the social and political arrangements of the empire. At the outset a trial was needed, but soon as a consequence the trial could be used against aggressive and active opponents of the Romans being “recognized as a society whose principle might be summarized as *odium generis humani*. A trial became unnecessary; the religion itself involved the crimes, and as a religion it was henceforth proscribed. The punishment of their condemnation was left to the police administration which could step in at any time with severe measures or remain remiss, as according to exigencies demanded. Christianity was henceforth a religio *publica*. The Rom 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 Rom 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 parti persecutione extenti imperii*) (odio, *secutioneque extrema* . . .). 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 punishing 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 Nero's persecution was only local. Nero was the first of the Rom persecutors who, like Herod Agrippa, came to a miserable end—a fact much dwelt upon by Lactantius and other Christian writers.

In the Flavian period no uniform imperial policy against Christianity can be discovered. According to Ramsay the Flavians 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 government set the future attitude of the Rom state toward the new faith. The Flavians 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 Hilary erroneously speaks...
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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 fact that 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 and brought up with a political religion. The clef1t 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 Suéttonius (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 owner 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 that of Ramsay and Mommens. The authenticity of the speech as contradicting the account of Jos is been impugned; at any rate it represents the point of view of Tacitus. Titus then advocates the destruction of the Temple in order that religion of the Jews and the Christians may be more thoroughly extirpated (quo plenius Judaorum 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 (radice subtata, stirpem faciliter periurum). We know, however, of no active measures of Titus against either party, his short reign perhaps allowing no time for them.

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 the whole Christian population was affected in accordance with 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 Roman 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 Roman 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 Mommens remarks, a standing proscription of Christians as of brigands, but harsh penalties were inflicted only 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 inquests. 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 Trajan. It is a curious fact that some of the best of the Roman emperors (Marcus Aurelius and Diocletian) were harsh to the Christians, while some of the worst (as Commodus, Caracalla, Heligabala) left them in peace (see Persecution, 17). Christianity had been rapidly spreading and 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 as 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 into effect the wholesale execution required by a consistent policy.

He wrote to Trajan telling him what he had already done, rather covertly suggesting toleration measures. Should no distinction be made between old and young? Should pardoned offenders be allowed to return to their trade or worship the emperor's image and cursed Christ? Should mere profession (nomen sacer) be a capital offence if no crimes could be proven, or should the crimes rather be punished that were associated with the faith (an fapia)? It was on this point that he explained his procedure: he gave those who were accused an abundant opportunity to retract thereupon to Christ, and their faith was executed. He considered their "stubbornness and inflexible obstinacy" (pertinacia corte et scherchilatem obstinacionem) as insuperable evidence. 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 deacons under torture discovered nothing but a perverse extravagant superstition (super, passim immolandi); Trajan replied that no universal and definite rule could be laid down regarding the correctness of Pliny's action and perhaps distinguishing Pliny from not yielding to private suggestions. Nevertheless, the emperor made three important concessions: (1) the Christians were not to be sought out by the police authorities, but those who were known and convicted they must be punished; (2) anonymous denunciations of those suspected of fapia in the past were to be pardoned on proving they were not Christians or on renouncing Christianity. Some Christians, as of Trajan as the first official and legal authorization to prosecute 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 that of highwomen, 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 heliomenian to close down any Jewish or Christian offices which he suspected in the caprice or character of provincial governors. This two was only part of Domitian's
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, ever the non-Christian, was accused, and any information against Christians could be threatened by these informers in order to secure a bribe for proceeding no farther. Licinius Silvanus Granius, like Pliny, found himself involved in difficulties and wrote to Hadrian for advice. Hadrian replied impressively to Granius'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 Mommsen, Hardy, Lightfoot, and Ramsay. Indeed, it is no easier 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 to which Pliny replied. The answer 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) protest against the Chias theory that the accused have committed something illegal; (3) mere petitions and accusations 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 stimulus toward 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 Ptolemais and Lycia 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 Larissae, Athens, Thessalonica and to "all the Proconsuls" at Smyrna, his rescript 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 superstition, partly by public building 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 absent. No general edict or definite rescript of persecution was issued; the numerous martyrdoms recorded in this reign are partly due to the fuller rise of the Christian literature. Christianity in itself still constituted a crime, and the obstinacy (παράθεσις, παράτασις) of Christians in itself deserved punishment. Aurelius seems to have actually rebuked the severity of the Roman governors at Augsburg, an action which further discouraged the trade of informers against Christians. Tertullian actually styles him as debeatolor Christianorum ("protector of Christians"). We find as yet therefore no systematic or serious attempt to extirpate the new faith. The central policy of the government was to continue the policies of the previous reign. 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 Hardy (The Other World and Roman Empire, 150 f.) that Ramsay "has to some extent anticipated the extinction of anything like a Christian faith," due to an undetected period of constant and a state of persecution, due to a state of persecution, due to a state of persecution, due to a state of persecution; and Hardy thinks that the Christian organization was not a more than an abstract danger during the first two centuries. Hadrian had taken the same attitude, and its organization was a real danger and an imperium in imperio, she must have taken a systematic exterminating policy during a period when Christianity could have least withstood it. When the empire did—as it did in the 2nd century—outstrip the power of the severest of Zeus, Christianity was already too strong to be harmed, and we shall find the empire henceforth entirely on the defensive against it.

In the next period the insecurity of the church, when in less than 100 years a number of scenes of candidates were the purple and almost each 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 peace; in particular we see the great increase in the number of Christians, and the effect of the Christian population in the eastern towns increased. The number of emperors turned from a Church to a Christianized Church, but positively friendly. In this period we find no severe (except perhaps that of Decius) and certainly no protracted persecution. The Christian Church had become 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 (lacte Christiano educatus: Tert.). Helogabalus assisted Christianity indirectly (1) by the degradation of Rome, and (2) by tolerance. According to one writer he proposed to fuse Christianity, Judaism, and Roman paganism into one.

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) Rom 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' temporal rights, but on Christianity now entered upon a period of 40 years' tranquility: as outward dangers decreased, less desirable converts came within her gates and her adherents were overtaken in a flood of worldliness, stayed only by the peremptory order of the last emperor. Like some other persecutors, Diocletian was one of the ablest Rom 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 Bibles, Christian assemblies and churches. The second was against church organization. A sudden and unexpected call for the payment of tithes recanted, but sought to compel the submission of recalcitrants by tortures —a partial confession of failure on the part of the imperial government. Christianity 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, overcome 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 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 the state, the empire, adopted Christianity, it immediately became an intolerant, bitter persecutor, both of its old rival and of heresy. Constantine, having done so much toward the triumph of the Christian faith, 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 Constantine the emperor became the historically the state religion—an alliance with benevolent 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 only 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 pernicious measures. Christianity was now in the ascendancy 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 son of Constantine justly elicited the national reaction under Julian the Apostate—the most humane member of the Constantine family. He made a "romantic" effort to reestablish 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 bidding 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!" (σειρομενον Μακαριονε, μεγαλην φωλο το βαθαίνεις). For a brief period after his death there was religious neutrality. Gratian— at the instigation of Ambrose—departed 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 his edict against heresy, in 391 heathen public worship was interdicted, in 392 several acts of both private and public heathen worship were forbidden, and greater penalties were attached to the performance of sacrifice. Christian vandalism became rampant; all kinds of violence and confiscation were resorted to, monks or priests often leading the populace. For the present the West did not suffer so severely from fanatic iconoclasm. Under the sons of Theodosius the suppression of paganism was steadily pursued. 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 (paganus . . . 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. 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 Conversions to 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 overrun the West. It restrained and educated them under the lead of the papacy, so that his conquests now extended beyond the Roman empire.

Mervale (preface to Conversion of Rom Empire) attributes the conversion of the Roman empire to four causes: (1) the external evidence of apparent fulfilment of prophecy and the evidence of miracles, (2) internal evidence as satisfying the spiritual wants of the empire and offering a beneficial for the physical wants of the empire, (3) the lives and heroic deeds of the early Christians, and (4) the success which attended the Christian cause under Constantine. Gibbon (ch xx of Decline and Fall) seeks to account for the phenomenal success of Christianity in the empire by the "miraculous design of the God of men and all the Christians, (2) the belief in Christianity in immortality with both future happiness and future punishment, (3) the miracle, (4) the high ethical code and pure morals of professing Christians, and (5) strong ecclesiastical organization on imperial patterns. The weight of these causes seems to account satisfactorily for the progress and success of the religion of Jesus.
— the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of the ancient 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 religious change, by 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 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 cognizance of its teaching with the spiritual nature of mankind" (Lecky). There was a deep-seated earnestness 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 equally superior to the latest consistent propertied systems. One inexcusable 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 nobler living. The person of Jesus was an ideal and moral dynamic 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 expatriate 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 Tertull. Schrift. De spect. imp. Liv. ille des Antich. (in Hardy's ed), Dio Cassius (in Xiphilin), the apologists, Church Fathers, Inscriptions, etc. There are too numerous to mention in full, but those most helpful to the student are: Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; and, for the Romans under the Empire; The Fall of the Roman Republic, 1856; Conversion of the Roman Empire, 1865:
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LITERATURE.

In the present art. we shall treat (1) Rom Private Law and (II) 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 our attention will be directed chiefly to the constitutional guarantees which were intended to protect Rom citizens against arbitrary and unjust punishments, these being one of the most important privileges of Rom citizenship (see Civiznen). 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, and by virtue of which their 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, the Rom statesmen developed 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 to private execution, and the night-time theft of grain might be cited as survivals of primitive private ven-
gence. 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 divine or public exercise of self-defense in assigning 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 an outline of the disputed issues, called a forum, 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 guidance 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. In this way a body of rules was amassed by interpretative adaptation which the authors of the Twelve Tables would never have recognized.

3. Jus honorarium derived its name from the circumstance that it rested upon the authority of the praetors (hence the magistracy). In this respect and because 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 these the expediency 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.

After the institution of the praetor peregrinus (241 BC), who heard cases in which one or both of the parties were foreigners, a series of similar edicts proceeded from those who were chosen to this tribunal. The

4. The praetor peregrinus annual edicts of the praetor peregrinus became an important means for broadening Rom law, for the strangers who appeared in these courts were mostly Greeks from Southern Italy, so that the principles of law which were gradually formulated as a basis for proceedings were largely an embodiment of the spirit of Gr law.

Direct legislation superseded the other sources of law under the empire, taking the form, occasion-

ally, of bills ratified by the people (leges), but usually of enactments of the senate (senatus consulto), or imperial ordinances. The

5. Imperial Ordinances the latter, which eventually prevailed to the exclusion of all other types, may be classed as edicta, which were issued by the emperor on the analogy of the similar orders of the republican magistrates, decreta, or decisions of the imperial tribunal, which had force as precedents, and rescripta, which were replies to requests for the interpretation of the law. All these acts of imperial legislation were known as constitutiones.

In the 2d cent. Salvius Julianus was commissioned to invest the praetorian edict with definite form. The Institutes of Gaius appearing about the same time became a model for subsequent textbooks on juristic jurisprudence (Gaii institutionum com-

meniaris quaedam, discovered by Nie-

buli in 1810 at Verona in a palimpsest).

This was the Golden Age of juristic literature. A succession of able thinkers, among whom Papinian, Paulus, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Gaio held foremost rank (of Codex Theodosianus 1, 4, 3), applied to the inchoate mass of legal lore the methods of scientific investigation, developing a system of Rom law and establishing a science of jurispru-

The period of the later empire was characterized by various attempts at codification which culminated in the final treatment of the body of Rom law under Justinian. The work of the board of eminent jurists to whom this vast undertaking was intrusted was published in three parts: (1) the Code, which contains a selection of the imperial enactments since Hadrian in twelve books, (2) the Digest or Pandects, which is composed of extracts from the juristic literature in fifty books, and (3) the Institutes, which is a textbook in four books. In this form mainly Rom private law has come down to modern times, and has become, in the words of an eminent authority (Bryce, Studies in History and Jurisprudence, Ox-

ford, 1901), next to the Christian religion, the most plentiful source of the rules governing actual conduct throughout Western Europe.

II. Roman Criminal Law.—In the royal period criminal jurisdiction, in so far as it was a function of secular administration, belonged mainly to the king. But under the first centuries the praetors and praetores peregrindii and duumviri perduel-

tions, belonging to officials to whom the royal authority in these matters was occasionally delegated, indicate the nature of the earliest crimes brought under secular jurisdiction. The royal prerogative passed to the republican magistrates, and embraced, besides the right to punish crimes, the power to com-

pel obedience to their own decrees (coercitio) by means of various penalties.

But the right of the people to final jurisdiction in cases involving the life or civil status of citizens was established by an enactment (lex Valeria) which is said to have been proposed by one of the first consuls (509 BC), and which granted the right of appeal to the assembly (pro-

vocatio) against the execution of a capital or other serious penalty pronounced by a magistrate (Cicero De Rep. ii.31-34; Tacitus iii.41). This right of appeal was reinforced or extended by subsequent decrees of 367 and 296 BC. It was valid against penalties imposed by virtue of the coercive power of the magistrates as well as those based upon a regular charge, and liberalized the magistrates made no provisional sentence of their own, but brought their charges directly before the people.

(1) Penalties.—The death penalty was practically abrogated in republican times by allowing the accused
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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 xlvii.6.5), 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 Roman citizens were sent to Rome, whereas other persons 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 (quaestiones 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 justices 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, corruption, extortionate practices, murder, fraud, and assault.

The justice, or jurors, were originally chosen from the senate. A law passed by C. Gracchus transferred membership in all the juries to the equestrian order, thus excluding the senators.

4. Jurors

of 70 BC provided for the equal representation of all three classes of the people in the courts. There were then about 1,080 names on the list of available jurors, of whom 76 seem to have been chosen for each trial (Cicero In Pisonem 40). Caesar abolished the plebeian jurors (Suetonius Caesar 41). Augustus restored the representatives of the third class (Suetonius Aug. 32), but confined their action to civil cases of minor importance. He likewise excused the members of the senate from service as jurors.

The system of criminal courts (quaestiones perpetuae) diminished in importance under the empire and finally disappeared toward the close of the 2nd cent. Their place was taken by the senate under the presidency of a consul, the emperor, and eventually by imperial officials by delegated authority from the emperor. In the first case the

5. Disappearance of Criminal Courts

6. Right of Trial at Rome

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 without the help of a jury, so that after the 3rd cent., when the judicial 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 Roman citizens for the privilege of trial at Rome (Digest xlviii.6.7).

Although there appear to have been some exceptions to this rule (Pliny, Epist. ii.11; Digest xlviii.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 Rom 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). It is, therefore, very proper for us to try to bring together 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, provoco ad Caesarem (Kaisara epikoloumai: 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 governor, 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 (Dioecet xi. 19), and certain of equestrian rank in the army, and centurions (Dio Cassius lii. 22, 33).
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LITERATURE

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 arcaea 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 far-reaching discussions of Christian pravity, with inscriptions 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 Pet, 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. Tertullian 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 and expansive tone, its well 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 some details, just as it left the author's 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. and we can hardly read precisely like 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 any of 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 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, supposing St. Paul to have sent 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 (18:22) to have received 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. Ampliatus, 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 that there may have been nothing more than the incident, that the converts and friends belonging to the "household" who, a very few years later, perhaps not more than three, were around him at Rome when he wrote to Philippian (Phil 4:22), and sent their special greeting ("shelied they") to the Philippians, were formerly residents at Philadelphia, 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 same conclusion, as he carefully noticed that they 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. The case 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 (1.25-27) placed by many critics in the encolpsach 14 and is omitted freely by three MSS and by Marcion. The leading uncial and a large preponderance of ancient evidence place it where we have it. It is quite possible that St. Paul may have reissued Rom after a time, and may only then have added the doxology, which has a certain resemblance in manner to his later (capitular) 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 are observed against its place at a final place.

It is worth noting that Hort, a singularly fearless, while sober student, defends without reserve the entirety 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 gather 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, and his collection was mainly 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 58 AD. This estimate follows the lines of Lightfoot’s chronology, which Robertson (1904, 241) approves. 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 mind the many events of that time, whether public or private, which 30 years ago made any marked impression on his mind, as if ever we knew how prescient men and women still are the prominent personages of 30 years ago, many of whom are still with us. And let him transform for this thought to the 1st cent., and to the time of our Ep. Let him remember that we have at least this one great Christian writer 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. Think 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 vividness and the rhetoric, but of a treatise pregnant with masterly argument and admirable 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 historic 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, 177.)

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 14 a Gaus, closely connected with St. Paul. He commends to the Romans the deaconess Phoebe, attached to “the church at Cenchreae” (18.1), presumably a place near that from which he was writing; and Cenchreae was the southern part of Corinth.

The first advent of Christianity to Rome is unrecorded, and we know very little of its early progress. Visiting Romans (ērōyōteuses, epi-

dōnouštes), both Jews and proselytes, appear at Pentecost (Acts 2.10), and no doubt some of these returned home believers. In Acts 18.2 we have Aquila and Prisca,

cella, Jews, evidently Christians, “late come from Italy,” and probably from Rome. But we know practically nothing else of the story previous to this Ep., which is itself 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 made. 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 martyrdom there. St. Peter’s history in St. Peter’s was, indeed, the sense 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 apostles. We know that all the early Rom bishops bear Gr names. And some 40 years after the date of this Ep. we find Clement of Rome writing in Gr to the Corinthians, and later again, early in the 2nd 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 4. Place Col were written). Nor would 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 commenda-
dory 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 significance. And his own life-course would fall in with such a super-
natural call. He had always aimed at large centers; and no place was larger in the year 58 than the Levant, and Rome was closing; he had worked at Ephesus, Thessa-
lonica, Corinth; he was at last in the very center of all. Rome must always have had a dominant interest for the “Apostle of the Nations,” and any suggestion that it would be a great city to evangelize might have intensified 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 Elias 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 12-18. Some account of the writer’s plans, and his salutations to friends, requests for prayer, etc., form the central greatness of Rom. It suggests its main成为一个 Christian duty in common life, personal, civil, religious. Under the latter head we have a noble treatise on religious observances, among the converts, Jew and Gentile.

Such phenomena cast a possible light on the occasion of writing. The Rom mission was only one side, by its locality and surroundings, eminently gentle. On the other, there was, as we have seen, a strong Judaic element in Rom life, particularly in its lower strata, and no doubt around the Jewish community proper there had grown up a large community of “worshippers” (งรขงข extractos, ἔμποροι) 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 conversion classes, but a number of converts from native Judaism, but very many in whose minds both traditions were working at once. To such converts the problems raised by Judaism, both within and without the church, would come home with a double weight 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 the guidance of the apostolic teaching 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 unholy 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 diverse and equitably minded people, be a living problem.

(4) Was it not with this position before him, known to him through the many means of communication between Rome and Corinth, that St. Paul cast his letter into this form? And did not the realization of the general nature of the theme suggest to an ample scale? The result was a writing which shows everywhere his sense of the presence of the Judaic problem. Here he 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 “simpler” and “higher” sides of 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 sense is 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 to eternal life? And by his own 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.

Excepting only Eph (the problem of the authorship of which is insoluble, and we put that great document here aside), Rom. is, of all the New Testament books, St. Paul has written, least a letter and most a treatise. He is seen, as we read, to support his religious beliefs in the highest order in a free but reasoned succession; problems of the darkness and of the light, of sin and grace, fall and restoration, doom and remission, faith and obedience, suffering and glory, transcendent hope and humble duty, now in their relation to the soul, now as to develop the holy collectivity of the common life. The Rom converts are always first in view, but such is the writer, such his handling, that the results are for the universal church and for every believer of all times. Yet all the while (and it is this in a splendid example of that epistolary method of revelation which is one of the glories of the NT) it is never for a moment the mere treatise, however great. The writer is always very personal, and constant in personae. The Ep. is indeed a masterpiece of doctrine, but also always “the unforced, unartificial utterance of a friend to friends.”

Approaching the Ep. as a treatise rather than a letter (with the considerable reservations just stated), we indicate briefly some of its main doctrinal deliverances. Obviously, in the Teachings of the Epistle, 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.

(1) The doctrine of man.—In great measure this resolves itself into the doctrine of man as a sinner, as being guilty in face of an absolutely holy and absolutely imperative law, whether announced by abnormal revelation, as to the Jew, or through nature and conscience only, as to the Gentile. The back of this presentation lies the full recognition that man is cognizant, as a spiritual being, of the eternal difference of right and wrong, and of the universal sense of creation to personal “eternal power and Godhead” as its cause, and that he is responsible in an awe-inspiring way for his unfaithfulness to such cognitions. He is a being great enough to be in personal moral relation with God, and able to realize his ideal only in true relation with Him; therefore a being whose sin and guilt have an unfathomable evil in them. So is he bound by his own failure that he cannot restore himself; God alone, in sovereign mercy, provides for his pardon by the propitiation of Christ, and for his restoration by union with Christ in the life given by the Holy Spirit. Such is man, once restored, once become “a saint” (a being hallowed), a ‘son of God’ by adoption and grace, that his final glorification will be the signal (in some sense the cause?) of a transfiguration of his whole personality. A man is a being actually in the midst of a life of duty and trial, a member of civil society, with obligations to its order. He lives not in a God-forsaken world, belonging only to another and evil power. His life is the whole of the Spirit in him, to show itself in a conduct and character good for the state and for society at large, as well as for the “brotherhood.”
(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 all, particularly the sole cause of all good, but the 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-foregoing” (προφανή, preceding “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 patiently and truly Paul repudiates the notion that God is said to “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 the other New Testament epistles present 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 5, where the interrelation of our redemption and the transfiguration of the Son by the Father is said to be in the Son’s consciousness. His Sonship is the entire basis of the terms of Exposition, the only condition of our relation to God. It follows that 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 coincides with the doctrine of the Son’s role as the Mediator of the covenant. The Son is not only the mediator of any existing covenant, but also the one in whom that covenant is consummated, and from whom it is to proceed. 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. If full union with 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 peace that he will be rewarded, “in accordance with the works of the righteous, and he, 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.”

(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 Epv. 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 unity of the grace governs 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 as if 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 St. Paul’s solution, the promised 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 responsibility and the value of one’s life, 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 prescription. It deals with the sovereign freedom of our acceptance for Christ’s sake, 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 coincides with the doctrine of the Son’s role as the Mediator of the covenant. The Son is not only the mediator of any existing covenant, but also the one in whom that covenant is consummated, and from whom it is to proceed.
Rome, Rome: THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA 2018

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.

In the present essay it is our aim 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 are the most prominent as interpreters of Rom. Chrysostom in his expository Homilies, models of eloquence and illustrative discourse, boasts of "sanctifying common sense," while not perfectly appreciative of the utmost doctrinal characteristics; Augustine, not in any comparable sense, but in his anti-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 open-eyed 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 rightly "Calvinistic" than some of his followers. In modern times, the not learned but masterly exposition of Robert Haldane (c 1830) claims mention, and his thoughts, rightly suggestive of his exposition of the letters (about the same date) of Thomas Chalmers. H. A. W. Meyer (5th ed. 1872. ET 1873-74) among the Germans excelled in thoroughness and insight: Godet (1879, ET 1881) equally so among French-writing divines; of later writers the best French are C. H. J. C. Jeannin (1905), and the many revisions, in particular Banday and Headlam (1957, in the "International" series) and E. H. Gifford (admirable for scholarship and exposition of his work) who worked first in the translator’s (J. R. C. Boak, 1866, now separately) claim particular mention. J. H. Parry writes on Rom in The Expositor’s Gr. Text. (1930).

Luther’s lectures on Rom, delivered in 1516-17 and long since been recovered and published, are published by J. Ficker in 1908. Among modern German commentators the most important is B. Weiss in the later revisions of the Meyer series (9th ed. 1890), while a very elaborate comm. has been produced by Zahn. In his work, a prelude and a prologue, is his book on the works of Lukanisch (Hand-Kommentar, 2d ed. 1892, very scholarly and suggestive). L. Schmoller’s Handbuch zum ersten christlichen Theologenleben (linguistic), and Julliér (J. Weiss, Schriften des NT, 2d ed. 1906, an intensely able piece of popular exposition).

A. E. Garfle has written a brilliant little comm. in the "New Century" series (no date); that of R. St. John Parry in the Cambridge Gr. Text, 1913, is more popular with less use of the Gr text. F. B. Westcott’s St. Paul and Justification, 1915, contains a close grammatical study with an excellent paraphrase.

The poetical treatment is to some extent accompanied by his shorter comm. (1879) in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and a few more recent not in a more homiletic style, in the Expositor’s Bible, 1934.
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LITERATURE

Rome (Lat. and Ital. Romo; Ρώμη, Rhôme): 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 Mediterranean Sea in 14° 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 Rom government and society with the Jews and Christians, and, in addition, to present a rapid survey of the earlier development of Roman institutions and power, so as to provide the necessary historical setting for the appreciation of the position of the Jews in the Roman State.

1. 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 ravaging the city in 390 BC, destroyed the monuments which might have offered faithful testimony of the earlier period (Liv. 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 it is a military or monarchical form of government which supplanted the looser patriarchal or sacerdotal organs of authority. This second stage may be indicated by the legendary rule of the Tarquins, which was probably a period of Etruscan domination. The confederation of clans was welded into an 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 Capitoline temple of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva (Etruscan pseudo-Hellenic deities) was erected as a central shrine; but people, not above all 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 colleguiality were the earliest checks to the abuse of unlimited authority. But the true cornerstone of Rom liberty was thought to be the lex Valeria, which provided that no citizen should be put 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.

2. Struggle between Patricians and Plebeians.

Patricians and plebeians, 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 centurionum), 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 protected from the patricians by a 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 (intercession), 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 administration of legal institutions, the nature of which had hitherto been shrouded in mystery (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

3. Senate and Magistrates

senate is 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 prerogatives of each, but also to the contraction of their aggregate independent influence. The augmentation of the number of 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 nature of these influences. For when the plebeians carried by storm the citadel of patrician exclusiveness in gaining admission to the consulsip, the highest regular magistracy, the necessity for another magistrate with general competency afforded an opportunity for making a compensating concession to the plebeian party. Thus, a new magistracy was created, to which at first members of the old aristocracy were alone eligible. Under the fully developed constitution the regular magistrates were five in number, consulship, praetorship, and censorship, tribunate, 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 an early period 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 number and birthright of 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 enforced 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. The old aristocracy, however, was still solidly connected with the patricians and formed a new aristocracy, which is called 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 (287 BC), the senators 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 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 many reasons; the remoter and poorer 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 grains was partly displaced by that of the olive and vine, which were less subject to the hazards 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 ardent 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 compelling unusually radical acts, but 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 Tib. Gracchus declared in 133 BC that a tribune who opposed the wishes of 100,000 Romans might command 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 lying general principles which lay beneath 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 Gaius and Saturninus, the leaders of the popular faction in the city in 100 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 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 perception for constitutional restraints and the right of minorities. The senate and already a
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 was 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 supremecy 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 Rom political institutions is Mommsen and Marquardt, Handbuch der historischen Alterthiimerei, (3d ed.). Other Political Institutions, Boston and London, 1901, offers a useful summary treatment of the subject.

II. Extension of Roman Sovereignty.—See Rome. 1. IMPERIALISM; CHRISTIANITY.


III. The Imperial Government.—Augustus displayed considerable tact in blending his own mystery in the state with the old institutions.

1. Imperial authority, legally, rested mainly upon the tribunician power, which he had probably regained as early as 27 BC, when it was established on a better basis in 23 BC, 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 vote in election 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 administration 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 Rom 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 Jesus, NY, 1909, p. 95).

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 laetus clovis or privilege of wearing the tonic 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 admission to 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 consultum 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 tonic. 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 Rom religion was originally more consistent than the Gr, because the deities as conceived by the unimpassioned 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 influence or change of conditions, a very 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 re-creation and ceremonial, 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 higher beings. Symbolic representations of their 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 the terracotta, terra cotta as statues and a pediment group for the Capitol temple.

The types of the Gr deities had already been definitely established when the Hellenic influence in molding Roman culture began to predominate. The gods were entirely the Gr gods became familiar to the Romans in works of sculpture, they gradually supplanted those Rom deities with which they were not nominally related, a real or fancied resemblance.

See Greece, Religion in.

(4) The importation of new gods was a comparatively
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. The many gods of their creed increased as necessity and human consciousness of natural phenomena expanded. Besides, it was customary to invite the gods of conquered cities to transfer their abodes to Rome and favor the Romans in their undertakings. But the most productive source for religious expansion was the Sibylline Books. 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 ceremonies would secure adequate divine aid. The forms of worship recommended by the Sibylline 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 Diana was merged with Artemis, and the group of Ceres, Liber, and Libera were identified with foreign Demeter, Dionysus, and Persephone. Thus Roman 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 engrailed 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 insure the fulfilment 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 absent 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 unconscious influence on 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 the spectacle of a sort of religious chaos where all national cults were guaranteed protection, that Rom polytheism was naturally tolerant, and that the only form of religion which the state could not endure was one which was equivalent to an attack upon 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 (archierus kai archdrchos; Jos, Ant, XIV, iv, 4) invested with judicial as well as religious functions. But Antony and Octavius gave Pal (40 BC) as governors 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 Jerus (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 Idumea with the title archdrchos (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 Jos, Ant, XIX, vi, 1; viii, 4.

After the fall of Jerus 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 Jerus. 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 Maccebees (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 and 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 (Phil. Legatio ad Casum 46). Agrippa
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offered 100 oxen in the temple when visiting Herod (Jos., Ant. XVI, ii, 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 rites 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 repulsion 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. Proscription v.5), and the literature of the Augustan age contains several references to the observation of the Sabbath (Thubalus 13; Ovid Ars amatoria i.67, 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 (sedobenomen), as they were called, were tolerated in the domestic affairs of the city, 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., XX, viii, 11; Tacitus Ann. xvi.6).

On "proselytes of the Gate," GJV, IV, 157, 177, very properly corrects the error in UJP. These "Gate" people were not proselytes at all; this was the first step that carried them into Judaism—viz., circumcision (Ramsey, Expos. 1890, p. 200; Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, I. 11; see Devletius: Proselytis).

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. Inscriptions show that there were seven communities, each with its synagogue and council of elders presided over by a gerousia. Five cemeteries have been discovered with many Gr., a few Lat., but no Heb. inscriptions.

VI. ROMA AND THE CHRISTIANS.—The date of the introduction of Christianity into Rome cannot be determined. A Christian community 1. Intro- 1. existed at the time of the arrival of St. of 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 agitaton of Chrestus (Suetonius Claudius 25; Juveno impul- sive Ceres adico tumultuosa Rome opera, probably in 49 AD), is proof of the diffusion of Christ inatian 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 Paul, who was one 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 46 AD the Christians were very numerous (Tacitus Ann. xv.44: "multitudo 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 sects. There was no legal proscription of one of the peoples embraced within the empire. Christianity was not legally proscribed until after its distinction from Judaism was clearly perceived. Two questions demand our attention: (1) When was Christianity recognized as a distinct sect of Judaism? (2) When was the profession of Christianity declared a crime? These problems are of fundamental importance 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 vices of Christianity, we infer that at that time the Christians were confused with the Jews. The name of Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judaea, who was committed to the jurisdiction of her husband (Tacitus Ann. xiii.32) for adherence to a foreign belief (taperata religio), formed the basis of Tacitus' proof that as early as 57 AD Christianity had secured a covert, though imperceptible, degree of recognition. The weight of evidence in this case by the contemporary authority from whom Tacitus has gleaned this incident would supply approximately the same number of several oriental religions from the point of view of Romans of that time; for Persians, Parthians, and Aureans were exempted in manner since 44 AD. Since there is some other evidence that Pontius was a Christian, the indefinite account of the accusation against him as mentioned by Tacitus is partial proof that Christianity had not as yet been considered a threat to the empire. Such a development is clearly indicated by the letter of Domitian in A.D. 88 to the Roman council (Marucchi, Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne I. 13). At the time of the great conflagration in 64 AD the populace knew of the Christians and had charged them collectively with a plot to destroy the city (Tacitus Ann. xiv.44). The recognition of the distinctive characteristics of Christianity is already taken for granted. This was probably due in large measure to the circumstances of St. Paul's sojourn and trial in Rome and to the unprecedented number of converts made at that time. The emperor Vespasian, who was probably an adherent of Judaism (Jos. Ant. XX. 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, it is convenient to adopt as starting-points certain incontestable dates between which the act of proscription was, in all probability, issued. It is clear that at the time of the great conflagration (64 AD), the profession of Christianity was not a ground for any special action. It was not until Nero was at liberty by decree of the imperial court (cf. 2 Tim 4 17) that he had charge against the Christians as 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 (Pliny, xii.59; Tacitus Ann. xiv.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.97). It follows, therefore, that the law against Christianity which was the legal basis for persecution was not an expedient to meet (such, for example, as) a rebellion 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 contemporaneous origin. Tradition ascribes a general persecution of the reign of Domitian, which would follow that Christianity was already forbidden religion at that time. Allusions in Rev. 6, 9, the references to recent calamities in Rome by St. Clement in his letter to the Corinthians in A.D. 96, and the condemnation of Aculius Glaubri (Dio Cassius xvii.13), a man of consular rank, together with the emperor's cousin Flavius Clemens (Dio Cassius, xii) and Flavia Domitilla and many others on the charge of atheism and Jewish customs (cf. 46 AD), are cited several times as evidence of persecution. The fact that a number of persons in Bithynia addressed Christians two years before the judicial investigation of Pliny (Pliny x.96) is of importance as corroborative evidence.
ROSE, roō. (1) (ῥόδινον, ἡ ῥόδοπετάλη; ἀνθός, ἀνθώς, "a flower") [Cant 2:1], ὄφρον, κρίνον, "a lily" [Isa 35:1]: By general consent EV is wrong: in Cant 2:1 it reads "Heb ἱβασπεράλη, the autumn crocus," and in Isa 35:1 it reads "or autumn crocus." This is the Colchicum autumnale (N.O. Lilico-eae). 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.O. Narcissus pseudonarcissus (N.O. Amaryllidae), 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) ἰβοῦρ, ῥόδον, "the rose," mentioned in Ecles 24:14; 39:13; 50:5; Wisd 2:2; 2 Esd 2:19: There is no reason why the rose, of which several varieties are common in Pal, should not be meant. Tristram favors the rhododendron. 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 reaspnd by placing the root in water.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

ROSH, roōsh (ר"ש, ro'ash): A son or grandson of Benjamin (Gen 46:21)

ROSH (ר"ש, ro'ash); 'Pēs, Rhōs, var. [Qē] kephalēs, kephalōs; Vulg captivos): This name occurs in the prophecies against Gog in Ezek 38 and 39, where AV has "Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Renderings Meshech and Tubal." This tr is due to ro'ash being the common Heb word for "head" or "chief" (cf the Gr variant 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 Fasalan (same period), under the name of Rūsā, as a people dwelling on the river Rha (Veilga). Apart from the improbability that the dominion of Gog extended to this district, it would be needful to know at what date the Rūsā of the Veilga arrived there.

Notwithstanding objections on account of its eastern position, in all probability Fried. Delitzsch’s identification of Rosh with the māt Rāḵā, “land of Rāḵā” of the Assyrian inscriptions, is the best. Sargon of Assyria (c 710 BC) conquered the countries “from the land of Rāḵā on the border of Elam as far as the river of Rūsā,” and this country is further described in the Khorsabad Inscription, 18, as “the land of Rāḵā, of 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 only power with which “Gog of the land of Magog” would have had to reckon, but it may well be doubted whether the Bab king would have been able to exercise power in the district of Rāḵā, except as a very faithful vassal. It may here be noted that the Heb spelling of Rōṣā presupposed an earlier pronunciation as ṛāḵā, a form agreeing closely with that used by the Assyrians. See Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 225.

ROT, rot, ROTTENNESS, rottenness (vb. ṣad, ṣadē, noun ṣadāh, ṣadākhān, Job 41 27), with ṣad-q, mak, “decay” [Isa 5 24], and ṣad-q, ṣadāh, “shrivele” [so Joel 1 17 RVm]: “Rottenness of the bones” (Prov 12 4; 14 30; Hab 3 16), has in addition, has “rot” in Nu 5 21, 22, 27, where RV has “fall away” (ṣad-q, nāphāl), but a euphemistic phrase is in point (see the note on Joel). In Jer 11, 12 AV has “old rotten rags” for ṣād-q, melah, “rag” (RV “worn-out garments,” a term that specializes too far).

ROTE, rōt: RVm gives “learned by rote” in Isa 9 13 for AV “taught,” which indicates that the service of Jeh was merely formal.

ROWER, rō’er, ROWING, rō’ing. See Ships and Boats, III, 1.

ROYAL, rō’al: 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”), They are: (1) melek, “king”: “Asher . . . 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 melek, which is the emphatic Aram. term for melek, “king” (2 K 16 7); (2) mamlākhāh, “the power and dignity of a king,” “Gibeah one of the royal cities” in 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) melkhāhū, “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; 2 17; 6 8); commandment (1 19); “her royal estate,” lit. her kingdom (1 19); house royal (2 16; of 1); royal apparel (5 1; cf 6 8, 15); throne (5 1); “royal presence,” lit. “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 (2 S 25 3); (5) in Jer 43 10 we find the word shaphrēr; its meaning is uncertain; “royal pavilion” (RV and AV), “glittering” (RVm), “scepter,” “a carpet covering a throne.”

The NT uses the word for basilikōs, “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 mamlēkhēth kōhānîm, “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, rū’bi. See STONES, Precious.

RUDDER, rud’er, Rudder-Bands. See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2, (3).

RUDDY, rud’i (רְדִי), ‘adhmonî [1 S 16 12; 17 42; Gen 26 25 RVm, דַּעְמִי, ‘adhām [Can 5 10]; vbs. דַּעְמִי, ‘adhām [Lam 4 7], and ἐπιφάνεια, ἐπιφάνεια, “to blush” [Ad Est 15 5]): “Ruddy” is the term taken by the adj. “red” used as a term of praise of the human skin, and this is its use in the Bible (the Heb and Gr words are all usual words for “red” or “to be red”). The dark-skinned Hebrews found great beauty in a clear complexion.


RUDIMENTS, rō’di-ments (ῥυτίξεια, stoicheia, pl. of ῥυτίξεον, stoicheion) [Gal 4 3,9; Col 2 8, 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 state 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.”

(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,
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by means of fire. In He 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 understood the Advance, or the Book (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 it is often fixed on a child's cap or clothes as a kind of charm.

RUE, ῥοῦ (ῥιγγαος, ῥηγμόν): One of the plants mentioned in Lk 11 42 as subject to tithe: in the passage, Mt 23 23, anise and cummin are mentioned. Rue (Ruta graveolens) 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 it is often fixed on a child's cap or clothes as a kind of charm.

RUFUS, ῥοῦσος (Ῥοῦσος, Rhoaihos): 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" (Demetrius). 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, rug: Alternative rendering of a word (Ῥῦγμα, smitikha) in Jgs 4 18 RV, "mantle" AV. The tr is doubtful; OHl gives "rug or thick coverlet (?)"

RUHAMAH, ῥοῦ-χαμα, ῥοῦ-χαμα: See Lo-Ruhamah, the symbolic name of Hosea's daughter (Hos 1 6.8).

RUIN, ῥοῖν (Ῥῶιν, hērīs, etc.; ῥῆγμα, ῥήγμα): "Ruin," the tr of hēriša (Am 9 11; cf Acts 15 16, where RV Gr text, lā katestramēnōn), and of a number of other Heb words: in Lk 6 49 ῥῆγμα, "breakage," is used both in a literal sense (Isa 23 13; 26 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 (Prov 26 28). RVn correctly renders mikhēh in Ezk 18 30 "stumblingblock" (AV "ruin"), and RV in 21 15 "stumblings" (AV "ruins"). RV has "ruins" for AV "desolation" in Ezk 9 9, m "waste places"; Ps 74 3; in their ruins for "with their mant- tockas" (2 Ch 34 6, m "with their axes! The Heb is obscure); midst of the ruin for "deso- lation" (Job 30 14); their ruin for "their wicked- ness" (Prov 21 12). "Ruinen" is the tr of nap- polaha (1 Sam 17 1) and of nēzēk (2 K 19 25; Isa 37 26).

RULER, ῥοῦλερ: (1) ῥουλ, mōshēl, "rueler," "prince," "master" (tyrant), applied to Joseph in Egypt (Gen 45 8; cf Ps 106 21); to the Philis (Jgs 15 11); to David's descendants, the future kings of Israel (2 Ch 7...
8. of a number of instances RV renders it "prince," where AV has ruler (1 S 26 30; 2 S 21; 1 K 1 35, etc.). It was used of Azrikam having charge of the palace of King Ahaz (2 Ch 22 7; "grand vizier" or "minister" of Nebuchadnezzar (Ezech 21 20; 17 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 8 the names of three others are given (Hilkiah, Zedekiah and Jehiel).

9. The word means, "nāḇāl, "prince" (so Nu 13 2, AV "ruler"); generally speaking, the nāḇāl is one of the public authorities (Ex 22 28); the rulers of the congregation (Ex 16 22; cf 34 31); "The rulers brought the oxen stones" (Ex 35 27), as it was to be the business of the people of the tribe of Simeon and financial ability: "when a ruler [the head of a tribe or tribal division] sinneth" (Lev 4 22).

10. gāḏāhān, the representative of a king or a prince; a vice-regent; a governor; then, in the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, a leader or principal of the priests under the general supervision of these two men. The AV renders it "ruler" (Ezek 23 12 23, "deputy" (Jer 51 23 28 57), and, in most cases, "ruler" with "deputy" in m (Ex 9 2; Neh 2 16; 4 14 19; 6 7 17; 7 5; 12 40; 13 11; Isa 41 25; Eze 23 6) always used in pl.

11. kāḏān, a "judge" or "magistrate" (Isa 1 10; 3 6 7; 22 3; Mic 1 19); "a military chief" (Josh 10 24).

12. rōḏēk, 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.

13. rōḏēm, 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 archēgos (Acts 4 26).

14. sār, "chief; "head"; prince, king, 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" (1 K 22 26; 2 K 23 8); "rulers [or captains; of 1 K 16 9] of his [Solomon's] chariots" (1 K 22 12); 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 AV omit their 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 a large force in case of an attack.

15. shillōth, "a commander," "an officer": "the rulers of the provinces" (Dol 3 27); shilūth, "a person in power," "a potentate" (Dol 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. shēlāq, "to have dominion," "he shall rule as the third in rank" (cf vs 16 29).

16. Nāḇāhān, "shied": "Her rulers [shields] dearly love shame" (Hos 4 18). Perhaps we ought to read (with LXX) ἀγαπέων, "their glory," and to translate it as they love shame more than their glory; they would rather have a good (!) time than a good name.

17. ἀρχή, ἀρχηγός, used of the "rulers" of the Spartans (1 Mac 14 20) and, in a general sense, of the Romans (1 Mac 2 41 2). RVm has the word also in a general sense in Gen 11 18 (RV "ruler"); a "helmsman," "ruler," etc, "one leading the way." A quite general term, Sir 10 2 (ruler of a city); 17 17 (of gentile nations); 46 18 (of the Tyrians). Also 2 17 AV (RV "he that ruleth"); and 10 35 AV (RVm "master of a feast, AV "master") of the city of Philippi; "Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people" (Acts 23 5; cf Ex 22 28, nāḇāl; see, 1 [3] above), a magistrate, a person in authority (cf Acts 7 27 35; Rom 13 3, the public authorities; "the elders of this city of Cezaerah", persons being mentally superior to their fellow-men, and so having great influence in shaping their opinions and directing their actions.

18. ἀρχηγός, ὀρχήστρα, "ruler of the synagogue." There was the permanent president, 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 25; 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 (of Acts 18 17, Sothelines), 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 excommunicate, the guilty ones (cf Jn 9 22; 12 45; 16 2).

19. ὀρχήστριος, ὀρχήστρις, the ruler ("steward," RVm) of the feast (Jn 2 8). See separate articles.

20. κοσμοκράτωρ, kosmokrátōr, a "world-ruler" (Eph 6 12). The angels of the devil (Mt 25 41; 12 45) or Satan, the prince of this world (Jn 12 31), participate in his power; they are his tools, their sphere of action being "this darkness," i.e. the morally corrupt state of our present existence.

21. πατρόκλους, patroklous; 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, showing reference to the city of THEBE (A.T. ibid.). From where it was lost is 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 (eph tois politaríchas). 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 (ἀρχιτρικλίτων, architriklinos; AV governor): The word occurs in the N.T. in the account of the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee (Jn 2 8,9). According to Eusebius (321) 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 that 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 SYNAGOGUE. See RULERS, 3, (1), (2).

RULERS OF THE CITY. See RULERS, 1, (8), 2, (2), 3, (5).

RUMAH, ῥούμα (Ῥούμα, ῥαμά; B, 'Pepá, Rhound, A, 'Pepá, Rhound): To this place belonged Pedaiah whose daughter Zebudah (RV “Zebahah”) 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 Abumoa, but this is an obvious clerical error for Arumah. 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 Nebi, Gögo de Talm, 263), which may be identical with the modern Dayr Râmah, about 3 miles N. of 'Effâsâra. Some, however, would identify Rumah with Dumah of Josh 15 52, where the substitution of r for d is supported by the LXX (Rheu-ma), possibly represented by the modern Dûmah, about 13 miles S.E. of Beit Jibrin. This of course was in the territory of Judah, and no question of juss connubium is involved, such as might arise in the case of a Galilean site.

W. EWING

RUMP, rump: AV uses this word as tr of ῥοδάν, 'alyah (Ex 29 22; Lev 3 9; 7 3; 8 25; 9 19), where RV correctly renders “fat tail.” Reference is here 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 tresspass 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-gát: A runaway: “The runagates continue in scarceness” (Ps 68 6, Prayer Book Version, RV “The rebellious dwell in a parcelled land”).

RUNNER, run'er. See GAMES.

RUSH: (1) ῥοδάν, gwón; πὁρυγα, pápyros, “bulrushes,” m “papyrus” [Ex 2 3]; “rush,” m “papy-rus” [Job 8 11]; “papyrus,” AV “rush” [Isa 18 2]; “rushes” [55 7]: This is almost certainly the famous papyrus, Cyperus papyrus (N.O. Cypero-ae), known of 598-463 B.C. as “papyrus,” m “pap-
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. Orpah gave up the journey and returned to Moab, but only Ruth remained with Naomi, journeying with her to Bethelam, 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 Bethelam 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 Elimelech. 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 her a bundle of barley and wheat grain before their bundles (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 far from laboring without wages. Naomi was so much heartened by what had occurred that she sent to Boaz to recall to him his duty as near kinsman of her late husband Elimelech (3 1 f.). Boaz acknowledged the claim and promised to take Ruth in marriage, subjecting fullfilment of the legal duty of another whose relationship was nearer than that of Boaz himself (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 obtain 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 according to the laws of Israel: and gave to the elders a bundle of barley and wheat grain before his bundles (4 1–5). 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 ff.). 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 gathered to the house of Naomi, singing songs of joy in the home of her family and house was now assured, and the latter became the child's nurse. The name of Obed was given to the boy; and Obed through his son Jesse became the grandfather of David (cf Mt 1 5 f.; Lk 3 31 ff.).

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 is a simple but interesting and affectionate 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 more than memory of an incident, the national significance of which has survived, but to which value will always be attached for its simplicity and natural grace.

For the literature, see Ruth, Book of.

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.

1. Order in Canon. There is one of the five the canon מֵגִּיהָלָּה or Rillos, which were ordered to be read in the synagogue on 5 special occasions or festivals during the year.

In printed ed of the OT the מֵגִּיהָלָּה are usually arranged in the order: Cant. Ruth, Lam. Eccl. Est. Ruth occupied the second position because the book was appointed to be read at the Feast of Weeks which was the second of the 5 special days. In Heb MSS, however, order was considerably altered. marginal heads were considered generally, and in one at least of the Ger. school cited by Dr. Ginzburg (Intro to the Heb. Bible, London, 1897, 4), Ruth precedes Cant: and in the former Eccl is placed before Lam. The מֵגִּיהָלָּה constitute the second portion of the קְרִית הַנַּהֲרָה or "reading of the river," as in the case of the books of the Heb Scriptures. The Talm, however, disapproved of Ruth altogether, and placed מֵגִּיהָלָּה, and places it first among the Hagiographa, before the Book of Ps. By the Gr translators the book was removed to the position where it now stands in the Can., and because it described events contemporary with the Judges, was attached as a kind of appendix to the latter work. This sequence was adopted in the Vulg. and has thus been 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 presentation of the story and its records of the descent of Israel's royal house from a Moabite ancestress was probably due in the first instance to oral communication for some considerable time before it was committed to writing. The writer also makes no distinction 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 far 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 2. Authorship and Purpose. It is also important in the position of the book of Ruth in the 3. Date of Heb Canon that the date of its com- Composition. Position to the closing 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 chaste, but has been supposed in certain places in 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 was ante-exilic, for the laws and rights of the succession are enjoined, or
that the writer of the former work was acquainted with the latter in its existing form. Slight differences of detail in the procedure would seem to suggest the contrary. On the other hand, the motive of the book, being the exhibition of the ancestry of David's house would have lost its significance and raison d'être with the death or disappearance of the last ruler of David's line in the early period of the return from Babylon (cf Zec 4:9). The most probable date therefore for the composition of the book would be in the later days of the exile, or immediately after the return. There is no clue to the authorship. The last four verses, giving the genealogy from Perez to David (cf 1 Ch 2:4-15; Mt 1:3-6; Lk 3:31-33), are generally recognized as a later addition.

The ethical value of the Book of Ruth is considerable, as setting forth an example of steadfast filial piety. The action of Ruth in refusing to desert her mother-in-law and accompanying her to her own land meets with its due reward in the prosperity and happiness which become hers, and in the honor which she receives as ancestress of the royal house of David. The writer desires to show in the person and example of Ruth that a sincere and generous regard for the claims of duty and affection leads to prosperity and honor; and at the same time that the principles and recompense of right dealing are not dependent upon race, but are as valid for a Moabitess as for a Jew. There is no distinctive doctrine taught in the book. It is primarily historical, recording a decisive incident in the origin of David's house; and in the second place ethical, indicating and enforcing as a well-known example the advantage and importance of right dealing and the observance of the dictates of filial duty. For detailed contents see preceding article.

LITERATURE.—Eng. comm. upon the Book of Ruth are naturally not numerous. Cf G. W. Thatcher, "Judges and Ruth," in [New] Century Bible; R. A. Watson, in Expositor's Bible; the most recent critical comm. is by L. B. Wolfenson in AJSL, XXVII (July, 1911), 288 ff, who defends the early date of the book. See also the relevant arts. in Jot Enc., HDB, EB, and Driver, Lot, 6, 484 ff.

A. S. GEDEB

RYE, ST. See SPOLT.

S

SABANCHATHNI, sâ-bâék-tha-nê. See ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI.

SABACO, sab'a-ko, SABAKON, sab'a-kon. See S0.

SABAENS, sa-bâ'anz (םבאנ, shabhâ'nîm [Joel 3:8 AV], שָבַהַנִּים; 'SABAKON, SABAEAN, Sabaean, Sabaeans, [Isa 45:14]; שַׁבָּהָנִים). 1. Forms of read shabhâ'nîm but rendered as though the Word from shabhâ', "to imbibe," hence "drunkards;" אוֹבָנִים, oûbâ'nîm, "wine-drunkens" (Ezk 23:42 AV): "Sabaean" is also the tr. of the name of the country itself (םבאה, shabhâ') in Job 4:15; 6:19. This last, which is the root of shabhâ'nîm, is regarded by Arabists as coming from that root with the meaning of "to take captive," though she'bâ', "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 Javan, the 4th son of Cush; (2) the 10th son of Joktan; (3) the 1st son of Jokshan, 2d 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 Sabaeans, however, who are the best known, and the two genealogies attributed to them (Joktan-Abraham and Jokshan-Abraham) seem to imply two settlements in the Sabaeans land regarded as that of their origin.

3. Semitic and Commercial As Ezekiel 27:23 mentions Haran (Hirran), Cusheth (Kannah), and Edom 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 27:23), perfumes (Ezr 8:20; Isa 28:11), and if the rendering "Sabaean" for Joel 3 (4) be correct, the Sheba, "a nation far off," dealt in slaves. See SEBA; SHEBA; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. PINCHES

SABANNEUS, sab-a-né'us (B. Zâbânanoe, Sabannoea, B. Zabana, Banaeia, and AV Bannaia, following the Aldine): One of the sons of Asom who had married "strange wives" (1 Esd 9:33) = "Zabad" in Ezr 10:33.

SABANNUS, sa-bân'nuus (Zâbânânoos, Sabannahos; AV Sabban): The father of Moeth, one of the Levites to whom the silver and gold were delivered (1 Esd 9:63). "Moeth the son of Sabannahos" stands in the position of "Noadiah the son of Binnui," in Ezr 8:33.

SABAOOTH, sab'a-oth, sa-hâ-oth. See God, NAMES OF, III, 8; LORD OF HOSTS.

SABAT, sa-bat: AV = RV SABRAH, (2) (q.v.).


SABATHUS, sab'a-thus, (Zâbâdeos, Sabattes; AV Sabatus): An Isrealite who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esd 9:28) = "Zabad" in Ezr 10:27.

SABATUS, sab'a-tus: AV = RV SABRATUS (q.v.).

SABBAN, sab'an: AV = RV SABBAN (q.v.).

SABBATEUS, sab-a-té'us (Zâbâsrâlaus, Sabbataius; AV Sabbatheus): One of the three (or rather two, for "Levits" = Levite) "assessors" in the investigation held concerning foreign wives (1 Esd 9:14) = "Shabbathai the Levite" in Ezr 10:15. He is probably the "Sabatue," one of the Levites who expounded the Law (1 Esd 9:48), and so = the "Shabbathai" in Neh 8:7.

SABATH, sab'ath (שֶׁבָּה, shabbath, šēbâh, šabbathim; סֶבָּת, sebâth, ša sebâtha, ša sbbatha; the šēbāth 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.  The Gospels 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 seventh day, but also rested from all his labor, and the seventh day became to him and his descendants a sacred day, a day of rest.

2.  Biblical Account creatively. The word “Sabbath” does not occur in the story; but it is recognized by critics of every school that the author (P) means to describe the Sabbath as primeval. In Ex 20:8—11 (ascribed to JE) the reason assigned for keeping the 7th day as a holy Sabbath is the fact that Jeh rested after the six days of creative activity. Ex 31:17 employs a bold figure, and describes Jeh as refreshing Himself “catching His hands after six days of work.” Thus a statement that God set apart the seventh 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 product of a priestly imagination of the sixth day. There are so 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 whole 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 f.). The first express mention of the Sabbath is found in Ex 15:21—26, in connexion with the giving of the law. Jeh 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). The Fourth Commandment enjoins upon Israel the observance of the 7th day as a holy day of rest, the week as a holy day on which no work shall be done by man or beast. Children and servants are to desist from all work, and even the stranger within the gates is required to keep the day holy. This provision 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 rehearsed 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; 32:6; Lev 19:33; 25:3—8). A wilful Sabbath-breaker was put to death (Nu 15:32—36).

In the Deuteronomic 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 planetary) have been almost 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), or the rather as a day of rest, its name being merely by a radiol of work to the Babylonian (Schrader, Stud. u. Krit., 1874). It is customary to connect the name with the Heb word sabattan. Thus wrote Professor C. H. Toy in 1899 (JBL, XVIII, 190). In a syllable {I R, 32, 160} sabattan is said to be equivalent to the Heb libbi, 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 sabattan as equivalent to the Heb Sabbath. But Jensen and others have shown that the phrase should be rendered “day of the appeasement 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, therefore one should do over the same day particular day. Now the term sabattum has been found only 5 or 6 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 that it was not eaten 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 sabbath or other 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 able paper by Professor M. Jastrow, which has been 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 (AJT, II, 31—32). 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 not as an unfavorable day; but rather as a day set apart for the benefit of man. 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 imposing upon it beneficent and humanitarian aspects.

We must call attention to Meinhold’s ingenious hypothesis as to the origin of the Sabbath. In 1894...
Theophrastus G. Pinches discovered a tablet in which the term "shabbat" is applied to the 15th day of the month. Moderns in Bab denote the day of the full moon. Dr. Skinner thus develops Meinhold's theory: "He points to the close association of new-moon and Sabbath, as in the present references to the OT, I Chron 8:5; Hos 2:11; Isa 1:13; 2 K 4:23; and concludes that the early Israel, as in Babylonia, the Sabbath was the full moon festival. The phrases of the weekly Sabbath he traces to a desire to accommodate the Israelites for the loss of the old lunar festivals, when these were abrogated by the Deuteronomic reform. This innovation he attributes to Ezekiel; but steps toward it were produced in a new yearly day of rest during harvest, only (on the ground of Dt 16:8; cf Ex 34:22), and its observance was thus made in profusion of the year (Lev 25), which he considers to be older than the weekly Sabbath" (ICC on Gen, p. 39). Dr. Skinner well says: "the whole story involves the improbability. It is not certain that the Babians applied the term 'sabbata' to the 15th day of the month because it was the day of the full moon; and it is by no means certain that the early prophets in Israel identified sabbath with the festival of the new moon.

The wealth of learning and ingenuity expended in the search for the origin of the Sabbath has brought to the present yielded small returns.

II. History of the Sabbath after Moses.—The early prophets and historians occasionally make mention of the Sabbath. It is sometime named in connection with the festival of the new moon (2 K 4:23; Am 8:5; Hos 2:11; Isa 1:13; Ezek 48:3). The prophets faulted faithfulness to the worship on the Sabbath, because it was not spiritual nor directed to the glory of God. 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 possession is made of Israel's unfaithfulness in profaning the Sabbath (Jer 17:21–27; Isa 56:2–4; 58:13; Ezek 20:12–24). In the Pers period Nehemiah struggled earnestly to make the people of Israel 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 Inter-testamental Period 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 (1 Macc 2:39–41). This was during the period between Ezra and the Christian era that the spirit of Jewish legalism flourished. Innumerable restrictions and rules were formulated for the conduct of life under the Law. Great principles were lost to sight in the mass of petty details. Two entire treatises of the Mish, Shabbath and 'Erubbin, are devoted to the details of Sabbath observance. The subject is touched upon in other parts of the Mish; and in the Gemara there are extended discussions, with citations of the often divergent opinions of the Tannaim. In the Mish (Shabbath, 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 following 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 commented more than religious leaders of the Jews as in the matter of Sabbath observance. He set Himself squarely against the current rabbinic restrictions 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 subject all his personal interests; in other words, that man was made for the 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 6:1–18; 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 import. 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 many occasions give the law of the Sabbath (Mk 2:28). The argument 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 sabbatarians 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 of the Jews. It was held that he fought for and won freedom for his gentle fellow-Christians. It is significant of the attitude of the apostles that the decrees of the Council at Antioch in 56, which as we know of Sabbath observance in the requirements laid down, were rejected (Acts 15:21). 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); but in all such matters one ought to be careful not to put a stumbling-block in another's way (Rom 14:13). That Paul contended for personal freedom in respect of the Sabbath is made quite clear in Col 2:16, where he groups together dietary laws, feast days, new moons and sabbaths. The early Christians brought over into their midst the practice 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 considerations: (1) what the law 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 Scriptures. What the law says concerning the Sabbath day is recorded in Genesis 2:3. The blessing here placed upon the Sabbath day distinguishes it from the other days of the week, and the day thus blessed was "sanctified" (AV, RV "holy-apart from other days").

That the Sabbath thus instituted was well known throughout the Patriarchal age is clearly established both by direct evidence and by necessary inference. "If we had no other passage than this of Gen. 2 3, there would be no difficulty in deducing from it a precept for the universal observance of a Sabbath, or seven days, to be devoted to God as holy time by all of that race for whom the law was given. All the things therein were special preparations. The first men must have known it. The word does not mean that men were to observe it otherwise. They would be a blank unless in reference to some who were required to keep it holy" (Lange's Comm. on Gen. 2 3, I, 187).

"And the day arrived when Moses went to Goshen to see his brethren, that he saw the children of Israel in their hardness and hard labor, and Moses was grieved on their account. And Moses returned to Egypt and came to the house of Pharaoh, and came before the king, and Moses bowed down before the king. And Moses said unto Pharaoh, I pray thee, my lord, I come to speak a small request from thee, turn not away my face empty; and Pharaoh said unto him, Speak. And Moses spake unto Pharaoh, saying, let my people go to serve the Lord, and let them sacrifice to the Lord their Creator. And Pharaoh said, I will let them go, if they shall sacrifice to me in this land. And Moses said, Behold I have lifted up thy face in this thing to grant thy request. And Pharaoh ordered a preparation throughout all his places, and gave to Pharaoh saying, To you, all the children of Israel, thus says the king. Shall do your work, and labor, both on the sixth day you shall rest, and shall not perform any work; thus shall you do in all the days, as the king and Moses the son of Bithia have commanded. And Moses rejoiced at this thing which the king had granted to him, and all the children of Israel did as Moses ordered them. For this thing was from the Lord to the children of Israel, for the Lord had begun to remember the children of Israel to save them for the sake of their fathers, And the Lord was with Moses, and his fame went throughout Egypt, and Moses became great in the eyes of all the Egyptians, and in the eyes of all the children of Israel, seeking good for his people Israel, and speaking words of rebuke to the king regarding his request to the king" (Book of Joshua 70:41-51, published by Noah & Gould, New York, 1895-1899).

"Hence you can see that the Sabbath was before the law of Moses came, and has existed from the beginning of the world. And if Moses and Moses were in the presence of the true faith, met together and called upon God on this day, (Ex. XXXV, p. 32). 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 left none called man to that commemoration before? And it is certain that which was observed in the falling of the manna before the giving of the Law; and let any considering Christian judge . . . (1) whether the note was not more rest of God's rest in the creation, and was this called upon that to the original reason of the Sabbath; (2) and then the first, and should not have been said. Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day, for six days the manna fell, and not on the seventh; rather than for six days God created heaven and earth, etc. and rested the seventh day". And it is

usually added. Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Nay, consider whether this annexed reason intimates not that the day on this ground being divided into two parts, God had sent not down the manna on that day, and that He prohibited the people from seeking it" (Richard Baxter, Practical Wisdom, 1711, II, 774, ed. 1875). 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 rest, so 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 29 AV). 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 which was instituted at creation, and had been observed during the intervening centuries, was embodied in a 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). That in the 4th commandment that tenet of 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". 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 as a memorial of God'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 observation of the true Sabbath would preserve them from idolatry, being a constant reminder of the one God, the Creator of all things. Even when, however, suffering from the attacks of the Babylonians, God assured His people, through the prophet Jeremiah, 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 people's relation to God. And all the 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 66:1-7.

(2) NT teaching.—From the record found in the four Gospels, it is plain 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 objections that He then revealed of the 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 brought against Him for no other reason than that He refused to allow the requirements of man to change the Sabbath, blessed of God, into merely a 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." (Le 23:56) and that they treated the following day, the first day of the week, the same as old, is further evidenced upon that day they came unto the sepulcher for the purpose of anointing the body of Jesus. In all, whatever charge was made against the work of the disciples in proclaiming the gospel of a risen Saviour, no other Sabbath is recognized than the seventh day by their conduct and by the record of the Scriptures, in which He expressly stated that Sunday was only a human ordinance, but that He had added nothing to the command. There would be no restoration of the Sabbath whatever 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 falsify anything else, "God save everything that he had made, and, behold, it was signification of very good" (Gen 1:31). The Sabbath was both the sign and the memorial of that creative power which is able to make all things good, and 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, if man is in sin, as there is a new creation: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2 Cor 5:17). "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation" (Gal 6:15). "For all things are made new. . . . Christ be exalted in your hearts, who God afore prepared that we should walk in them" (Eph 2:10).

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 exercised in the signs and miracles which preceded their deliverance, and in those miracles, such as the opening of the Red Sea, the transformation of the stone into bread 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 delivered from Egypt, as a new creation. And so the deliverance from Egypt is the type of every man's deliverance from sin; and the instruction to Israel concerning the Sabbath is both historical and typical.
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." But the same Word which was with God, and was God, "became flesh, and dwelt among us" (Jn 1 1.3.14).

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" (Eph 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.

Inasmuch as the redemptive work finds its chief expression in the cross of Christ, the Sabbath, which is 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 the keeping of a man's law, 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 the Sabbath is the sign of that predicted apostasy in which the man of sin would be revealed who would cause 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-bra'king. See Crimes; Punishments.

SABBATH, COURT OF THE. See COVERED WAY.

SABBATH, DAY BEFORE THE. See DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH.

SABBATH DAY'S JOURNEY, jûr'ni (σαββαθῶν ὁδὸς, sabbithôn hodos): Used only in Acts 1 12, where it designates the distance from Jesus to the Mount of Olives on which He discipled 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 Ex 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 Josh 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 Jesus is stated in Jos (Ant. XX, xvi, 6) to have been five stadia or furlongs, and in B. B. V, i, 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, the approach of 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 should be at the trunk 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. 'Erbûnî 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 (Nu 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. POTTER

SABBATH, MORROW AFTER THE. See MORROW AFTER THE SABBATH.

SABBATH, SECOND AFTER THE FIRST (σαββάτῳ δεύτερῳ τρίτῳ, sabbatô deuterô troîth; [Lk 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 2-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 (Lev 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-first Sabbath"; (4) the word is a monstrous combination of the words δεύτερος, "second," and πρῶτος, "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, δευτερο-πρῶτος is omitted by many MSS (including K 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 BAUR

SABBATHES, sab-a-thé's: AV = RV SABBATHES (q.v.).

SABBATHS, sab-ath'z, OF YEARS (τὰ ἰερήματα, thâ ierê'mata; ἀναπαύσεως τὰς, anapausiseos tâs; [Lev 25 8]): The seven sabbatic years preceding the Year of Jubilee. See SABBATICAL YEAR; JUBILEE YEAR; ASTRONOMY, I, 5.

SABBATICAL, sa-bâ'tik-al, YEAR (τὸ ἰερήμα, tô ierê'ma; sabbath; ἀναπαύσεως, anapausiseos, "a year of solemn rest"; or τὸ ἱερήματος, tô ierê'matos, sabbath; ἀναπαύσεως, sabbata anapausiseos, "a sabbath of solemn rest" [Lev 25 4];
or ἡμέρα τοῦ Χαμέρα, χαμήρα ἡς τὴν μήνα τῆς Χαμήρας, "the year of release" ([Dt 15:9; 31:10]). We find the first rudiments of this institution in the so-called Covenant Book (Ex 21:1–23). Its connection with the day of rest (Sabbath) is obvious, although it strikes us as somewhat remarkable that in Ex 23:10–12 the regulation regarding the 7th year should precede the statute respecting the 7th day. Still it seems natural that after the 9th year, "whence Israel was sojourners in the land of Egypt," the Covenant Book should put in a good word for the poor in Israel (ver 11: "Let it rest and lie fallow, that the poor of thy people may eat"). Even the beasts of the field are remembered (cf Jon 4:11).

We must, therefore, conclude that in this early period of the history of Israel the regulation regarding the 7th year was primarily intended for the relief of the poor and for the awakening of a sense of responsibility in the hearts of those better provided with the means of subsistence. It would be wrong, however, to deny its Sabbatic character, for the text expressly says: "But the 7th year shall be a Sabbath to the land" (lit. "thou shalt release it"), implying that the land was entitled to a rest because it needed it; it must be released for a time in order to gain fresh strength and insure its future fertility. Two motives, then, present themselves most clearly, one of a social, the other of an economic character, and both are rooted in God's dealings with Israel (cf Ex 21:1).

Another evidence of the humane spirit pervading the Mosaic Law may be found in Ex 21:2–6, where in the case of a Hebrew slave, the term of his servitude is limited to six years. The connection of this passage with the idea of the Sabbatical year is evident, but we fail to detect here any reference to the Sabbatical year. It is clear that the 7th year in which a slave might be set free need not necessarily coincide with the Sabbatical year, though it might, of course. The same is true of Dt 15:12–15: it has nothing to do with the Sabbatical year. On the other hand it is reasonable to assume that the "release" mentioned in Dt 15:1–3 took place in the Sabbatical year; in other words, its scope had been enlarged in later years so as to include the release from pecuniary obligation, i.e. the remission of debts or, at least, their temporary suspension. This moral principle of Israel was now developing from a purely agricultural to a commercial nation. Still the same spirit pervaded the command for the poor to be fed and for the land to be allowed to rest. In the former period, it goes without saying that the old regulations respecting the release in the 7th year was still in force. (cf ver 2: "because Jehovah's release hath been proclaimed").

According to ver 6 of this proclamation occurred at the end of every 7 years, or, rather, during the 7th year; for we must be careful not to strain the expression "at the end" (cf ver 9, where the 7th year is called "the year of release"); it is quite natural to identify this 7th year with the Sabbatical year.

Moreover, we are now almost compelled to assert that the Sabbatical year by this time had become an institution observed simultaneously all over the country. From the wording of the regulation regarding the 7th year in the Covenant Book we are not certain about this in the early periods. But now, it is different. Jehovah's release hath been proclaimed.

It was a solemn and general proclamation, the date of which was very likely the day of atonement in the 7th month (the Sabbatical month). The observance of the Feast of Tabernacles (booths) began five days later and it lasted from the 15th day to the 21st of the 7th 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.

In Lev 25:1–7 the central idea of the Sabbatical year is under consideration. Although we should be careful not to look for too much of the ideal and dogmatic in the institutions of the children of Israel, yet we must never lose sight of the religious and educational character even of their ancient legislation.

One 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.

If we think of the purely religious character of the Sabbatical year, we are now keeping with the idea permeating the OT, namely that the children of Israel are the chosen people of Jehovah. All their agricultural, social, commercial and political relations are to be based upon calling and shaped according to God's sovereign will.

But did they live up to it? Or, to limit the question to our subject: Did they really observe the Sabbatical year? There are those who hold that the regulations regarding the Sabbatical year was not observed before the captivity. In order to prove this assertion they point to Lev 26:34 f. 43; also to 2 Ch 36:21. But all we can gather from these passages is the palpable conclusion that the law regarding the Sabbatical year had not been strictly obeyed, a deficiency which may mar the effect of any law.

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 9:8; 10:32 f.). In ver 31 of the last-named chapter he alludes to the 7th year, "that we would forego the 7th year, and the exact time are not sure of the exact meaning of this 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 Samarians "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, viii, 6).

During Maccabean and Asmonean times the law regarding the Sabbatical year was strictly observed, although it frequently weakened the cause of the Jews (1 Macc 6:40, 53; Jos, Ant, XIII, viii, 1; cf I Rd, i, ii, 4; Ant, XIV, x, 6; XV, i, 2). Again we may find references to the Sabbatical year in Jos, Ant, XIV, xvi, 2, etc; Tac. Hist. v. 4, etc, all of which testifies to the observance of the Sabbatical year in the Herodian era. The words of Tacitus show the popular and an emphasis on 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, be being allured by their lack of energy, they also spend the 7th year in laziness. See also Astronom. 1, 5, 3 (4); Judæus Year. W. F. BAUD.
SABBAT, or SABTHAH, sab'ta (סבתא, sabbathā', סבתא, sabbathā): Third son of Cush (Gen 10 7 = 1 Ch 1 9). A place Sabta is probably to be looked for in South Arabia. Arab geographers give no exact equivalent of the name. Al Bekri (185) quotes a line of early poetry in which Dhu 'l Sabta is mentioned, and the context might indicate a situation in Yemamah; but the word is possibly not a proper name. It is usually identified with Sabatha (Ptol., vi.7, 28) or with the Sabota of Pliny (vi.22; 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 Elishar, whose name presents a striking resemblance to Dhu 'l-Ashtar, one of the "Tabbas" 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'tē-ka (סבתה, sabbēkhāh'; סבתה, sabatha; סבתה, Sabatha; סבתהא, śabethaḥ; Sabatha): The 5th name 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 (Skizze, II, 252) has revived the suggestion of Bochart that it is to be identified with Samylda 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, sakkār (סקר, sakkār): (1) Father of Abiam, a follower of David (1 Ch 11 35, B, אֶשֶׁר, Achōr, A, סָכָר, Sakkār = "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, I, (f).

SACKCLOTH, sak'kloth. 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 else, the term has figured with such importance in the history of Christianity that 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" (Ep. x.97), but scholars are now pretty 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. Though the term of 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 μεταμορφωσ, μεταστασις, "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 in 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 declared 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 rescripting (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 forms is perfectly arbitrary. For example, for the sake of 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 expressed in the Christian church, the various classes together under this name, they found the distinguishing marks of sacraments (1) in their institution by Christ, (2) in their being enjoined by Christ in the New Testament, (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 status is thus apparent 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, with the Passover—the 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 15 f 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 an injuction 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 Harmon, History of Dogma, 1, 79, and the references there given); it is evident, however, that such an objection is 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 (cf Rom 6 3 f; 1 Cor 13 13; 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 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 Jewish regard the speedy consummation of His kingdom make it impossible that He would 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 5 9 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 by traditions of what he had seen in Corinth and elsewhere of the mystery-practices of the Gr world.

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 narratives of the synoptics, which are highly compressed in any case, the first two evangelists would seem to have confined themselves to setting down those sayings which formed the essential moments of the Supper and gave its symbolic contents. 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 23.26), and just as the Supper rests 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 gentile 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. For example Acts 2 42–46, spiritual quickening (Col 2 12) 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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to Deity and given back by Him to the offerer to be used in the priest service. This practice was called "heave offering," something lifted up, or properly, separated from the rest and given to the service of the Deity. It is the expressing homage or gratitude thus separated for the priest. The term is applied to products of the soil or portion of land separated unto the Divine service, etc.

**Theory of Sacrifice** — "an oblation," or "offering"; another generic term for all kinds of offerings, animal, vegetable, or even gold and silver derived from the vb. lībah, "to draw near," it signifies what is drawn or brought near and given to God. "Theoroi" or "theories" is a sort of etymological food.

**Kīlīth** — "whole burnt offering," the entire animal being burned upon the altar. Sometimes used synonymously with āśeke. A technical word in the Carthaginians.

**Lībbar** — a "feast," used metaphorically for a sacrificial feast because the meat of the sacrifices constituted the main part of the feast. Lībbar, "frankincense," "incense," used in combination with the meat offerings and burnt offerings and placed also upon the altar in the holy place. See INCENSE.

**Kīrōth, Kīrōth** — "smoke," odor of sacrifice, or incense offerings, as a soothing savour and supposed to be pleasing and acceptable to God. It is offered as a sign of sacrifice because of its purifying and preserving qualities.

**Shemen** — "oil," generally olive oil, used with the meat 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 puerile and expository, or an offering of food as a gift to the God. It may be practically a Bribe, 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. Theoretically, it defined the right shoulder or thigh as the 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 his own 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 Rformed theologians, and was based mainly on the narrative in Gen 4:4.

**1. Theory of Sacrifice** — According to the theory that the origin of sacrifice was the offering of a strong plea as follows: Since faith was 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 gods of the Greeks 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 as is with it. There may have been such a revelation cannot be denied, but it is not a necessary or probable explanation.

(I) *The gift-theory.* — By this it is held that sacrifices were originally presented to God, a deity which the offerer sought to placate or to the burnt offerings. It may account for some heathen systems of sacrifice, but can help in no degree in understanding the Bib. sacrifices.

Cicero vouches for such a view when he says: "Let not the impious dare to appease the gods with gifts. Let them hearken to Plato, who tells us that justice can be no doubt what God's disposition to them will be. Even an empty thing will return good to the wicked." (HDB, IV, 331a). This view of sacrifice prevails in classical literature. Spencer therefore thinks that it is self-evidently false, and that the natural explanation of the act of gift is "a thing of beauty." Tylor and Herbert Spencer also find the origin of sacrifices in the idea of a gift, whether to the dead, to the dead ancestors, food being placed for them, and this afterward comes to be regarded as a sacrifice. Such a view gives no account of the peculiar value attached to the burnt offerings or to the burnt offerings. It may account for some heathen systems of sacrifice, but can help in no degree in understanding the Bib. sacrifices.

(2) *The magic theory.* — There are two slightly variant forms of this: (a) that of R. C. Thompson (*Sem Magic, Its Origins and Developments, 174-218*), who holds that a sacrificial animal serves as a substitute victim offered to a demon whose activity has brought the offerer into trouble: the aim of the priest is to entice or drive the malignant spirit out of the sick or sinful man into the sacrificial victim where it can be isolated or destroyed; (b) that of L. Marilier, who holds that sacrifice in its origin is essentially a magical rite. By a magical force the effusion of the victim's blood will injure the god to the will of the man. From this arose under the "cult of the dead" the gift-theory of sacrifice. Men sought to ally themselves with the god in particular by purifying walls and offering him the blood by the application of the blood to the altar, or by the sacrifice of a living animal and the contact of the sacrificial with its blood. Such theories give no account of the burnt offerings, meal offerings and sin offerings. They do not connect themselves entirely from the development from God, and divest them of all sacrificial value. They may account for certain deified and hidden systems, but not for the Biblical.

(3) *The table-bone theory.* — Ably advocated by Wellhausen and others, it says that the burnt offerings were meals which the worshippers and the god shared, partaking of the same food and thus establishing a firmer bond of fellowship between the two. *Nature of Sacrifice*.
Sacrifices, 75) first advocated this, holding that the efficacy of sacrifices is "the fact that eating and drinking were the ordinary symbols of friendship, were the usual rites in engaging in covenants and leagues." Thus sacrifices are more than gifts; they are "oath of hospitality," which knits gods and worshippers together. W. R. Smith has expounded the idea into the modern theory that sacrifice was the victim—whether animal or man—which the sacrificer par take of. Though this view may contain an element of truth in regard to certain biblical customs, it certainly helps not to account for all the sacrifices. 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 sacrifices."

(4) The sacramental communion theory.—This is a modification of the table-bond theory. The basis of it is the totemistic idea 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 (658, 313). In some cases the blood is drunk by the worshippers, thus imbibing the life. Sometimes, in such cases as the camel, this would be the quivering flesh before the animal was really dead, and the entire carcase 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 king, 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, point out that such a theory is far from having established the historical or the logical connection between the common meal and the other kinds of sacrifices. Under piacula he confines purification, propitiation and expiations. His attempts to establish a relationship between this totemic character and the late and not sacrificial do not succeed. Smith's theory is mainly the sacramental, though he does recognize the honorable 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 homage theory.—This has been advocated by Warburton and F. D. Maurice. The idea is that sacrifices were originally an expression of homage and dependence. Man naturally felt impelled to seek closer communion with God, not 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 act of 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 prayer and submission enter into some sacrifices, the burnt offerings in particular; but it does not account for all kinds of offerings.

(6) The piacular theory.—This holds that sacrifices 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 sacrifices there are some ideas of purchase or substitution, though these may not have issued from some primitive form. The unifying principle in all sacrifices is that the Divine is put in communication with the profane by the intermediary of the victim—whether animal or man—which the sacrificer particpates. 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 an original idea in sacrifice a piaculum, a substitute for the offerer.

This view is the most simple, the most natural, and the only one that can explain certain sacrifices. Man felt himself under liability to punishment or death. The animal was his, it 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).

Objection is raised to this by A. B. Davidson (Theology of the Old Testament, 981). While, however, others, on the ground that such an origin represents too advanced a 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 sacrifices 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. Why atone for a sin, only because atonement had been made. In fact, many sacrifices were of the most solemn character and represented the deepest and most serious emotions of the heart.

(7) Originating in religious instincts.—Neither the theory of an objective Divine revelation, nor of a human origin will account for the universality and variety of sacrifices. 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 Omnipresent 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 childish 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 sacrifices became the leading features of the religious life of primitive man. Naturally other ideas would be added, such as that a gift of food had a sacred use, 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 other isolated and primitive communi-
ties, as to attempt to understand the Bible ideas in sacrifices by studying the cults of those heathen and savage tribes of Semites, etc.

III. Classification of Sacrifices.—Maimonides was among the first to classify them, and he divided them into two kinds: (1) Those on behalf of the whole congregation, fixed by statute, time, number, etc., and sacrificed. As these would include burnt, meat and peace offerings, we shall deal with their accompaniments. (2) Those on behalf of the individual, whether by virtue of his connection with the community or as a private person. These would be burnt, sin and guilt offerings with their accompaniments.

Others, such as W. R. Smith, classify them as: (1) honorific, or designed to render homage, devotion, or adoration, such as burnt, meat and peace offerings; (2) piacular, designed to ex-
piate or make atonement for the errors of the people, i.e., burnt, sin and guilt offerings.

2. W. R. Smith and Others

3. Oehler

Oehler divides them into two classes, viz.: (1) those which assume that the covenant relation is undisturbed, and the offerings were undisturbed symbols of submission; and (2) those which intend to do away with any disturbance in the relation which had been right, such as burnt, sin and guilt offerings.

Professor Paterson and others divide them into three: (1) animal sacrifices, burnt, peace offerings; (2) vegetable sacrifices, meat offerings, shewbread, etc.; (3) liquid and incense offerings; wine, oil, water, etc.

5. Wiener

H. M. Wiener offers a more suggestive and scientific division (Beihefte zu Sachristolchen, 200 f.): (1) customary lay offerings, such as had been offered in the temple or at home at fixed times; (2) offerings on altars of earth or stone, without priest, used and regulated by Moses and in more modern times, viz., burnt, peace, meal and peace offerings; (3) 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 | feet of ancient history. Everywhere sacrifices existed and sometimes abounded as an essential part of religion. The space of the archaeologist, and the researches of scholars help us understand the pre-Mosaic period.

1. In Egypt—probably from the beginning of the 4th millennium there were sacrifices and sacrificial systems. Temples at Abydos, Thebes, On, etc., were great priests' centers with high priests, lower priests, rituals and sacri-

2. In Babylonia,

all peace offerings predominated. Oxen, wild goats, pigs, geese were the chief animals offered. Besides these, wine, oil, beer, milk, cakes, grain, olives, 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 concept 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 other people would not take special care to in-

stitute such a system.

In Babylonia, from the year 3000 BC or thereabouts, according to a scribe (Geschichte des Altherums), there were many centers of worship such as Sippar, Agade, Assur, Ur, Nisibis, Laredo, Sippur, etc. These and others continued for centuries with elaborate systems of worship, sacrifices, temples, priesthoods, etc. Considerably over 100 temples and sanctuaries are mentioned, with hundreds in the temple tablets, so that Babylon was studded with temples and edifices for the gods. At all these temples people offered—primarily human, vegetable. A long list of the offerings of King Gudea includes oxen, sheep, goats, lambs, deer, fish, birds (1,200), milk, green, light, frost. In HDB, V. 520, f. s.v.). 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 man with the food, etc., of the gods, as it is no uncom-
promised a consultation with a priest, and was really an assessment for the services rendered. It was not a vol-
untary offering, its ritualistic object was primarily to flatter, to propitiate, to incite the favor of the gods. Special sacrifices on special occasions were offered in Babylonia and Assyria, including many strange and unac-
ccustomed, both as regards the purely legal portions and those sections dealing with religious ritual, Bab methods of legal procedure and of ritual developed in Bab temples must be 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 Osian ritual was a thin sinew, even in its developing, and was completed after the exile. To do so is to turn history upside down.

3. Nomads and Tribes of Arabia and Syria, sacrifices had been common for millenniums before Moses. There is no reason to doubt that Smith are valuable here, whatever one may think of their theories. The offer-

ings were usually from the herd animals, sometimes from the spoils taken in war or the fruits of the fields. The occasions were many and various, and the ritual was very simple. A rude altar of earth or stone, with a scapegoat, the offerer killing the victim and burning all, or perhaps certain parts, or carrying it as part of the offering. Family, constituted the customary details. Sometimes wild animals were offered. Babylonians, Phoenicians and Arabs offered sacrificial beasts. Sacrifices of captives and of the fruit of the earth were made. There were no sacrifices in the service of kings. Assyrians sometimes sacrificed captive kings. The Canaanites and others sacrificed children. The account of the offerings of Cain and Abel (Gen 4:41) show that the ceremony dates from almost the beginnings of the human race.

4. Cain and Abel

5. Noah

The account of the offerings of Cain and Abel (Gen 4:4) shows that the ceremony dates from almost the beginnings of the human race. The custom of offering the first-

lings and first-fruits had already begun.

6. Abraham

The sacrifices of Noah followed and celebrated the epochal and awe-inspiring event of the ark and beginning life anew. He offered burnt offerings of all the clean ani-
mals (Gen 8:20). On such a solemn occasion only an 'olah 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 the sweet savor and was pleased. It was an odor of satisfaction or restful-

ness. Whether or not the idea of expiation was included is difficult to prove.

Abraham lived at a time when sacrifices and religion were virtually one. He set an example of his offering at Ur or Haran, but

6. Abraham on his arrival at Shechem he erected an altar (Gen 12:7). At Bethel also (ver 8), and on his return from Egypt he worshipped 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 16:4 ff he offers a ‘covenant’ sacrifice, when the animals were slain, divided the horns, set open the carcases 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 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 26:25).

Jacob’s first recorded sacrifice was the pouring of the oil upon the stone at Beth-el (Gen 28:18). This was consecration or dedication of the awe-inspiring presence of the Deity. After his covenant with Laban he offered sacrifices (‘z’bhākim) and they ate bread (Gen 31:54). At Shechem, Jacob erected an altar (Gen 33:20). At Beth-el (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 Arab tribes, Egyptians, 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 flocks (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 (10:9). 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 in their firstborn, at this season has no support and is altogether improbable (Frazier, *Golden Bough*, pt. III, 175f). The whole ceremony is very primitive and has retained its primitiveus to the end. The choosing of the lamb or kid, the killing at a certain time, the family gathered in the home, the carcase 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 good account.

As a priest of Midian Jethro was an expert in sacrificing. On meeting Moses and the people he offered both ‘olah and z’bhākim 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 sacrifices and offerings and peace offerings were well established. 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 important transition took place at Sinai and was accompanied by sacrifice. 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 there was nothing.

This is in exact accordance with Jer 7:21f. 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 its altar (24:4ff). The blood would symbolize the community of life between Jehovah and Israel, and consecrated the altar. The Law was read, the pledge again given, and Moses sprinkled the representatives of the people, consecrating them also (24:7f). Descending the mount, they had a vision of God, held a feast before God, and ate 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 crass features of common Sem 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 Common Altars whole place where I cause my name to be remembered, etc (ver 21f). 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 no further allowed. This same law is implied in Dt 16:21 a passage given or explained away by the Wellhausen school (see Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, 200f).

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), Mizpeh in Gilgal (Jgs 11:11), Gilgal (1 S 13:9). High places were chiefly used until the times of Solomon, when they were abolished because of their corruption. The purpose of such 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 priest officiating were the chief factors. Heathen sacrifices 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 “horne’d” 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 consists: the altar 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 was sprinkled on the altar, the life was given as atonement for the atonees, the bullock being burned as food for God, and the flesh and remainder were burned without the camp (vs 13,14). This is a sin-offering—

horne’d—the term is from the verb “horn”. Probably introduced by Moses, it was intended to be peculiar and to signify that seven bullocks, the smallest, in which the fire was sprinkled round about the altar, flesh was cut in pieces, washed and piled on the altar, then burned as an offering by Aaron unto God. This burnt offering was an odor of a sweet savour (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 other offerings it was on the right hand. The blood is sprinkled on the altar, and the fire is kindled around about; some upon the garments of Aaron and his sons (vs 19-21). Certain parts were waved before the fire along with the bread, and are then burned upon the altar (vs 22-25). The breast is offered as a wave offering (trusháh) with the right thigh or shoulder as alesh for Aaron (trusháh). These portions here first mentioned were the central sanctuary offerings, although this 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 frame forth. The same ceremony on each of the seven days attuned for, cleansed and consecrated the altar to the service of Jehovah, and it was most holy (vs 35-37). The forehead is presented to the altar (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 festival followed the usual habits at such gatherings 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 are no minute regulations, but this ritual was intended primarily for the burnt offerings and were brought to the priest as needed. They were for the statutory individual and national offering upon the “horne’d” altar before the sanctuary. Already the daily burnt offerings of the priests had been provided for (Ex 29:38). The burnt offering is here called korban, “oblation.”

(1) The ritual for the offerer (Lev 1:3-17).—This may have been 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 1:5-17).—If a bullock, of or over one year old, was one of the one-horned bullocks, it was to be placed upon a fire, and the fire run round about the altar, put on the fire, the wood and pieces of the carcase, wash the inwards, legs, etc, and burn it all as a sweet savour to God. If a fowl, he must wring the neck, drain out the blood on the side of the altar, cast the crop, filth, entrails among the ashes, remove dividing the bird and burn the carcase on the altar.

(3) General laws for the priest.—The burnt offering must be continued every morning and every evening (Ex 29:8; Nu 28:3-8). At the fulfillment of his vow the Nazite must present it before God and offer it upon the altar through the priest (Nu 6:16): on the Sabbath, two lambs (Nu 28:9); on the first of the month, two bullocks, one ram and seven lambs (Nu 28:10); on the day of the atonement (Yom Kippur) only, the same (Nu 29:27); on the 1st day of the 7th month, one bullock, one ram, seven lambs (Nu 28:9); on the 15th day, 13 bullocks, 2 rams, 14 lambs, the number of bullocks diminishing daily until the 7th day, when only 12 lamb and 28 bullocks were offered (Nu 29:12-34); on the 22nd day of this month one bullock, one ram and seven lambs were offered (Nu 29:35-36). Non-Israelites were permitted to offer the ‘olah, but no other sacrifices (Lev 17:8; 22:15-25).

(4) Laws in Dt (12:6-18,14,27; 27:6).—Anticipating a central sanctuary in the future, the lawgiver counseled the people to bring their offerings there (12:6,11); they must be careful not to offer them in any place (ver 19), but must patronize the Levites. He gave the Aaronic common altars and customary sacrifices were allowable and generally necessary (16:21; 27:6).

The term “meal offering” is here confined to offerings of flour or meal, etc (AV “meat-offering”), and was first used at the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:41). These must not be offered on the altar of incense (Ex 30:9); were used at the completion of the tabernacle (40:29); and always with the morning and evening burnt offerings.

6. Law of the Meal Offering (minahah)

(1) The ritual for the offerer (Lev 2:1-8).—It must be of fine flour, with oil and frankincense added, and brought to the priest; it baked in the oven, unleavened, mixed with oil, and seasoned with frankincense; then took it, and fasted the morning, when he burned the incense as incense on the altar, an offering of sweet savour (ver 3). The “ollah” and “minahah” were distinct, the former was burnt, the latter was “to eat” or “eaten”. "Eaten" means partaken of, or given to the people, or “sacrifice”, or "offer". It was a libation to God, and an expression of gratitude to God, or a thank offering.

(2) The ritual for the priest (Lev 2:1-8).—This required him to take a handful with the oil and frankincense therewith and burn it as a memorial upon the altar. The remainder was holy and belonged to the priest. Of the ashes, after burning them to the altar, he was to take an handful, pour it and appropriate the remainder, the same with the first-fruits.

(3) General laws for the priest (Lev 6:14-18 [Heb 7:11], etc).—He might eat his portion without leaven in the holy place. At his own free will he might give his own oblation of fine flour—1/3 of an ephah, one-half in the morning and one-half in the evening. If baked, it must be with oil. The meal offering must be burnt; none could be eaten. With the sin and guilt offerings every meal offering must be baked. (Lev 7:9,10; 10:12; Nu 18:9). The meal offerings accompanied the other offerings on all important occasions, such as the consecration of Aaron (Lev 9:4-17); cleansing of a leper (Lev 14:10,20,21,31); feast of first-fruits.
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 (Nu 4:16; 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 burned 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 criminal (sā'bā'yāh), 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 27-30), and the heave offering (ver 2) or the uncleanness of man (ver 3), or rashly swearing in ignorance (ver 4). For conscious and wilful violations of the Law, no atonement was possible, with some exceptions, for which provision was made in the guilt offering.

(b) The ritual for the offerer (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 Jehovah. 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 Jehovah. The ruler must bring a he-goat and do the same. One of the common people might bring a he-goat or lamb and do the same. If too poor for these, two turtledoves or young pigeons, one for a sin offering and one for a burnt offering, might suffice. If too poor for these, one tenth of an ephah of fine flour without oil or frankincense would 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. The blood must be poured out at the base of the altar. The fat must be burned upon the altar, all the rest of the carcass must be carried to a clean place without the camp and burned. In the case of the whole congregation, the ritual is the same. In the case of a ruler, the blood of the altar of burnt offering, not the altar of incense. In the case of one of the common people, the ritual is similar, and that of the he-goat. Sometimes the carcass belonged to the priest. If a bird, the priest must touch its head, sprinkle blood and 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 touch the head of it, dip a handful of meal in fine flour, keeping the remainder for himself. The use of fine flour for an offering was to be eaten by the worshippers. It was exceptional and intended to be so. Though life was not given, yet a necessity of life—that which represented life—was offered.

(d) General laws for the priest (Lev 6:24-30): The sin offering was to be slain in the same place as the burnt offering. It was most holy, and the priest alone might eat what was left of the ram, pigeon or flour, in the holy place. Whatever touched it to be holy, any garment sprinkled with the blood must be washed in a holy place, earthen vessels used must be broken, and brazen vessels thoroughly scourged and rinsed.

(e) Special uses of the sin offering: (i) The consecration of Aaron and his sons (Lev 8:21.4-15) was similar to that of Lev 4:11-12, only Moses was to kill the offerings and put their blood upon the horns of the altar. On the 8th day a bull-calf was offered (Lev 9:2), and the congregation offered a he-goat (ver 3). In this case Aaron performed the ceremony, as in Lev 4:11-12. Moses complained that they had not eaten the flesh of the calf and goat in the sanctuary, since that was required by law and was not brought into the sanctuary (Lev 10:16-20).

(ii) Purifications from uncleannesses required after childbirth a young pigeon or turtle dove (Lev 12...
6–8). The heifer 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 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 Jeh, as a sin offering, and the other for the LORD, as a sin offering; 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 t 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 carcass of the bullock and he-goat were burned 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 8th day after contrition (Lev 14 8.18); when a he-goat fulfills an offering, it 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 the congregation a he-goat was to be offered (15 24–25). If one person sinned, 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 (29 5), at the days of Atonement (30 1), on the solemn days of the wave offering to eat it in a clean place (Lev 10 14). The he-goat’s head was to be waved by the priest, before being offered (Lev 10 11.15); vs 31: ‘&’ (ver 14 24). At the feast of first-fruits the sheaf must be waved before the Lord (Lev 23 10.11.15); 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 Jeh (Nu 6 19 ff).

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 Jeh (Lev 8 27). On the 8th day Aaron, the priests, the Levites and all the priests, when the breast and bread were waved before Jeh (Lev 7 30.34 fixes the law of offerings, and the custom was seemingly initiated at the consecration of Aaron and his sons, Num 6 21–25). When the breast and bread were waved before the priest, the breast and bread were not included in the other offerings (cf 14—6).

11. Heave Offerings. It must be brought from the remaining part of the peace offering (Lev 7 14). The offering must be eaten in a clean place (Lev 7 14) by the priests, family only unless the Nazirite offered the heave offering then the peace offering was also given to the priest (Nu 6 20). If the Nazirite was in 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 repeatedly noted (Nu 15.1.2) to have a tithing of the heave offerings of the people (ver 24). They were in turn to offer up a tithe of this to the priests (vs 26–32). The portion of the spoil of Midian was a heave offering (31 29.41). Dt commands that all heave offerings he brought to the central sanctuary and eaten there (12 6.11).

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. Offerings or a sacred drink offering were called 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 15 17). Wine and oil must accompany all votive and freewill offerings (15 4.5.7.10.24); the continual burnt offering (28 7.8); libations with all their libation set feasts (Ex 29 5–39, passem). That drink offerings were common among the heathen is shown by Dt 32 29.

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 stoneament 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

1. The Situation at Moses' Death

at Shiloh was removed, or Saul set up as king. The ark was now in the tabernacle (1 Sam 3). Solomon

2. In the Time of Joshua

sacrifice. The ark was now in the tabernacle (1 Sam 3). Solomon

3. In the Period of the Judges

sacrifices would naturally use the high places, when possible. The stationary altars of the Canaanites were of course unlawful. The inevitable tendency would be to imitate the worship of the Canaanites. They were reburied and threatened for this, and, consequently, offered sacrifices at Bethim (Jgs 2 1–5). Gideon rebuilt an altar of Jehovah and offered a bullock as a burnt offering (6.25.26). The kid prepared for the angel was not first a sacrifice, but its acceptance as a gift was indicated by its being burned (6.19 f). Jephthah offered up his daughter as a burnt offering, believing such a sacrifice well-pleasing to Jehovah (11.31.39). Manoah and his wife prepared a kid for a burnt offering, a meat offering accompanying it (12.16 f). At the time of the civil war with Benjamin the ark and statutory altar seemed to be at Bethel, where they offered burnt and peace offerings (20.26). The feasts at Shiloh imply at least peace offerings (21.19).

4. In the Time of Samuel and Saul

offering appears to be at Shiloh. Elkanah sacrifices, and the feasts there yearly (17 1.3 f). Such feasts were joyous and tended to excesses, as drunkenness—seen common (1 13 f). All Israel came thither (2 14); the priests claimed their portion, seizing it in an unlawful manner before the fat had been burned, or the flesh had been boiled (13.17). This shows that such ritual as was prescribed in Lev was practised and considered by the people the only lawful custom. Was it in writing? Why not? Guilt offerings were made by the Philis when smitten by the Gibeonites, and the LXX, etc., is a sacrificial feast in a small city (9.12.13) on a high place. At Gilgal there were burnt and peace offerings (10 S; 15.21). Saul offered burnt offerings himself (13.9–12), but his fault was not in offering them himself, but in his haste and disobedience toward Samuel. "To obey is better than sacrifice," etc., says Samuel (15.22), recognizing the fundamental principle of the covenant and realizing that ceremonies are in themselves worthless without the right spirit. The same truth is reiterated by the prophets later. To prevent the offering of flesh with the blood Saul built a special altar (14.32–35). Family and clan sacrifices and feasts were evidently common (16.2–5).

5. In the Days of Gideon, David, and Solomon

sacrifices for the feasts of the new moon, when peace offerings would be sacrificed (1 S 20.5.24–29). The sanctuary at Nob had the sheep bread upon the table (21.4 ff) according to Ex 25.30. When the ark was brought up to Jerus, burnt and meal offerings were offered according to the Law (2 S 6.17–18; 1 Ch 16.24). Ahithophel offered private sacrifices at Shiloh (2 S 15.12). David offered up burnt, meal, and peace offerings when purchasing the threshing-floor of Araunah (1 Ch 21.23–26). The statutory burnt altar at this time was at Gibeon (2 Ch 1.6; 1 Ch 21.26), but was soon removed to Jerus (1 Ch 22.1). In the organized sanctuary and ritual, Levites were appointed for attendance on the sanctuary, meal and burnt offerings, burnt offerings, morning and evening sacrifices, sabbaths, new moons, the feasts of weeks, etc. (23.23–31), attempting to carry out the Levitical laws as far as possible. At the dedication of the temple Solomon offered burnt, meal, and peace offerings in enormous quantities (1 K 8.63; 2 Ch 7.4–7); also burnt and peace offerings numerically (1 K 8.25). The ritual at the regular seasons, daily, sabbaths, new moons, set feasts, etc., was observed according to the Levitical Law (2 Ch 2.4; 8.13). Was it written? The golden calf worship was carried on at Dan and Bethel, with priests, altars and ritual (1 K 12.27 f). The high places were in use, but very corrupt (13.2 f). A common offering ancient was in use at Mt. Carmel. A common offering ancient was in use at Mt. Carmel. Kingdom (18.30.32). Many others were known as Jeh's altars (19.10). The sanctuary was in full swing in Amos' time (Am 4.4.5) at Bethel and Gilgal and probably at Beer-sheba (5.1). Amos bitterly satirizes the hollow, insincere worship, but does not condemn the common altars and sacrifices, as these were legitirom. With Hosea's situation is worse, the cultus has been "canonized," priests have been led on the sin or sin offerings of the people, and the kingdom soon perished because of its corruption.

The high places were still in use and not denounced yet by the prophets (1 K 3.2; 2 K 14.4; 16.4.35). Worship was not fully centralized, though tending in that direction. In the days of Abijah...
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 Je- hoshaphat, the kings of Judah were on different terms according to Moses (23 18; 24 14 b; 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, 234; V, 234 Paton, V, 234), 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 them 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 21–24); and so, also, burnt offerings (27 f), peace and thank offerings etc., in large number (28 3). As for I sa 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 2), and the king's portion (ver 3). All the common altars of the time were removed, and worship centralized in Jerus (32 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 (35 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 (8 B, IV) that an altar was soon re-built and sacrificing was carried on there. It is true that in the book 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 (va 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 women offered guilt offerings (16 9). The firmans of Artaxerxes provided money for bullocks, rams, lambs, with meal and drink offerings (7 17). Under Nebuchadnezzar and after the formal acceptance of the Law, a more complete effort was made to observe it. The shew- bread, continual burnt and meal offerings, sabbaths, 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 f). 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 Elephanta in the Nile. It was built by a Jewish military colony, and a system of sacrifices was observed how far they could, by all the laws, and what were their ideas of a central sanctuary are uncertain. Several semi-tribal nations practiced offerings at Elephanta human sacrifices. It was common among the Canaanites, as is shown by the exca- vations at Gezer, the Israelites. They seem to have offered children in sacrifice in the laying of foundations of houses or other construc- tions. Among the Carthaginians, Phoenicians, Greeks and Romans human sacrifices were all too common. The custom was not unknown to the Israelites. Abraham called upon the Lord three times (Gen 15 9–18). They offered the act, and a lesson was given for all time. 9. A Temple, and Sacrifices.—In Israel's Sacrifices. It is common among the Phantime Israelites, as is shown by the exca- vations at Gezer, the Israelites. They seem to have offered children in sacrifice in the laying of foundations of houses or other construc- tions. Among the Carthaginians, Phoenicians, Greeks and Romans human sacrifices were all too common. The custom was not unknown to the Israelites. Abraham called upon the Lord three times (Gen 15 9–18). They offered the act, and a lesson was given for all time. 10. Human Sacrifices. The abominable practice is forbidden by the Law (Lev 18 19). It was the act of as a passing through the fire to Moloch, referring to the Phoenician and Ammonite practices. Anyone practising it was to be stoned (Lev 20 2). 11. Certain Heathen Sacrifices. In Israel's History. When the destruction of the Temple was imminent, and the temple was to be burnt, Ezra (12 31; 13 10). The rash vow of Jephthah resulted in the immolation of his daughter, but the incident is recorded as something extraordinary (Jgs 11 31 f). The execution of Zebah and Zalmunna is a case of blood revenge, not sacrifice (18 18 f). Nor is the slaughter of Agag in any sense a sacrifice (1 10 32 f). The death of Saul's sons because of his breach of coven- ant with the Gibeonites was an expiatory sacrifice, to atone for the father's peridy (2 9). The Mosaic law in desiring offerings might be taken to appease the anger of Chemosh, and the effect was start- ing to the heathens (2 K 10 18–24). Yet, it is clear that the abomination in times of trouble (16 3). Such sacrifices were intended to secure favor with the Deity or appease his wrath. The firstborn of all the firstborn of oversum- mer (Ex 13 2). They were probably sacrificed at the rebuilding or fortifying of Jericho (1 K 9 27 f); of Jos (Josh 24 18). They were an essential part of the custom (2 K 21 6), but it was stopped by Josiah (23 10). Micah's words were probably applicable to those times of Anah, Micah was probably thinking of God's way to obtain God's favor by costly gifts apart from ethical regulation (Jgs 21 26). Thus, in the case of the custom practised by Israel of slaying the children in secret places (Isa 57 5), and Jeremiah represents it as practised in his time (Jer 32 19). At the same time, the same practice (Ezk 16 20 21 23 37). Heathen sacrifices were mentioned in the later books, such as awine, a mouse, a horse, a dog (Jgs 65 4; 66 317; Ezek 8 10; 2 K 25 11). All such ani- mals were unclean to the Hebrews, and the practice had its roots in some form of primitive totemism which survived in these heathen cults. They were little practised among the Israelites. See Totemism. VII. The Prophets and Sacrifices.—The prophets were reformers, not innovators. Their emphasis was on the ethical, rather than the ritual. They based their teachings on the central ideas 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 enlarged the temple and movement toward a central sanctuary, but it is the abuse of the cult that they condemned, rather than its use. They combated the heathenish idea that all God needed was gifts, lavish gifts, and would condone any sin if it only bestowed abundance of gifts. They demanded an inward religion, moral- ity, justice, righteousness, in short, an ethical religion. They preached an ethical God, rather than the profane, debasing and almost blasphemous god of the heathens. They reminded the people of the covenant at Sinai, the foun- dation principle of which was obedience and loyalty to Jeh. If Joel be early, the cult is in full practice, as he deplores the cutting-off of the meal offering, or minhah, and the negel or drink offering, through the devastation of the locusts. He deplores the stop- ping of the burnt offerings, etc., as these would not be cut off by the locusts (Joel 1 7 13; 2 14). Joel emphasized the need for a genuine repentance, telling them to rend their hearts and not their garments (2 13). Among the heathen, a crude, licentious and sarcastically bids them go on transgressions (4 4 5), mentions burnt, peace, thank and freewill offerings (4 4 f; 5 22), reminds them of the fact that they did not offer sacrifices in the wilderness (6 25),
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 statement 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 (4:13, f), for they are as bad as the Canaan- itish cults (4:9). Jeh used them (8:13; 9:4). The defection of the nation began early (11:2), and they have multiplied altars (12:1; 13:2). He predicts the time when they shall render as bullocks the "calves" of their lips (14:2 A.V.).

Sacrifice is 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 his God." This does not mean that the least 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, with incense, he-bears, 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 pious performances today. Israel is just as much talked of as a temple (6:1.6). 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 feast come around (28:1).

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 and burnt incense to her, saying, "Add your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, . . . concerning . . . sacrifices: but . . . commanded . . . saying, Hearken 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 polemicize 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-heavenly 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 (17:25). (We are aware of the humanity of an 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 altar (42:10) is a sin offering, with burnt and peace offerings with a ritual similar to Lev 8:11 (Ex 29:8-27). There are to be ministers and slav burnt offerings and sacrifice for the people (44:11). The priest must offer his sin offering before he offers the burnt offering, and then sacrifice the sin and trespass offerings as in 44:29. In chapter 45, the people are to give the king lambs for meal, burnt and peace offerings, while the prince shall give the meal, burnt and drink offerings for the feasts and new moons, and the Sabbaths and feasts. He is to prepare them to make atonement (45:13-17). In cleansing the sanctuary the Levitical 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) must 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 burnt offering, pictures it as a grander ideal situation than Moses. The people are all righteous, with new hearts, the Spirit in them enabling them to keep the Law (36:26), and yet has "no 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 authors of the OT seeks to convey this hope 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 it is burdened with sins (56:3-6). Those foreigners who respect the covenant shall offer acceptable sacrifices (56:7) in the holy city to God. The Servant of Jehovah is to be be a guilt offering (53:10) to expiate the sins of Israel. Sacrifice is here for the first time lifted out of the animal sacrifice and placed upon the link between the OT and the NT. In the glorious age to come there shall be priests and sacrifices, 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 worshipers 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 sacrificed the blind, lame and the sick, etc., as sacrifices. He rules against ephahs, saying, "I have no delight in the name of the God of Jacob, and I have no respect for you. . . . For from the day that your fathers听了 the voice of the Lord God, they have transgressed and have not kept his covenant and the commandments which he commanded their fathers. . . . Yet they have not hearkened, nor have they abased themselves concerning their iniquity. . . ." (3:10-11). The Gentiles offer better ones (1:11). The Israelites covered the altar of Jehovah with tears by their hypocrisy. The sacrifice was literally the flesh of the goat, 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 (1:7 f), applying it to the destruction of Israel by Jehovah. Bozrah and Edom are to be victims (3a 34b); also Gog and Magog (Ezk 39 17.19).

In summing up the general attitude of the prophets toward sacrifices, even G. F. Moore in Zeph 2b admits that the prophets "in the main 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 of atonement." For it is of the essence of propitiation that there is

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 characteristic maxim of the Talmud is, 'In the peace offerings (14.14). The trespass Proverbs offering (7) 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. Köheleth speaks of sacri-
cifices as quite the custom, and depreciates the of-
fers of fools (Eccel 5:1, 9:2).

The Psalmist is remarkable from 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 ac-
ceptance of sacrifices (20:3). 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 wilder-
ness 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 a 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 of thanksgiving.
Sacrifices as such are no delight to God, the real
sacrifice is a broken heart (61:16). When the heart
is right, then, as an expression of true-hearted-
ness, devotion, repentance and faith, burnt offerings
are highly acceptable (Ps 50:10). The Psalmist
promises a freewill 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 en-
tertained regarding them is not so clear. No
single theory can account for all the facts. The
unholy 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 in this list of foods 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 food-fare, 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 ex-
perienced. The offering, and more naive idea was
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 have value to God as a
broken 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.

3. A Means of Purifi-
cation from Un-
cleanliness

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 contact with men and women; (2) those resulting
from contact with a corpse; (3) the
case of recovery from leprosy. Purifi-
cation ceremonies were the condition of such per-
sons enjoying the social and religious life of the
community. They may have been neces-
sary 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 unclean-
lessness was the subject unift for society, and that
unfitness was an offence to God and required a piacul offering.

Consecration was of men and things. The cere-
monies at the sealing of the covenant and the con-
secration of the Levites and of Aaron
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This is the view of Schults, 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 with whom there is no
relationship unless mediated through self-sacrifice
and self-abasement. Such offerings were regarded as a
natural act of communion. The blood was offered to God
as an object of communion which He enters into, on
which He places His seal. As such it is the source of all
the ceremonies of consecration which are in relation to
the consecrated person. This view is probably nearer
to the reality than that of the covenant idea. It
explains properly why the blood is used in sacrifice.
From Ritschl's view it can be understood why the blood
is used in sacrifice. The blood “covers" all sin and de-
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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
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10. Vicarious Expiation Theory

11. Typical Sacrifices
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 Liberty 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 had not and could not grasp. We must 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 stretching of the 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 special selection is attempted: arts. in Enc. Brit. 11th ed: EB (G. F. Moore); HDB (Paterson); RE and Sch.-Herz (Orelli); J. E. Nec, Nieclintcr and Stimson's Modern Bible Dictionary, B. Kautzsch, Jastrow and Wiedermann in HDB: art. on "Comparative Literature of the Old and New Testament"; OT Theology of Oehler, Dillmann, Smend, Schultz, Davidson, Koenig, etc.


Biblical sacrificial: F. Bühler, Symbolik des orthodoxen Kultus; Der Kaukasische Opferkultur; A. Stewart, The Mosaic Sacrifices; J. G. Murphy, Sacrifices as Set Forth in Scripture; A. Caven, Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice; J. T. Jastrow, The Book of Elizabeth. See also: Schults, J. T., 1900, 257 f.; Smöller, Studien und Kritiken, 1891, Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism; Pentateuchal Studies; Driver, ERE, VI.

J. J. REEVE

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. TERMS OF SACRIFICE EPISTEMOS

I. Terms of Sacrifice Epistemos—The word "offering" (προσφορά, προσφορά) describes the death of Christ, once in Paul's Teaching (Acts 3:31; 2:20; 13:33; 1 Cor. 15:3; Rev. 4:6; 2 Cor. 5:14; 5:19), and twice in the NT (Rev. 4:6; 2 Cor. 5:14). The verb προσφέρω, προσφέρομαι, "to offer," is also used in 5:15 in He (Acts 13:19; 1 Cor. 15:3; 16:17; 2 Cor. 8:1; 12:8; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:4). The noun προσφορά occurs 15 t in LXX, usually as the tr of τέμπον, "sacrifice." This noun in the NT refers to OT sacrifices in Acts 7:42; 21:26, to the offering of money in Acts 24:21. The same noun is also used in 3 t in He (7:27; 9:28; 13:15); also in Pet 2:5.

The word "sacrifice" (θυσία, θυσίαν) translates in LXX 8 Heb words for various kinds of sacrifice, occurring about 115 times: (1) The Servant's death, once in LXX (Ps 46:4); (2) sacrifices for sin, once in LXX (Ps 32:2); (3) sacrifices for sin, 2 t in He (9:23; 10:12); it refers several times to sacrifice demanded of the one giving (Phil 2:17, 4:18, Heb 13:15, 16; 1 Pet 2:5). The verb "to sacrifice" (θυσίαν, θυσίαν) is used once by Paul to describe Christ's death (1 Cor 15:31).

The blood (παράδοσις, kalma) of Christ is said to secure redemption and an eternal inheritance (He 9:12; 1 Cor. 10:16; Eph 1:17; 2:13; Col 1:20); 3 t in He (9:12, 14; 10:19; cf also 10:20); 2 t in Pet (1:21) and 5 t in the Johannean writings (1 Jn 1:7; 5:6, 8; Rev 1:5). Unmistakably this figure of the blood refers to Christ's sacrifice, and its "balm" is repeatedly referred to in the NT. In Ex 21:8, meaning the ransom paid by a father to redeem his daughter from a cruel master signifies (1) deliverance gained by Christ's death, 5 t in Paul (Rom 3:24; 1 Cor 6:20; 1 Pet 1:18, 19, 20); (2) once in He (10:5); (3) once in He (9:15); (4) general deliverance (twice (Lk 22:17, 20) the Christian's final deliverance, physical and spiritual (Rom 8:33; Eph 4:30). The simple word θύσια (θύσια, "redeeming" in Ex 21:8) means once only in the NT (1 Tim 2:6).

καταλλάγα (καταλλαγή, "reconciliation," only twice in LXX), means the relation to God into which men are brought by Christ's death, 4 t by Paul (Rom 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor 5:18, 19)

καταλλάξω (καταλλάξεω, "to reconcile," 4 t in LXX), means to bring men into the state of reconciliation with God, 5 t in Paul (Rom 5:18, 19, 20; Col 1:22; 1 Cor 15:20, 21). The words with the propitiatory idea occur as follows: ἐξαρατέομαι (ἐξαραθώ, "to propitiate," 12 t in LXX, τι "to forgive") occurs twice (Lk 18:13; Heb 9:17); ἐκκατορτίζω (ἐκκαταρτίζω, 7 t in LXX, ἐκκαταρτίζων) also occurs (atone; "forgiveness") occurs twice in 1 Jn (2:2, 4:10); ἐκκατορτίζωs ἐκκαταρτίζων, 21 t in LXX, translates "mercy-seat," where God was gracious and spoke as God (He 9:5).

The idea of sacrifice demanded of His disciples and to make His own cross the symbol of sacrifice (Mt 10:38; 16:24; Mk 8:34; Lk 9:23; 14:27, with contexts; 14:14; 12:32, etc).

Though it is not our province in this article to discuss the origin and history of sacrifice in the ethnic religions, it must be noted that sacrifice has been a chief element in almost every religion (Jiinns and Baals are being the most notable exceptions). The bloody sacrifice, where the idea of propitiation is prominent, is well-nigh universal in the ethnic religions, being found among even the most enlightened peoples like the Greeks and Romans (see art. "Expiation and Atonement" in ERE). Whether
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 ethical ideals 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 excelled the ethical far above the ceremonial; even denounced the sacrifice of animals if not accompanied by personal devotion to rightness (Am 5:21 ff.; Hos 6:5; Mic 6:6 ff.; Isa 1:11 ff.). The Stoic and Platonic philosophers also attacked the system of animal sacrifices. But these exceptions only accentuate the historical fact that man's sense of the necessity of sacrifice to Deity is well-nigh universal. Only the sacrifice of Christ and the destruction of Jesus caused a cessation of the daily, weekly, monthly and annual sacrifices among the Jews, and only the knowledge of Christ's sacrifice of Himself will finally destroy the last vestige of animal sacrifice.

II. Attitude of Jesus and NT Writers to the OT Sacrificial System.—Jesus never attacks the sacrificial system. He often takes for

1. Jesus'

attitude

sacrifices (Mt 5:24). More than that, He accepted the whole sacrificial system, a part of the OT scheme, as of Divine origin, and to the moral laws, as shown by His

He endorsed Hosea's fine ethical epigram, 'God will have mercy and not sacrifice' (Mt 9:13; 12:7). He also commends as near the kingdom the scribe who put love to God and man above sacrifice (Mt 12:35). But Jesus teaches not merely the inferiority of sacrifice to the moral laws, but the

termination of sacrifice as a system, when He said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" (Mt 14:24; Mt 26:28; Lk 22:20). Not only is the ethical superior to the ceremonial, but the sacrifice of Himself is an superior to the sacrifices of the old system as the new covenant is superior to the old.

Paul's estimate of the Jewish sacrifices is easily seen, although he does not often refer to them. Once only (Acts 21:26) after his conversion does he offer the Jewish sacrifice, and then as a matter of expediency for winning the Judaistic wing of Christianity to his universal gospel of grace. He regarded the sacrifice of the OT as type of the true sacrifice which Christ made (1 Cor 5:7).

The author of the Ep. to the Hebrews discusses 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 the remission; but the merits of the sacrifices of the new covenant are calculated according to the fruits of men (10:11), shown by the necessity of repeating the offerings (6:2), and because God had appointed another high priest, His Son, to supplant those of the old cove-
nant (5:5; 7:1-28). The heart of this author's teaching is that animal sacrifices cannot possibly atone for sin or produce moral transformation, since they are Divinely appointed only as a type or shadow of the one great sacrifice by Christ (8:7; 10:1).

To sum up, the NT writers regarded the OT sacrificial system as of Divine origin and so obligatory in its day, but imperfect and only a type of Christ's sacrifice, and so to be supplant by His perfect sacrifice.

III. The Sacrificial Idea in the NT.—The one central idea of NT writers is that the sacrifice made by Christ on the cross is the final perfect sacrifice for the atonement of sin and the salvation of men, a sacrifice typified in the various sacrifices of the OT, which are in turn abrogated by the operation of the final sacrifice. Only James and Jude among NT writers are silent as to the sacrifice of Christ, and they write for practical purposes only.

The Baptist, it is true, presents Jesus as the coming Judge in the Synoptic Gospels, but in Jn 1:29-30 he refers to Him as 'the Lamb of 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 , a title worthy of the infinite 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 in his 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: (1) He did not regard it as a sacrifice (Lk 22:20; Mt 26:20); (2) He came to give His life a ransom. Thayer (Gr-Eng. Lex. of the NT) says this word means "the price paid for redeeming." Hence the idea in ransom must be of sacrificial significance. But if there could be any doubt as to the sacrificial import of this passage, there is a clear case of the sacrificial idea in Mk 10:34, where Jesus declared His own suffering to be for the sins of men who stumbled and were turned aside by the word of the kingdom, and who shall be the salt of the earth, for if the salt become tasteless, it is good for nothing but to be cast out and be trodden under foot of men. Thus, Jesus' sacrifice is for the whole creation, and He is to be the "salt of the earth." Several other passages in the NT teach that Jesus' sacrifice is in the sense of the atonement, and not comparable to the sacrifices of the OT.

Paul's teaching on the atonement is admirably clear and comprehensive in Rom 3:24-26. He points out that sin and death are the penalty of transgression, but God sparing all men, declaring the just cause of grace, and having mercy and not sacrifice, gave His Son for the salvation of men, that all men might be justified unto life. In 1 Pet 2:24, He declared that the change in the sacrifice was for the sins of all men, and that He was himself offered to God as sacrifice for the sins of many. In 1 Pet 3:18, He declared that Christ died to reconcile the Jews with God, and that He was offered a sacrifice for sin. In 1 Pet 2:24, He declared that Christ died for the sins of men, and that He was offered a sacrifice for sin. In 1 Pet 3:18, He declared that Christ died for the sins of men, and that He was offered a sacrifice for sin. In 1 Pet 3:18, He declared that Christ died for the sins of men, and that He was offered a sacrifice for sin. In 1 Pet 3:18, He declared that Christ died for the sins of men, and that He was offered a sacrifice for sin.
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.

4. Paul's Teaching.

He 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 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 He asserts that Christ by the sacrifice of Himself "obtained eternal redemption" for man (9 12). John says that Christ "loosed (δελυσθη) us from our sins by his blood" (Rev 5 9). This idea in John is akin to that of redemption or deliverance by ransom. Peter teaches 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.

5. Teaching eternal high priest, after the order of Melchizedek, and offering Himself as the final sacrifice for sin, and for the moral transformation of man (4 14; 10 18).

In the First Ep. of Jn. (1 7; 2 2; 5 6.8) propitiation for sin and cleansing from sin are ascribed to the blood of Christ. In Rev 1 5 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 20; He 9 15-22); (2) as the sin offering (Rom 8 3; 2 Cor 5 21). This is, 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, There is no passage of man's own saving of man. 1. Redemp- tion or Deliverance: 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). Then 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 procurement. Thus, 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 transgression must bear, and which 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). Paul emphasizes the teaching in the Captivity Ep.: "In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses" (Eph 1 7; of Col 1 14).

2. Reconciliation: the restoration of favor between the two parties. There is a strange- ment between God and man. Reconciliation is the restoration of favor between the two parties. Jesus does not utter any direct message on reconciliation, but implies God's saving 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 propitio... (see Thayer, Gr.Eng., Lex., hikalaskein, but Jesus' word is a word implying propitiation as wrought by the death of Christ. So the doctrine of reconciliation is also in the Ep. to the Eph. John teaches the sacrifice procures "covenant," through Christ our Advocate, but does not expressly connect it with his death as the procuring cause (1 Jn 2 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 insti- tution of Sinns 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 21-8 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 to secure forgiveness as the shedding 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 express his argument for the universality of human sin by asserting that “all the world may be brought under the judgment of God” (AV Cancellation “guilty before God.” Rom 3:19).

4. The guilt of man is so heinous that it necessitates a sacrifice that can only be done by God. Thayer (Gr-Eng. Lex., in loc.) says of the Greek word "guilt" means “owing satisfaction to God” (liable to punishment by God). But in Rom 8:13 Paul exclaims, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus... God, sending his own Son in the likeness of his flesh without sin, (Rom 8:3) (a sacrifice identical to 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 (2:15), but is not expressed in Peter and John.

Right standing with God is also implied in the preceding idea. Forgiving sin and canceling guilt are the negative, bringing into right standing with God the positive, assertion of the same transaction. “He who partakes of the same of God, he shall be made partakers of his righteousness” (Rom 2:21).

Standing in 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 Paul can mean “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 subl. cleansing (καθαρισμος, καθαρισμός) is not used by Paul, and the or Sanctification vb. “to cleanse” (καθαρίζω, katharizo) occurs only twice in his later letters (Eph 6:26; 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 3:7).

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 Procedes 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 both with His person. 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 philosophical of the atonement, as presented in the NT. But the rules of exegesis are against this supposition. Jesus in the context is teaching his disciples that God is great. To illustrate the truth He refers to His own example of coming to minister, and our example of giving his life for his friends. This is the manner of enforcing a practical principle and not elaborating a theoretical truth. Moreover, this word is used metaphorically, and the laws of exegesis forbid us to press the literal meaning of a figure. The figure suggests captivity and ransom and delivers us out of a price (the price of the death of Christ). But Jesus does not tell us how His sacrifice procures salvation for man’s redemption from sin. The word “ransom” does give the clue to the development of the vicarious sacrifice (laborately later by Paul. Ritschl; see Thayer, Verh. 1888, 53) does not do the word “ransom” justice when he claims that it merely represents the meaning of the Heb. פֶּן, “kopher, “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. (Lk 22:27; Teaching of Jesus, II, 226) 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. Boyschlag (Neutest. Theol., I, 135) finds worldly ambitions and such sins by showing us the example of Jesus’s sacrifice of Himself (Rom 8:32, 1 Cor 3:18). So, he thinks Christ’s “surrender of His life... avails as a ransom which He gives instead of the many.” (Rom 2:25) who were not able to pay the price, He adds, “The saying regarding the ransom lays emphasis upon the God’s vicarious performance of Jesus which secures the salvation,” etc.

Nor does Jesus’ saying at the Last Supper, “This is my blood of the covenant” (Mt 26:28) give us in any acceptable evidence of how His death saves man. It does not 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 sacrificers at Mt. Sinai (Exod. 24:7-11), have a legal covenant between God and His people, so the death of Christ as the covenant sacrificer of God procures forgiveness of sin for the recipient person. Moreover, of grace between God and lost sinners, by virtue of which covenant God on His part forgives the penitent sinner, and the one. (Ritschl) which reappearing sinners present to himself to God for the life of sacrifice. But this statement fails to tell us how God can forgive sin on the basis of a covenant thus ratified by Christ’s death. Does it mean substitution, in that as the animal whose blood ratified the covenant was slain instead of the people, so Christ was slain in the place of sinners? Or does it suggest the imputability of the covenant on the basis of the animal’s (and so Christ’s) representing both God and man, and killing signifying loss of life or will to change the covenant (so Westcott, Comm. on He, 301) from the could scarcely mean that Christ’s sacrifice was the offering of a perfect acceptable sacrifice. (lsa 53:10-12, 1 Cor 3:11), or that Christ’s death is viewed merely as the common meal sacrifice, that God and His people thus enter into a new relationship of union with God. Among evolutionists in the study of comparative religion; see Menzies, Hist of Religion, 416 ff.

Ritschl and many modern scholars are disposed to reject all atonement in religion. They say, “Back to Christ.” Paul was only a human teacher of Jesus. But he was a Teaching Divinely-guided interpreter, and we need his first-hand interpretations of Jesus. What has to be said as to how Christ’s death saves men?

(1) The words expressing the idea of redemption.—See above on the terms of sacrifice. The classical passage containing the idea of redemption is Rom 3:24-26: “He has now been manifest in the flesh; as a propitiation through faith in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; who in the former times did wait in the patience of his counsel toward the fatherless, lest he should be unjust, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.” A fair interpretation of this passage gives us the following propositions: (a) The believer obtains right standing with God by means of, through the channel of, and only, see Thayer, II, 313, 2), redemption which is in Christ. (b) This redemption in Christ involves, or is based upon, the Divinely-purposed propitiation which Christ made...
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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, propitiation, 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 καταλέστρων as an adj. meaning "propitiatory."

De Wette, Frötsche, Meyer, Lipsius and many others take it in this sense; Gifford, Vaughan, Liddon, Reichenbach, think it means sacrifice in the same way as in He. 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 of God's grace through faith in Christ, and because of that He became a "curse" for man's sins. See Romans, Epistle to the, 9, 3.

(4) The prepositions ἐν, ὑπὲρ, and ἀντί, antithetical. Paul never uses ἀντί ("for," instead of, "in place of," so Thayer) to express what Christ's sacrifice does for the sinner, but ὑπὲρ ("for one's sake") is the only word, and, if anything, is a shade of meaning "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 2 25; 1 Thess 5 10; 1 Tim 2 6; Tit 2 14. It is to be noted that in 1 Tim 2 8 Paul uses αὐτίδρομον, "ransom," surrounded with the word ἀντί, which follows it with ὑπέρ, which may suggest that ὑπέρ is here used in the sense of ἀντί, "in the 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, Vindictive Sacrifice, 486. God is already willing to save men. His love makes the propitiatory sacrifice (Rom 5 8). God's love makes the sacrifice, not the sacrifice His willingness to save men. (b) The sacrifice is not a sacrifice under the curse, the penalty of the broken law (Gal 3 13), 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 greater. (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 will to save him (Rom 2 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 Representative 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 explained the relation not by the sinner's spiritual life by thinking of a transfer of the sinner's "curse" to Christ, which was placed under the cross (Rom 5 8), and of God's righteousness through Christ (Phil 3 9) to the sinner by faith in Christ. But we must not press this vicarious substitution too far, for both the atonement and claim that the system is the teaching of Paul. The substitutional, compensational nature of the atonement 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 philosophizing 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 apologue showing forth of
Hebrews
pristly sacrifice over that of the
Acrom priestly priesthood fixes his first thought on the
eficacy of the sacrifice rather than on its mode of
operation. He does use the words "redemption" (9 12, of ver 15), "propitiation" (2 17), and
sizes the opening up of the heavenly holy of holies by the high-priestly sacrifice of Christ. The access to the holies of God by Christ's death, 10 19, 20), which gives us data for forming a system based on a real propitiation for sin and reconciliation of God similar to the Pauline teaching formulated above.
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 for us."

4. Petrine upon the tree; who "suffered for and joined" sins once, the righteous for [huper, nine Teach- not add] the unrighteous" (1 Pet 5:18). No farther than Paul (perhaps not so far) in elaborating how Jesus' vicarious suffering saves the sinner. The Johannine writings contain the propitiatory idea (1 Jn 2:2; 4:10), although John wrote at the close of his life. The sacrifice was voluntary, 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. The Human Conditions of Application.

1. Jesus' Teaching in the OT and in the NT.

2. Paul's Teaching in the Galatians and Romans.

3. The teaching in Hebrews.

4. Peter and John do not discuss the ground of efficacy, and so add nothing to our conclusions above. The efficacy of the sacrifice is suggested by describing the glory of the person (1 Pet 1:19; 2:22-23; 1 Jn 1:17; 2:2).

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 person, but they do not discuss the subject directly. Paul, though discussing it more extensively, does not do so fully, but the author of Hebrews and Paul concludes his argument for the finality of Christianity, in the superior efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, which is grounded in His personality, Divine, royal, sinless, eternal (see Ménage, Théol. de l'Esp. de Hébreu.). It is easy to see, from the position taken by the author of He, how Asenlum in Cor Deus Homo developed his theory of the sacrificial Christ, according to which the Divinity in Christ gave His atomic 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 (Lk 24:47, "unto all the nations"); according to Paul (Rom 1:5; 5:18; 11:32; 2 Cor 1. Universal 15:14; Gal 3:14); according to the

1. General to the objective author of He (2:9, "death for Potency every man"); and according to John (1 John 2:2, "propitiation for the whole world").

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 must be applied individually.

2. The subjectively application of the NT doctrine of the sacrifice. How is the application applied? And the threefold answer is, by repentance, by faith, and by obedience.

By repentance. The Baptist and Jesus emphasized repentance (change of mind or heart, change of action and life) as the condition of entrance into the kingdom of God (Mt 3:2; Mk 1:15). Peter presented repentance at Pentecost and immediately after as a means of obtaining forgiveness (Acts 2:38). Paul also, although emphasizing faith, also stressed repentance as an element in the human side of salvation (Acts 20:19; Rom 10:13; Rev 2:20; Rev 2, 3, 21). Repentance is the condition of receiving the benefit of the sacrifice, though not stressing it as a means of receiving the benefit of the sacrifice. (1) By faith. Jesus connected faith with repentance (Mk 1:15) as the condition of receiving the Messianic salvation. Paul, as the great teacher of the NT teaching, is applying the work of Christ. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvations to every one that believeth" (Rom 1:16), whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith (3:25), not works, is reckoned for righteousness. The NT in the letters to the Cor, in the Captivity and the Pastoral Ep. empowers repentance as the act of bringing forth the faith which works salvation in us. Paul "heart" meant the seat or essence of the whole personality, and by this faith which works salvation in us, in Paul is the personal commitment of one's self to Christ as Saviour and Lord (2 Cor 5:15; compare Thayer, Gr-Eng. Lex. as a part of the discussion of the meaning of faith in this verse. The author of He discusses esp. faith as a conquering power, but also implies that it is the condition of entrance upon the life of spiritual rest and fellowship (ch 3:4 and 5:4, etc). Peter also emphasizes this phase of the human condition of salvation when he shows how sanctification grows spontaneously out of justification (Rom 6:8) and when he says that what "avails" is "faith working through love" (Gal 5:6). The author of He says, "He became unto all them that obey him the author (Gr ar, atis, cause) of eternal salvation" (1 Pet 3:21). Peter and James emphasize the keeping of His commandments, of His life and service, as the means of approaching to the fullest the saving benefits of Christ's death. The theologians in classrooms and preachers in the pulpits have failed to emphasize this aspect of "saving faith," as did Jesus, Paul, the author of He, and John. The NT teaching is a life as well as an act of repentance in 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. 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:

1. The Christian's life of sacrifice 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 die to one degree or another as they present their best efforts to be acceptable to God, if they 'suffer as Christians' (1 Pet 2:20; 3:18) in the exercise of their graces and powers.

But how do these sacrifices of the Christian affect him and God? The NT writers never hint that our sacrifices propitiate God, or so win His favor that He will or can on account of our sacrifices forgive our sins. They are 'well-pleasing' to Him, a 'sweet odor'; that is, they win His approval of our lives the more appropriately in the service which Christ gives us. Their influence on us is the increase of our spiritual efficiency and power and finally a greater capacity for enjoying spiritual blessings in heaven (1 Cor 3:14).

Some scholars (Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, etc.) regard the memorial supper as a kind of sacrifice which the Christian offers in worship.

5. The Supper as a Sacrifice

Neither Jesus, Paul, the author of He, or Peter, or John, ever hints that in eating the bread and drinking the wine we give a sacrifice to God in Christ. Paul teaches 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 in which Christ gives us. Their influence on us is the increase of our spiritual efficiency and power and finally a greater capacity for enjoying spiritual blessings in heaven (1 Cor 3:14).

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 the 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. Jesus and the leading NT writers agree that Christ saves men through His vicarious suffering.

(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 and faith, which lives and fruits in obedience and sacrificial living, are recognized by Jesus 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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III. DOCTRINES OF THE SADDUCEES
1. Laid to Codification of the Law
2. Disbelief in the Resurrection
3. Disbelief in the Incarnation and Providence: Their Materialism
4. Relation to Epicureans
IV. CHARACTERS OF SADDUCEES
1. Josephus Describes Them as Boorish
2. Talmudic Account of the Sadducees
3. Relation to the Temple and Worship a Hebraish One
4. Results of the Sadducees
V. RELATION OF SADDUCEES TO JESUS
1. Reasons for His Denouncing the Sadducees as More Unworthy Than the Pharisees
2. Attitude of the Sadducees to Jesus

This prominent Jewish sect, though not so numerous as their opponents, the Pharisees, by their wealth and the priestly descent of many of them had an influence which fully balanced that of their more popular rivals. They were a political party, of priestly and aristocratic tendency, as against the more religious and democratic Pharisees.

I. Introductory.—The Talm form suggests derivation from the name of their founder, but the form in NT and Jos would imply connection with the vb. "to be righteous." The probability is, that the name is derived from some person named "Zadok." The most prominent Zadok in history was the Davidic high priest (2 S 8 17; 15 24; I K 1 35), from whom all succeeding high priests were claimed to descend. It is in harmony with this, that in the NT the Sadducees are the party to whom the high priests belonged. On the authority of "Aḥōḥāt d '-Rabbī Nāṭḥan (a 1000 AD), another Zadok is asserted to be he from whom the Sadducees received their name. He was a disciple of Antigonus of Socho (c 250 BC) who taught that love to God should be absolutely disinterested (Pirkē Aḥōḥāt, i.3). "Aḥōḥāt d '-Rabbī Nāṭḥan's account of the derivation of the Sadduceanism from this teaching is purely an imaginary deduction (Charles Taylor, "Sayings of the Jewish Fathers", 112). The majority of authoritative writers prefer to derive the name from Zadok, the colleague of Abiathar, the contemporary of David.

Our main authorities for the teaching of the Sadducees are the NT and Jos. According to the former, the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the body, and did not believe in angels or spirits (Mt 22 23; Ac 28 25). That they did not understand from Jos, but his evidence is to be received with caution, as he was a Pharisee and moreover, had the idea that the Sadducees were to be paralleled with the Epicureans. The Talm is late. Before even the Mishna was committed to writing (c 200 AD) the Sadducees had ceased to exist; before the Gemara was completed (c 700 AD) every valid tradition of their opinions must have vanished. Further, the Talm is Pharisaic. The Fathers, Origen, Hippolytus, Epiphanius and Jerome, have derived their information from late Pharisaic sources.

II. Origin and History.—Jos describes the Sadducees along with the contemporary sects, the Pharisees and the Essenes (Jos, Ant, XIII, v, 9; X, vi, 2; XVII, i, 4, 5; BJ, II, v, 14). His earliest notice of Josephus is after his account of the treaties of Jonathan with the Romans and the Lacedemonians. He indicates his belief that the parties were ancient; but if so, they must have formerly had a name not given by Josephus. It is only in the earlier form of the conflict between the Sadducees and Pharisees was opposition between the priests and the prophets. This, however, is not tenable; in the Southern Kingdom there was no such opposition; whatever the state of matters in the Northern Kingdom, it could have had no influence on opinion in Judaea and Galilee in the times of Our Lord. By others the rivalry is supposed to be inherited from that between the scribes and the priests, but Ezra, the earliest scribe, in the later sense of the term, was a priest with strong sacerdotal sympathies.

Probably the priestly party only gradually crystallized into the sect of the Sadducees. After the return from the exile, the high priest drew to himself all powers, civil and religious. To the Pers. authorities he was, as the Jews, the king of the Jews. The high priest and those about him were the persons who had to do with the heathen supreme government and the heathen nationalities around; this association would tend to lessen their religious fervor, and, by reaction, this roused the zeal of a section of the people for the law. With the Gr. domination the power of the high priests at home was increased, but they became still more subservient to their heathen masters, and were the leaders in the Hellenizing movement. They took no part in the Maccabean struggle, which was mainly supported by their opponents the Hasideans, as they were called (the Hasidaeans of 1 Macc 2 42). When the ḥaṣidīm, having lost sympathy with the Maccabees, sought to reconcile themselves to the priestly party, Akhmus, the legitimate high priest, by his treachery and cruelly soon renewed the breach. The Hasmoneans then were confirmed in the high-priesthood, but were only lukewarmly supported by the ḥaṣidīm.

The division between the Hasmoneans and ḥaṣidīm, or, as they were now called, Pharisees, culminated in the insult offered by 3. Favored

Elezar to John Hyrcanus, the Has-

mane high priest (Jos, Ant, XIII, 118). Alexandra, the son of Hyrcanus, became a violent partisan party. Toward the end of his life he fell out of sympathy with the Sadducees, and on his deathbed recommended his wife Alexandra Salome, who as guardian to his sons succeeded him, to favor the Pharisees, which she did. In the conflict between her two sons, John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, the Sadducees took the side of Aristobulus, the younger. It is evident that the contest was between Jews, the Sadducean candidate prevailed. When the Romans were called in, they gave the advantage to Hyrcanus.

Thrown into the background by the overthrow of their candidate for the high-priesthood, they soon regained their influence. They allied themselves with the Herodians who had supported Hyrcanus, but were subservient to Rome. Though they believed in the Messiah, they became so to defend their policy against the attacks of the Pharisees. A historical parallel may be found in the Cavaliers of the reign of Charles I, as against the Puritans.

The Sadducees at first regarded the struggle between Our Lord and the Pharisees as a matter with which they had no concern. It was not until Our Lord claimed to be the Messiah, and the excitement of the people consequent on this proved likely to injure the Pharisees, that the Sadducees attacked Him. A secret was shared among the Jews the belief in the coming of a Jewish king who was to rule the world, and that one who appeared claiming to be this Messiah, very soon would the

Sacrifice, Human Sadducees
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 unmeasured in 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 the Apostles after Christ's Departure in the Sanhedrin, and later, under the leadership of Annas, or as he is sometimes called by Jos, Annas, the high priest, they put James the brother of Our Lord to death (Jos, Ant, XX, i, 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 idumaean allies (Jos, BJ, IV, v, 2). With the destruction of the temple and the fall of the Jewish state the Sadducean party disappeared.

III. Dogres of the Sadducees.—As the ascetic party, the Sadducees laid great stress on the ceremonial of sacrifice, 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 declared the Sadduceans were the descendants of the house of Aaron and that the Messiah was to arise from their midst. The Sadduceans also rejected the traditions concerning the resurrection of the dead, the existence of angels, and the coming of the Messiah.

2. Disbelief in the resurrection, in Spiritual World and in Judgment.

As appearances of angels are mentioned in the Law, it is difficult to harmonize their reverence for the Law with this denial. They have regarded these angelophanies as theophanies. 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 and the prophets as the canonical books of the Bible. 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 Psalter.

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 resurrection. The Sadducees had no other characteristic resemblance which 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). This want of manners is not a characteristic usually associated with an aristocracy, or with supreme 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 shows of Annas at the trial of Paul before the same tribunal who "emits him on the mouth," show them to be rough and overbearing. What Jos relates of the conduct of Annas (or Annas) in regard to James, above referred to, agrees with this. Jos, however, does not make any such condemnation of Annas in the NT (IV, v, 2) he 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, Annas resorted to against the Zealotsbetter than the dict of Jos than the later. As to their general character Jos mentions that when the Sadducees became magistrates they conformed their judgments to Pharisaic opinion, otherwise they would not have been terrors of Ant, XVIII, 1.

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 Pesahim 57a it is said, "Woes to him on account of the house of Hanan [Annas], woe's me on account of the house of Kastrius, woe's me on account of their house, woe's me on account of their house, woe's me on account of their house." These voices represent the Pharisees saying: "Would these have judged as we?"

2. Talmudic Accounts of the Sadducees.

Accounts of the Sadducees when the traditions concerning the Sadducees, such as had survived, had filtered through 20 generations of Pharisaism.

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, as ordinary coins had to be changed into the shekels of the sanctuary. From all these the priests of the high-priestly caste derived profit at the expense of degrading the temple (Ederhalam, 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 an earlier stage.

The favor for the memory of John Hyrcanus shown by the writer of 1 Mace (16.23.34) renders probable Geiger's opinion that the author was a Sadducee. He shows that Hyrcanus devoted his life to the temple: his outlook on life is eminently sane, and his history is trustworthy. He has sympathy with the patriotic spirit of the Jews, 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, the question has occurred as to whether there were any points of agreement.

1. Less Denounced by Jesus Than the Pharisees. —Our Lord made no allusions to the Sadducees save along with their opponents the Pharisees; whereas He frequently denounced the Pharisees alone. As His position, both doctrinal and practical, was much nearer that of the Pharisees, it was necessary that He should clearly mark Himself off from them. There was not the same danger of His position being confused with that of the Sadducees. Jos informs us that the Sadducees had influence with the rich; Jesus drew His adherents chiefly from the poor, from whom also the Pharisees drew. The latter opposed Him all the more that He was sapping their source of strength; hence He had to defend Himself against them. Further, the Gospels mainly recount our Lord's ministry in Galilee, whereas the Sadducees were chiefly to be found in Jerusalem and its neighborhood; hence there may have been severe denunciations of the Sadducees that have not come down to us.

The Sadducees probably regarded Jesus as a harmless fanatic who by His denunciations was weakening the influence of the Pharisees. Only when His claim to be the Messiah brought Him within the sphere of practical politics did they desire to intervene. When they determined to come into conflict with Jesus, they promptly decreed His arrest and death; only the arrest was to be secret, “lest a tumult arise among the people” (Mt 26:5). In their direct encounter with Our Lord in regard to the resurrection (Mt 22:25ff.; Mk 12:20ff.; Lk 20:29ff.), there is an element of contempt implied in the illustration which they bring, as if it was almost the end they failed to take Him seriously. For Literature see PHARISEES.

J. E. H. THOMSON

SADUK, sad'uk (A. Fritzsche, Σάδουκειος; Saddingus, Σάδδουκες; Saddoukos; Saddokeous; Saddoulkos; AV Saducee): The high priest, an ancestor of Ezra (1 Esd 8:2) = "Zadok" in Ezr 7:2 = "Saddo" in 2 Esd 11.

SADOC, sad'dok: (1) (Lat Sadosch): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esd 1:1) = "Zadok" in Ezr 7:2 = "Sadduk" in 2 Esd 8:2. (2) (Σαδώκ, Saddok): A descendant of Zerubbabel and ancestor of Jesus (Mt 1:14).

SAFFRON, saf'run (κόκκινος, kókkinos; krókos): Identical with the Arab. kurkum, the same as zaférân, "saffron." The source of the true saffron is Crocus sativus (N.O. Iridaceae), a plant cultivated in Pal; there are 8 wild varieties in all of which, as in the cultivated species, the orange-colored styles and stigmas yield the yellow dye, saffron. C. sativus is treated in C. sativus and C. rhodostemon. There is a kind of bastard saffron plant, the Carthamus tinctorius (N.O. Compositae), of which the orange-colored flowers yield a dye like saffron.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SAIL, sail, SAILOR, sâl'er. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, 3; III, 2.

SAINTS, sânts: In AV 3 words are thus rendered: (1) wâdîn, kadôshôl (in Dn the same root occurs several times in its Aram. form, wâdîn, kad-
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 close to the clear designation of saints and their consecration by God to His own.

DAVID FOSTER ESTES


SALAMI, sa-lä’mi-il (B A, Σαλαμιφ, Saloniti, S Salonit, Σαλονίτης, an ancestor of Judith (Jth 8:1) = AV "Samael.""

SALAMIS, sa-la’mis ( prá the ancient N of Cyprus, situated some 3 miles S of the ancient capital and nearest good harbor and was the most populous and flourishing town of Cyprus in the Hellenic and Roman 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 Salamis 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 (Herd, 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 Onuchus, 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 (Reis. of v. 1591). In 449 a Gr fleet under Athenian leadership defeated the Phoen. navy, which was in the service of Persia, off Salamis; but the Athenians, for whatever reason, failed to press the battle to a decided anti-Hellenic reaction, until the able and vigorous Salaminian prince Euphorbus, who was a warm friend of the Athenians (Isocrates, Euyp) and a successful champion of Hellenism. In 306 a Salaminian nobleman was found guilty of Salamis, in which Demetrius Poliorcetes defeated the forces of Ptolemy the Great, thus ending the struggle of Egypt for 11 years. In 58 BC the town came into Ptolemy's hands and, with the rest of the island, remained an appanage of the Egypt king until the incorporation of Cyprus in the Roman 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 Antioch, and landed at Salamis, about 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 worth noting as pointing to the existence of several synagogues and thus of a large Jewish community in Salamis. 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 of the island, 50 miles, 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 Salamis, but Barnabas doubtless went there on his 2nd missionary journey (Acts 15:8), and tradition states that he was married 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 with the utmost severity and the island was almost completely depopulated; and its destruction was afterward consummated by earthquakes in 332 and 342 AD. It was rebuilt, though on a much smaller scale, by the emperor Constantine II (337-61 AD) under the name Constantin, 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 647 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. Murno and H. A. Tubbs under the auspices of the Cyprus Exploration Fund will be found in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, XII, 58-68.

M. N. TÓD

SALASDÁI, sa-las’á-th’ (A, Σαλασάθ, Saladai, B, Σαρασάθ, Sarasáathi, C, Sarathai, Saris- sáati) an ancestor of Judith (Jth 8:1).

SALATHIEL, sa-lä’th-é-il: (1) (Σαλαθήθ, Salathith): AV; Gr form of "Saelith" (thus RV). The father of Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5:48-56; 6:2; Mt 1:12; Lk 3:28). (2) Another name of Estras (2 Esd 3:1, "Salaithie").

SALE, säl’ (זְמַקְר, смкăr): The word is used: (1) in the sense of the transaction (Lev 25:30); (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 19:9), though it may be the same as (1) above.

SALEKH, sa’lé-ka, salchah, salchah, sal’ka (Σαλγχ, salghch; B, Σεσκα, Sescah, יבש, Achh, Σαλδά, Solá, A, אבכה, Elchhā, ašelkhā, ašelkhā, Σαχά, Selchā): 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 13:5). 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 13:29 f). At a later time we are told that Gad dwelt over against the Reubenites in the land of Bashan unto Salech (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 900 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 Haurán, 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 Derah, away to the S.E. over the desert to Keltai 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 turba-
lence. In the recent rising of the Druzes (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, sâlîm (םָלִים, shâlîm; Σαλημ, Salîm): The name of the city of which Melchizedek was king (Gen 14: 18; He 7 1, 2; cf Ps 76 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 Jerus, as stated by Jos (Ant I, x, 2), who adds (VII, iii, 2) that it was known as Solyma (Σαλημα, Sôlûma, variants, according to Whiston, Salem and Hierosolyma) in the time of Abraham. It was also reported that the city and its temple were called Solyma by Homer, and he adds that the name in Heb means "security." This identification with Jerus was accepted by Onkelos and all the Tgs, as well as by the early Christians. The Samaritans have always identified Salem with Salim, E. of Nahalîmus, but Jewish and Christian tradition is more likely to be correct, supported, as it is, by Ps 76 2.

The testimony of the Am Tab is apparently negative. Knudtzon's no. 287 mentions "the land" and "the lands of Salam," twice, with the prefix for "city:" no. 289 likewise has this prefix twice; and no. 290 refers to "the city" or "a city of Amarna Tablets (Berlin, pl. 1197). As there is no prefix of any kind before the element salam, it is not probable that this is name of either a man (the city's founder) or a god (like the Assyr Šalmanu). The form in Sennacherib's inscriptions (cf Taylor Cylinder, III, 50), Ursalimmu, gives the whole as a single word in the nominative, the double m implying that the ì was long. As the Assyrians pronounced ì as sh, it is likely that the Urusalimites did the same, hence the Heb yĕrhôbalîm, with sh. See Jerusalem.

T. G. Pinches

SALEM (Σαλημος, Salêmôs; AV Salum): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esd 8 1) = "Shallum" in Ezr 7 2 = "Salem" in 2 Esd 1 1.

SALEMAS, sal'ē-mas, sa-lē'mas (Late Salome; AV Sadamias): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esd 1 1) = "Shallum" in Ezr 7 2; called also "Salem" in 1 Esd 8 1.

SALIM, sâlîm (Σαλημ, Salîm): A place evidently well known, since the position of Aeonon, the springs where John was baptized, was defined 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 Shilhem and Ain in the S. of Judah; that of Bölshing with 'Ain Kârim, and that of Barday, who would place Salim in Wady Salem near 'Anâda, making Aeonon the springs in Wady Fâr'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 Nablûs, Aeon being 'Ainân in Wady Fâr'ah, it would be sufficient to say that this is the very heart of Samaria, and therefore impossible. In any case the position of Aeon, 6 miles distant, with a high mountain intervening, would hardly be defined by the village of Salîm, with the important city of Shechem quite as near, and more easily accessible.

ONOM places Aeneon 8 Roman miles S. of Scythopolis (Beisâm), near Salvumius (Sâlim) and the Jordan. This points to Tell Rûdîyah, on the northern side of which is a shrine known locally as Sheikh Salîm. Not far off, by the banks of Umân el-'Amâdân, there are seven copious fountains which might well be called Amon, "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, sal-'imoth (B, Σαλημοθ, Salêmôth, A, Α'ςαλημοθ, Α'salêmôth; the latter is due to a wrong division of syllables; AV Assalimoth): The same as "Shelemith" (Ezr 8 10). S., the son of Josaphias, of the family of Banias, and with him 130 men went up to Jerus with Ezra (1 Esd 8 36).

SALLAI, sal'ā, sal'ah (טיל, salây; Σαλημ, Salôm, A, Σαλα, Σαλα, Salâ, with variants): (1) Eponym of a Benjamite family which settled at Jerus after the return, descendants of "Salal" (1 Ch 9 7; Neh 11 7 8); the pedigrees of Sallal differ decidedly in the two passages. Curtius (ICC) suggests that "son of Hodaviah, the son of Hase'mah" (Ch) is a corruption or derivation of "Judah the son of Hassenuah" (Neh).

(2) Name of a priestly family (Neh 12 20), called "Sallu" in ver 7.

SALLU, salū. See SALLAI.

SALLUMUS, sa-lē'mus, sa-lē'mos (Σαλημοςους, Sôlômosousoi): One of the porters who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esd 9 25) = "Shallum" in Ezr 10 24; called also "Salum" in 1 Esd 5 28.

SALMA, sal'ma. See SALMON.

SALMAI, salmî, salmâ'î (שָלָם, salmây, salmây; AV Shalmi [AV in Neh 7 48 is "Shalmai" = Ezr 2 40; RV "Salmai"]: The eponym of a family of Nethan, called "Shamali" in Ezr 2 46 (Kêrê, ש�מלויא, shamlîy; Qôra, קְמֵלַי, shemlay, K'tibhîth, שֶׁמֶלְי, shemlay), followed by AV text, "Shalma"); B, Samâx, Samânî, A, Shôelâ, Salâmî; Neh 7 48, B, Salâmî, Salâmî, A, Shôelâ, Salâmî, B, Samâx, Samâlî. The name suggests a foreign origin. In 1 Esd 5 30 the corresponding name is "Sabai".

SALMANASAR, sal-ma'na'sar (2 Esd 13 40) = Shâlmaneser (q.v.).

SALMON, sal'mon, SALMA (שָלָם, salmôn, "investiture" [Ruth 4 21], יִשְׂרָאֵל, isrâ'el, "clothing" [Ruth 4 20], יָשִׂרְאֵל, isrâ'el; 1 Ch 11 51, 54; Σαλμών, Salômôn): (1) The father of Boaz the husband of Ruth, and thus the grandfather of Jesse, David's father (Ruth 4 20 21). He is mentioned in both the genealogies of Jesus (Mt 1 4 5; Lk 3 32). From Mt 1 5 we learn that he married Rahab, by whom he begat Boaz.

(2) In 1 Ch 2 51 ff, we read of a Salma, "the father of Beth-lehem," a son of Caleb the son of Hur. He is also said to be the father of "the Netophathites, Atroth-beth-joab, and half of the Ma'nathathites, the Zorites, and several 'families of scribes.'" See also SALMON.

S. F. HUNTER

SALMONE, sal-mô'nê (Σαλμωνη, Salômône): Acts 27 7. See PHOENIX.

SALOM, sālō'm (Σαλόμ, Salōm):
(1) The father of Heklias (Bar 1:7). Gr form of "Salathiel".
(2) AV=RV "Salu" (1 Macc 2:26).

SALOME, sa-lō'mē (Σαλόμη, Salōmē):
(1) One of the holy women who accompanied with Jesus in Galilee and ministered to Him (Mt 27:56; Mk 16:10, 41, 47). She was present at the crucifixion (15:40), and was among those who came to the tomb of Jesus on the resurrection morning (16:12). 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) dispute the inference.
(2) Salome was the name of the daughter of Herodias who danced before Herod, and obtained as a reward the head of John the Baptist (Mt 14:3-11; Mk 6:17-28; cf. Jos. Ant., XVIII, v.4). She is not named in the Gospels.

JAMES ORR

SALT, sōlt (σάλσ, melih; ἀσά, ἡδα, ἢδα, ἢδε): 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; Ezr 6:9; 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 common among Arab-speaking peoples. The Arab, word for "salt" and for its "compact" or "treaty" is the same. Doughty in Arabia had more than once to the superstitious belief of the Arabs in the "salt covenant," to save his Arab he had in his tent 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 26:11). 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 crystals can be collected. As salt-gathering is a government monopoly in Turkey, the government sends men to pollute the salt which is being surreptitiously crystallized, 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 is used not only as a food, but as an antiseptic in medicine. Newborn babes were bathed and salted (Ezk 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 2:20f). Abimelech sowed the rubies 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).

SALT, CITY OF: The pillar of salt is emblematic of loyalty and friendship (see above). A person who has once joined in a "salt covenant" with God then breaks it is only to be cast out (cf Mt 5:13; Mk 9:50). Saltiness typified barrenness (Dt 29:23; 1 Esd 7:6). The types compared the same mouth giving forth blessings and cursings to the fountain of providing both sweet and salt water (Jas 3:11f).

JAMES A. PATCH

SALT, CITY OF (יִבְנַיָּה הַשָּׁרוֹן), 'tr ha-melah: Αυταὶ ταῖς ἀλαίσι, hai pōleisis halais): One of the six cities in the wilderness of Judah mentioned between Nibshan and Engedi (Josh 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 (נֶשֶׁר הַשָּׁרוֹן, ge ha-melah): 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 these same foes (2 K 14:7; 2 Ch 25:11). It is tempting to connect this "Valley of Salt" with es Serekh, 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 ha-melah with the Wady el-Milh ("Valley of Salt"), one of the three valleys which unite at Beersheba to form the Wady es-Sheba'. These valleys, el-Milh and es-Sheba', together make a natural frontier to Canaan.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SALT-WORT, sōlt-wōrt (σαλαριά, melitē, a word connected with melih, "salt," tr in LXX ἀλαρια, ἀλίμων, hēlimerion; AV mallow): The halimos of the Greeks is the sea orache, Atriplex halimus, a silvery whitish shrub which flourishes upon the shores of the Dead Sea alongside the ruin (see JUNIPER). 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 mallit-h to the Gr μαλλίς, mallowe, which is the Lat melon and Eng. "mallow." Certain species of mallow known in Arabic, as 3ṭāt, khubbātē, are very commonly eaten by the poor of Pal.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SALU, sālū (סָלָע, gālā; LXX Ὁλόμ, Salōn, Σαλων, Ἁλόα, Sału; AV has "Salom" in 1 Macc 2:20): 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 Macc 2:26).

**SALUM, sálūm (Σαλωμ, Salōm):** The head of the one of the families of porters (1 Esd 5:28; om. in B) = "Shallum" in Ezr 2:42; 10:24; Neh 7:45 = "Sallumus" in 1 Esd 9:25.

**SALUTATION, sal-ō-ta’shun (ἀσπασμός, aspas-mós):** A greeting which might be given in person, orally (Lk 1:20-41:44), or in writing, usually at the close of a letter (1 Cor 16:21; Col 4:18; 2 Thess 3:17; Acts 16:3). See σαλώμ (joy) in Jas 1:1). The Pharisees and 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, embracing, etc. When Jesus therefore sent out the Seventy, He forbade salvation by the way (Lk 10:4), though He ordinarily encouraged proper civilities of this sort (Mt 5:47; 10:12).

EDWARD BAGBY POLLARD

**SALVATION, sal-va’shun:**

**I. IN THE OT**
1. General
2. Individualism
3. Faith
4. Moral Law
5. Ritual Law
**II. INTERTESTAMENT LITERATURE**
1. General
2. The Law
**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

**IV. ST. PAUL**
1. General
2. Moral Progress
3. The Spirit
4. Mystical Union
5. Forgiveness
6. Atonement
7. Summary
8. Notes

**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 τρέχειν "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 only for the student doing minute detailed work, while it is the purpose of the present article to present a general view of the Bih. doctrine of salvation.

**I. IN THE OT.**—(1) As long as revelation had not raised the need that separates this life from the next, the Israelite thought of his high-
1. General
cost good as long life in a prosperous
Pal, as described most typically in Dt 28:1-14. 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 11:9; Hab 2:14; Jer 31:34).

Such a concept is normal for most of the OT, but there are central significances of huge emphases of it. That Israel should receive God's characteristic of righteousness is a part of the ideal (Isa 1:26; 3:4; 32:1-8; 33:24; Jer 31:33; Ezk 36:25; 26; Zec 8; Dn 9 24; Ps 81:10-12). God was found in the extension of Israel's good to the surrounding nations (Mic 4:1-4; Isa 2:2-4; 45:5; Zec 2:11; 8:2223; Isa 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). Pal 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; 21:20; Zec 2:10-13). (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 (Eek 36:25,26, etc).

(1) At first the "unit of salvation" was the nation (less prominently the family), i.e. a man though righteous could lose salvation through the faults of others. A father could bring a curse on his children (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 18:30). 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 Eek 14:12-20; 33:1-20, and fairly consistently in the Pss. But even Ezekiel still held that five-and-twenty could defile the whole nation (S 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 sin, 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. Eek 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 8:17-19; Jer 32:15-18, etc).
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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.) Salvation is 3. Faith
Inconsistent with such trust are, for instance, seeking aid from other nations (Isa 30:1–5), putting reliance in human skill (2 Ch 16:12), or forsaking Yahweh 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 16:12), but the reckless use of the creditor's right is sharply condemned (Neh 5:1–13). The prophets are never weary of giving short formulas that will exclude such supra-legalism 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 properly placed usually, in the books, 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 no one need remove the guilt of the sin if the sin be forsaken (Ezek 18) or, in the case of a sin that would not be repeated, if contrition be felt (2 S 12). Suffering may be a part of salvation by bringing knowledge of sin to the conscience, the exile being the most important example (Ezek 36:27). But almost 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 sacrificial means of expiation, most notably that of the sacrifices. But a theology of sacrifice is conveyed most usefully by the OT, for Lev 17:11 is too incidental and too obscure to be an exception. The Christian (or very late Jewish) interpretations of the ritual laws lack all solidarity 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 conscientious 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) The reference to such sins may not 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 pre-Christian prophets have little to say about their positive value (Jer 7:22 is the nadir). Indeed, in pre-Christian times the danger was the exaltation of sacrifice at the expense of morality, esp. with the peace offering, which could quite turn into a money-making deal (Am 5:21–24; Isa 22:13; cf Prov 7:14). Attempts were made to "strengthen" the sacrifices to Yahweh by the use of ethnic rites ( Hos 4:14; Isa 66:1–5), even with the extreme of human sacrifice (Jer 7:31; Ezek 20:26). But insistence on the strict conformity of the rite, allowing 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) bully 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 abstention seeming to reside at the background of the term "holiness." But a ritual breach was often a matter of moral duty (burning the dead, etc), and, for such breaches, the ritual means of expiation as a matter 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 9:5–7, when it is said that the rite would not be unfit 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 retained in the NT.
II. Intermediate Literature.—(1) The great change, compared with the earlier period, is that the idea of God had become more 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 Ecclesiastes, 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 was through some of the apocalyptic life and created the new literary form of apocalyptic literature, represented in the OT esp. by Zec 9:14–17; 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 joyfulness 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 RV: "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 an early date 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 interpretations). 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 and rightly allow of salvation because 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. And the most extreme case is in Jdb 9:31-38—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 the Lord commanded?" (Jdb 119 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 expositions are not the less important for 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 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 baptisms, was an earnest toke upon the people, who were to prepare men to face this judgment securely. 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 2. Kingdom with the eschatological phrase. The kingdom of God was the symbol of absolute dominion. Consequently His teaching must have been taken at once in an eschatological sense, and it is rather futile to attempt to limit such implications to passages where modern eschatological phrases are used unambiguously. "The kingdom of God is at hand!" had the inerrant exclamation "Judgment is 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 external. Man's nature is to be perfectly adapted to his spiritual environment (see ESCHATOLOGY), 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 16:19). The kingdom of God is, however, its meaning is not certainly not exhausted by a mere reformation 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. Occasionally there is a Christian reference to 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 was the unit 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. 23:38; Mk 10:5; 15:20, etc.). He admitted even that the position of the Jewish leaders rested on a reversal of this. A important factor for 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 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.

IV. Individual.—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

5. Moral Progress came from the Pharisaic casuistry which had invented limits to righteousness, and an exact code tokens of a perfect morality, and contemplated 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 (8:8). 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 have not works have no share 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); for he who does the will of the Father 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 (6 21), the one who receives remission of sins (Mt 2 5), Zaccheus 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 becoming 'a little child' (of Mk 10 15). Now the point here is not ceduleousness (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 1 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 give them help is prerequisite. 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 its need and trust, and turns to its Father for the rest, that is the savable soul.

Christ speaks of the pardon of the publican (Lk 18 9ff) and of the prodigal welcomed by the Father (Lk 15 20), both without 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 (Mk 9 40 is irrelevant). Real knowledge of the Father is possible only through the unclouded knowledge of the Son (Lk 10 21.22), and lack of knowledge of the Son (Lk 10 12-23) and lack of faith in the Son forfeits all blessings (Mt 6 5-6; 8 23). Faith in Him brings instant forgiveness of sins (Mt 2 5), and love directed to Him is an indubitable sign that forgiveness has been taken place (Lk 7 46). But Christ the servant of the Father's 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 judgment is unthinkable, a transcendental judgment is the sole alternative, corroborated by the use of the title Son of Man. But passage from simple humanity to the transcendental 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 2 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 position. So there is a complete justification 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) Asetic practices as a necessary element in salvation can hardly claim Christ's authority. It is true that the pained Jesus is not Christ's only disciples. Certainly not all of the hundred and twenty of Acts 1 15 (ef ver 21), nor of the five hundred of 1 Cor 12 6, were converted after the Passion. And they all certainly could not have been asked to travel to the ends of the earth for 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 characteristics of this method of this that the present acute 'Jesus-Paulus' controversy exists.

That St. Paul expected the near advent of the kingdom of God with a judgment preceding, and a 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 9 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 KINSONOM OF GOD), but the additional matter is without particular religious import. A certain privilege of the Jews appears (Rom 3 1-8; 9-11), 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 CURUCU).

(1) The moral ideal is distinctly that of character. St. Paul, indeed, is frequently obliged to give directions as to details, but the 2. Moral detailed directions are referred con- Progress stantly to the underlying principle, such as Rom 14 or 1 Cor 8 being excellent examples of this, while 'love is the fulfilment of the law' (Rom 13 10) is the summary. (2) Persistent moral effort is indispensable, and the new life absolutely must bring forth fruit to God (Rom 6 4; 13 12; Gal 5 24; Col 3 5; Eph 2 3; 4 17 22-32;
Tit 2 11-14). Only by good conduct can one please God (1 These 4 1), and the works of even Christians are to be watched as a fire (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 the peril of a lack of moral attainment must not be permitted to leave the mind (1 Cor 3 17; Gal 5 21; cf 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 St. Paul's Correspondence). 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 16-26), if a man walks according to it (1 Cor 6 19.20; 1 Thess 4 6-7). In ch 7 St. Paul looks back with a shudder on his pre-Christian helplessness (it is naturally the extreme of exegetical perservity to argue that he dreaded not the sin itself but only God's penalty on sin). But the Spirit got us to put to death the deeds of the body (8 13), to disregard the things of the flesh (8 5), and to fulfil 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 than of the Spirit): hence Pauline (Christ and the 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 brought into divine union with Christ's death was 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 (Rom 8 29). 5. Forgiveness. (Rom 5 8-9). And the acquisition of forgiveness strength through 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 appeal to the Law (Rom 3 25; 4 25; 15 56), which 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 possible.St. Paul calls it "washing" (1 Cor 3 3; 4 5; 2 Cor 6 18). Its chief use, however, is in opposition to "works" (most clearly in Rom 9 30-10 13). The Jews' "purposet after righteousness"—the attempt to wring salvation from God as wages earned—was vain (Rom 10 13); and in a doubt is the appeal to God, the conscious relinquishment of all claim (4 5). The soul looks trustingly for salvation to its Father, precisely the attitude of the "children" in the teaching of Christ. But no more than in the teaching of Christ is faith a purely passive virtue, for man must be "obedient to it" (Rom 1 5; 10 16; 1 Thess 2 13). And for the necessary presence of love in faith of 1 Cor 13 2; Gal 5 6; Eph 3 17.

Because of faith—specifically, faith in Christ (except Rom 4; Gal 3 6)—God does not visit the penalties of sins on believers, but 6. Atonement treats them as if they were righteous (Rom 5 1, etc). But this is not because of a quality in the believer or in the faith, but because of an act that preceded any act of Christian faith, the death of Christ (not the cross, specifically, for St. Paul does not argue from the cross in all of Rom). Through this death God's mercy could be extended safely, while before this the exercise of mercy had been limited to God's elect (Rom 3 25.26). And this death was a sacrifice (Rom 3 25, etc). And it is certain that St. Paul conceived of this sacrifice as existing quite independently of its effect on any human being. But he has given us no data for a really complete sacrificial doctrine, a statement sufficiently proved by the hopeless variance of the interpretations that have been propounded. And that St. Paul ever constructed a theory of the operation of sacrifices must be doubted. There is none in the contemporary Jewish literature, there is none in the OT, and there is none in the rest of the NT, not even in He. Apparently the rites were so familiar that sacrificial terminology was ready to hand and was used without particular reflection and without attempting to give it precise theological content. This is borne out by the ease with which in Rom 3 24.25 St. Paul passes from a ransom (redemption) illustration to a (quite discordant) propitiation illustration. Paul has two sources for his teaching about Justification. Here it is enough to say that to make a juridical theory constructed from Pauline implications and illustrations central in Christianity is to do exactly what St. Paul did not do.

Summing up the whole thought in St. Paul: the remission of penalties through the atoning death of Christ and the—7. Summary of the power of sin through strength flowling from Christ, the human element in both cases being faith. The question of the order of the steps is futile, for "to have faith," "to be in Christ," and "to have the Spirit" are convertible terms, i.e. in doctrinal phraseology, the beginnings of sanctification are simultaneous with justification. Attempts to unify the two lines of thought into a single theory cannot claim purely Bib. support. The "ethical" theory, which in its best form makes God's pardon depend on the fact that the sinner will be made holy (at least in the next world), introduces the fewest extraneous elements, but it says something that St. Paul does not say. On the other hand one may feel that considering St. Paul as a whole—to say nothing of the rest of the NT—the pure justification doctrine has bulked a little too large in our discussion. St. Paul's pardon for a sin is immensely important, but still more important is the new power of holiness.
8. Notes  
Paul today thun would have been a martyr to religion and such passages as Rom 6:1–7; Gal 3:27; Col 2:12 make it certain that he regarded baptism as conferring very real spiritual powers. But that he made a mechanical distinction between the blessings given then and those given at some other time must be doubted. (2) Salvation from the flesh (Rom 7:24) involves no metaphysical dualism, as “flesh” is the whole of the lower nature from which the power to holiness saves a man (Rom 13). Indeed, the body itself is an object of salvation (Rom 8:11; and see Revelation).  
(5) Quite in the background lies the 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 “covenant in 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 11:30–32). Only the chastisement or, 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 Pal. 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 (3:35; cf. 18:36), is replaced by “eternal life.” This life is given in the person of Christ (ch. 5:25–27; 6:46), but its full realization will be in the “mansion mansions” 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 the 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 expressible in the one word “death” (5:21). (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 “wholly a personal matter, but the believers enter a community of service (15:14), with the death 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; 15:12), 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 God’s commandments (17:17). This “doing” is the proof of love toward Christ (13:14; 15:21); only by bearing fruit and more fruit can discipleship be maintained (15:1–6; of 14:21), and, indeed, by bearing fruit men actually become Christ’s disciples (15:8, cf.). The knowledge of Christ and of God that is eternal life (17:3) 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 (cf. Acts 3:13; 18:9, 19, and see John 19:19, with or 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. 16:5; 2:46; 4:47). This emphasis on the Divine side of the process is probably the reason for the omission of the terms “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 Synoptist is there any explanation of how the Atonement became effectual. 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 with God in general; cf. 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 nothing but a 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 little held to by 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; 5:8, etc.). In He 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 normal). That the death was specifically tolerable (12:2; cf. 9:27) was 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 New Testament.  
The one 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 benefitting other men (3:16–20). It is hardly possible that St. Peter thought of this comparison as conveying an exhaustive description of the Atonement (of 1:19), 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 all that God promised in the Old Covenant is not to be ours until the end of human history (if, indeed, there will not be opened infinite possibilities of eternal growth), but the enjoyment of these blessings depends on conditions fulfilled in this life and by us. But a foretaste of the blessings of forgiveness of sins and of comfort and peace is present 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.
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But strength comes from God through the glorified Christ (or through the Spirit), this vital union with God being pivotal. 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-synergistic' or 'salvationism' are regarded as 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—here 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; Sanctification; Punishment 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. Carlyle's Romans in the "New Century" series should be used as a supplement to any other comm. on Rom. The juridical theology of the Atonement has its best defender in Eng. Deaney's The Death of Christ. The ethical theory is best presented in the works of Du Bos, The Gospel in the Gospels, The Gospel according to St. Paul, and High-Friehood and Sacrifice (Sandy's Expos reviews of the two former, reported in The Life of Christ in Recent Research, should be read in any case).

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

SAMAIL, sam'a-el: AV = RV Salamiel (q.v.).

SAMAIAH, sa-mā'yaḥ (Ṣama'ia, Samaías):
(1) One of the "captains over thousands" prominent at the Passover of Josiah (1 Esd 1 9) = "She-maiah" in 2 Ch 35 9.
(2) One of the heads of families of the sons of Adoniak who returned with Ezra (1 Esd 8 30) = "She-maiah" 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) = "She-maiah" in Ezr 8 16 (AV Samaiah).
(4) AV = RV "She-maiah the great," a kinsman of Tobit and father of Ananias and Jonathan (Tob 5 15).

S. ANGUS

SAMARIA, sa-mā'ri-a, CITY OF (יִשָּׁם, shām-
ron'; שָׂמָרְיָה, Samudreia, Sopam, Semerōn, 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 Elah and Zimri came that of Omri, who reigned 6 years at Tirzah, then he purchased the hill of Samaria and built a city there, which was thenceforward the metropolis of the kingdom of Israel (16 24). 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 shāmør, 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 16 25; 22 37; 2 K 10 35; 13 9 13; 14 16).

Toward the western edge of the Ephraimite uplands there is a broad fertile hollow called Wādī ets-Sha'tir, "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 prospect 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 Shobak, 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 (16 19 f.). There are many prophetic references to the enormities practised here, and to their inevitable consequences (Isa 8 1; 9 9; 10 9, 28, 30, 31; 14 21, 28; 16 9; 25 13; Ezk 23 4; Hos 7 1; 13 16; Am 3 12; Mic 1 6, etc.).

Under pressure of Damascas Omri conceded to the
Syrians the right to “make streets in Samaria” (1 K 20:34).

Ben-hadad II besieged the city, but suffered ignominy in the defeat (2 K 20:1–24; Jos, Ant, x, iii, 14). Persistent attempts by the Syrians to recapture the city in the time of Jehoram were frustrated by Elisha (2 K 6:1–6; 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, 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 height of the great western gateway occurred the crush in which the incredulous 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 10:18). In Samaria, the Chronicler tells us, Abijah 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 17:1; 18:9; Jos, Ant, XIX, iv, 1). This marked the downfall of the Northern Kingdom, the people being carried by the conqueror. That the city 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 subdued again. Colonists were brought from other parts to take the place of the inhabitants (2 K 17:24, 25). Against the greatest the city took in the 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 (C, Ap, II, 4). The city suffered at the hands of Ptolemy Lagi and Demetrius Poliorcetes, but it was still a place of strength (Jos, Ant, XII, 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 Harûn and ‘Ain Kefr Ritma, to the E. of the town, the water could not rise to the height of the mount, by 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 magnificence, calling it Seleuceia (Augusta), a honor of the emperor, a name which survives in the modern Sebastiyeh. A temple also was dedicated to Caesar. Its site is probably marked by the imposing flight of steps, with the pedestal on which stood the gigantic statue of Augustus, which recent excavations have revealed. The statue, 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 circular colonnaded 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, xxi, 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, XVII, vii, 5–7; XVI, iii, i–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 place in the lists of the apostles and missionaries (Phil. 1:23) is an argument to the contrary. The city was settled here 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 Nicea, Constantinople and Chalcodon. Its bishop attended the Synod of Jerusalem in 536 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 Bapt- ist’s body.

(2) 众 山亚, ha Samurâea: A town mentioned in 1 Macc 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 Mariesa, and probably the place intended is Mareshah, the site of which is at Tell Sandanahann, about a mile S. of Beit Jibrin.

W. Ewing
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 27,639. 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 Samaria, as 27,639 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 (Dan 11, 10). 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 need not 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 at that time was that of preserving what strength 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 Samaritans.

Of the history of Samaria under Assyry and Babylonia we know nothing. It reappears at the return of the Jews from Persia auspiciously. The Jews refused the proffered assistance of the Samaritans in rebuilding the temple and the walls of Jerusalem (Ezr 4 1 3). Highly offended, the latter sought to frustrate the pious work of the Jews (Ezr 4 4 ff; Neh 4 7 ff; 1 Esd 2 16 ff). That the Samaritans 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 house of their GodJerusalem;" (Ezr 4 4). They may also be those 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 in 333 BC. The number of the population at that time has not been preserved. The Bible gives a figure of 250,000 (2 M 3 22). Some suppose that this was the number of the people of the city and not the country. But it is certain that the latter was considerably larger, as Samaria was a commercial center of considerable importance. It was the seat of the highest authority in Palestine, and a favorite resort of the Jews during the time of the Roman domination. 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, II, 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 narrow 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

SAMARITAN, sa-mar‘i-tan, PENTATEUCH, THE. See PENTATEUCH, THE SAMARITAN.

SAMARITANS, sa-mar‘i-tans (σαμαριταί, shemmetrical), Σαμαριταί, Σαμαρίται [sing.], Samarites): The name "Samaritans" in 2 K 17 29 clearly applies to the Israelite 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 extirpated 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, and men of war and prominent men, who explicitly, the priests, the hosanah classes being left to till the land, the vineyards, etc. Hezekiah, who came to the throne of Judah probably in 715 BC, could still appeal to the tribes of Ephraim, Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, and Zebulon (2 Ch 30 10.11.18ff); and the presence of these tribesmen is implied in the narrative of Josiah's reformation (34 6f). Although the number of the colonists was increased by Esarhaddon and Osipap (Assur-bani-pal, Ezr 4 29 f), the population, able and willing, previously Israelite; otherwise their religion would not so easily have won the leading place. The colonists thought it necessary for their own safety to acknowledge Jeh, in whose land they dwelt, as one among the gods to be feared (2 K 17 21ff). In the intermixure 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 1f). Whatever justification there was for this claim, their proffered friendship was turned to deadly hostility by the blunt refusal of their request. The exegetes of the north and south 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 4ff; Neh 6 7ff. etc).
Samatus
Samson
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From the strict administration of the Law in Jerusalem malcontents found their way to the freeer atmosphere of Samaria. Among these renegades was Manasseh, brother of the high priest, who had married a daughter of Sanballat, the Pers governor of Samaria, to Josiah, son of Manasseh, with the sanction of Alexander the Great, built a temple for the Samaritans on Mt. Gerizim, of which Manasseh became high priest (Ant. XI, vij, 2; vii. 22 ff.). Jos. however, places Manasseh a century too late. He was a contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh 13. 28).

When it suited their purpose the Samaritans claimed relationship with the Jews, asserting that their roll of the Pentateuch was the only authentic copy (see Pentateuch, The Samaritans); yet they were equally ready to deny all connection in times of stress, and even to dedicate their temple to a heathen deity (Jos., Ant. XII, v, 5). In 128 BC, John Hyrcanus destroyed the temple (XIII, ix, 1). In the time of Christ the Samaritans were ruled by procurators under the Roman governor of Syria. Lapse of years brought no lessening of the hatred between Jews and Samaritans (Ant. XX, vi, 1). To avoid insult and injury at the hands of the latter, Jews from Galilee were accustomed to reach the feast at Jerusalem by way of Perea. "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon" was an expression of opprobrium (Jn. 8. 48). Although Jesus forbade the Twelve to go into any city of the Samaritans (Mt. 10. 5), the province was the scene of the Samaritan shows that His love overleaped the boundaries of national hatred (Lk. 10. 30 ff.; of 17. 16; Jn. 4. 9).

During the Jewish war Cæcilius treated the Samaritans with great severity. On one occasion (67 AD) he slaughtered 11,000 on Mt. Gerizim. For some centuries they were found in considerable numbers throughout the empire, east and west, with their synagogues. They were noted as "bankers" and money-changers. For their anti-Christian attitude and conduct Justinian inflicted terrible vengeance on them. From this the race seems never to have recovered. Gradually dwindling, they now form a small community in Nablus of not more than 200 souls. Their great treasure is their ancient copy of the Law. See SAMARIA.


W. EWING

SAMATUS, sam'at-us (Σαματός, Ŝamatos): One of the sons of Esor who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esd. 9. 34). It is difficult to say whether, if any, name it represents in Ex. 10. 34 ff., where no "sons of Esor" are inserted between "sons of Bani" and "sons of Nebo": probably Shallum (ver. 42), but possibly Shemariah (ver. 41).

SAMECH, sam'ek (ਸ, samekh): The 15th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as s. It came to be used for the number 60. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

SAMEUS, sa-maw'yus: AV = RV Sameus (q.v.).

SAMELLIUS, sam-e'l'i-us (B, Σαμελλίος, Samellius; A, Σαμελλίος, Sesellius, al Σαμελλίος, Semelius; AV Semellius): "The scribe," one of those who wrote a letter to Artaxerxes against the building of Jerusalem by the returned exiles (1 Esd. 2. 16. 17. 25. 50 = "Shimshai" in Ex. 4. 8).

SAMEUS, sam'aw'us (A and Fritsch, Σαμας, Samas; B, Σαμασ, Samass; Thunemann; AV Sameus): One of the sons of Enmer who put away their subversive wives" (1 Esd. 9. 21) = "Samshai" (RVm "Maasiai"") of the sons of Harim in Ezr. 10. 21.

SAMGAR-NEBO, sam-gar-ne'bo (םעגַר נבֵו, Samgar Nebô, a Bab name): An officer of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who accompanied him on his expedition of Jer. 39. 3, took his seat with other nobles in the middle gate of Jerusalem after the Chaldean army had taken the city. Schrader (COT, ii, 109) holds that the name is a Hebraized form of the Assyr. Sargarnabu ("the gracious, Nebo"), but Giesbrecht (Comm., 211) conjectures for Samgar a corruption of Sir-mag (sam-rag), equivalent to Rab-mag (rab-maghi), which implies virtual dittography. The number of variant readings exhibited by the LXX seems to confirm the belief that the text is corrupt. Nebô (nabo) is there joined with the following Sarsechim to agree with Nebuzaradan of ver. 13. If the name Samgar-nebo is correct, the first Nergal-sharer should perhaps be dropped; we would then read: "Samgar-nebo the Sarsechim, Nebuzaradan the Rab-saris [of ver 18] and Nergal-sharer the Rab-mag [Saysce]." See Rab-mag = Rab-saris.

HORACE J. WOLF

SAMI, sa'mî: AV = RV Sari (q.v.).

SAMIS, sa'mis: AV = RV Someus (q.v.).

SAMLAH, sa'm'la (שַׁמָּלָה, samdrâ): Σαμολά, Samolā, One of the kings of Edom, of the city of Masreka. He reigned before the Israelites had kings (Gen. 36. 38. 37; 1 Ch. 4. 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, sa'mus (Α, Σαμμοῦς, Samnous; B, Σαμμοῦς, Sameous): One of those who stood on Ezra's right hand as he expounded the Law (1 Esd. 9. 43) = "Shema" in Neh 8. 4.

SAMOS, sa'mos (Σάμος, Sámos, "height," "mountain" [see Strabo, §48, 457]): One of the most famous of the Ionian islands, third in size, after Rhodes, which includes Lesbos, Curo (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 straits where the Greco-Bactrian kings conquered the Pers fleet in the battle of Mycale, 479 BC (Herod. ix. 100 ff.). The surface of the island is very rugged and mountainous, Mt. Kerkì (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 revolving 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 (Disp. Cn. iv. 9; Flivy, NH, v. 37). Both Marcus Agrippa and Herod visited the island; and according to Jos. (Ant. XVI, ii, 2; BJ, i, xxx, 11) "bestowed a great many benefits" on it. In the Apoc. Samos is mentioned among the places to which Lucas, consul of the Romans, wrote, asking their good will toward the Jews (1 Mac. 15. 25).
In the NT, Paul touched here, after passing Cyrus (q.v.), on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts 20:15). In TR, he is found in this pasture

Kai \\

Theodore, who is the former Dardanian; for change of name see Pausanias vii.4.3; Strabo x.457, and for a full discussion on; Hauser and Klauser. Ate, "the Thracian " (see Saan), and towers above Thermon when viewed from the Trojan coast. The summit is about a mile high. It is mentioned in the Thiod (xii.13.12), 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 Cabeiri, which Herodotus (I.51) says was derived from the Phoenician inhabitants (see also Aristophanes, IV 277). The mysteries connected with the worship of these gods later rivaled the famous mysteries of Eleusis, and both Philip of Macedon and Olympia his wife were initiated here (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 (Xen. Hel. iv.3).

The famous "temple of Samothrace" (now in the Louvre) was set up here by Demetrius Poliorcetes in 300 BC, and was discovered in 1863. Since that time (1873-75), the Austrian government carried on extensive excavations (see Conze, Hauser and Bendendorf, 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 navigator always anchored somewhere if possible.

LITERATURE.—See under Samos.

SAMPSON, samp'son (Σαμπσόν, Sam-

<Sampson>:

A place mentioned in 1 Mace 15:23, usually identified with Samsun, on the coast of the Black Sea. Vulg. with RVm, has "Lampasus.

SAMSUN, samp'son (Σαμπσόν, Sam-

Sincip.:

A town in Asia Minor.

<Samson>:

His home was near Beth-

shemesh, which means "house of the sun." Compare the similar formation סַפֶּס, shamas (Ezr 4.8.9.17.23).

Samson was a judge, perhaps the last before Samuel. He was a Nazirite of the tribe of Dan (Jgs 13:5); a man of prodigious strength, a giant and a gymnast—the champion of the Philistines who had overthrown Israel some time before the birth of Samson, and was willing to fight them alone. He seems to have been actuated by little less than personal vengeance, yet in the NT he is named among the heroes of faith (He 11:32), and was in no ordinary sense an OT worshipper. He was good-natured, sarcastic, full of humor, and fought with his wits as well as with his fists. Milton has graphically portrayed his character in his dramatic poem Samson Agonistes (1671), on which Handel built his oratorio Samsun (1743).

The story of S.'s life is unique among the biographies of the OT. It is related in Jgs 13-16.

3. Story of His Life

To Manoah's wife the angel of Jehovah appeared twice (13-16), directing that the child which should be born to them should be a Nazirite from the womb, and that he would "begin to save Israel out of the hand of the Philistines" (13:7-14). The spirit of Jehovah first began to move in Mahaneh-dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol (13:25). On his arriving at manhood, five remarkable circumstances are recorded of him.

(1) His marriage with a Philistine wife of Timnah (ch. 14). His parents objected to the alliance (14:3), but S.'s motive in marrying her was that he sought an occasion against the Philistines. At the wedding feast S. proppused to his guests a riddle, wagering that if they guessed its answer he would give them 30 changes of raiment. Dr. Moore felicitously renders the text of the riddle thus:

'Of the eater came they to eat, And out of the strong came something sweet' (14:14).

The Philistines threatened the life of his bride, and she in turn wrung from S. the answer; whereupon he retorted (in Dr. Moore's version):

'If with my heifer ye did not plough, Ye had not found out my riddle, I trow' (14:18).

Accordingly, in revenge, S. went down to Ashkelon, slew some 30 men, and paid his debt; he even went down without his family to save her from shame gave her to S.'s "best man" (14:20). It has been suggested by W. R. Smith ('Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia,' 70-76) that S. did not from the first intend to take his bride to his home, his marriage being what is known among the Arabs as a kadibat, or gift marriage, by which is meant that the husband becomes a part of the wife's tribe. This assumes that the social relations of the Hebrews at that time were matriarchate, the wife remaining with her family, of which custom there are other traces in the OT, the husband merely visiting the wife from time to time. But this is not so obvious in S.'s case in view of his pique (14:19), and esp. in view of his parents' objection to the marriage outside of Israel (14:3). Not knowing that his bride had been given by her father to his friend, S. went down to Timnah to visit her, with a kid; when he discovered, however, that he had been taken advantage of, he went out and caught 300 jackals, and put a fire between every two tails, he burned up the grain fields and olive yards of the Philistines. The Philistines, however, showed they could play with fire, too, and burned his wife and her father. Thereupon, S.
smote 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 Jasim, near Zela), 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 Jehovah 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, assuming as he did so in pun-like poetry, 'With the jawbone of an ass, m. ass upon m.-ass'; or, as Dr. Moore translates the passage, 'With the bone of an ass, I ass-ailed my ass-ailants' (15 16).

At the same time, S. reverently gave Jehovah the glory of his victory (15 18). S. being thirsty, Jehovah 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 noised 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 Philis 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 wonderful power. J. G. Frazer (Golden Bough, III, 390 ff) 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 4-9). S. then hid his jawbone, 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, "Eyeless 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 Philis 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 The best fruit of our hand, Whom even our most powerful band Was never able to withstand" (16 24).

This song was accompanied probably, as Mr. M'Calister suggests, by hand-clapping (Gezer, 129). When they thought they had succeeded, they called for S. to play the bufoon, and by his gesticulations 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 power of his jawbone his strength had returned to him. The dismantled giant longed to be venged on his adversaries for at least one of his two eyes (16 25).

He prayed, and Jehovah 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, he did a great work, and killed there the 3,000 men 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). S.'s kinsmen came and carried him up and buried him near his boyhood home, between Zorah and Eshtaol, on the tomb of his father. "And he judged Israel twenty years" (16 31).

The story of S. is a faithful mirror of his times: "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (16 17; 21 29). 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 historicity 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 gospels of justice and mercy. His popularity which is a man of extraordinary prowess would naturally be widespread. All peoples knew his feats. The theory that the record in Jgs 13-16 is based upon some "solar myth" is now generally abandoned. That there are incidents in his story the difficulty of which is difficult to explain, is freely granted. For example, that he killed a lion with his bare hands (16 4) is not without parallel in the lives of Samson and Beniah did the same (1 S 17 34-36; 2 S 20 20).

God always inspires a man in the line of his natural endowments. S.'s greater endowment (16 15) is no more marvelous than what God did for Saul in the wilderness (Gen 31 19-20). To push 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 of 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 entirely supported by two main pillars of wood resting on bases of stone, like the main pillar of the temple of Solomon (1 K 7 22), 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. McCalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer, 1900, 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 for the blessing 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 Jehovah—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 Jehovah 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 unconsciuos 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 must be combined with spiritual gifts and the training 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 thing, a Passion ruled. He could not resist the blandishments and allurements 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, and 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 C. F. Keil, Jgs, 1860; Budde, Kurzer Handkommentar, 1887; Nowacke, Handkommentar, 1900; E. L. Curtis, The Bible for Home and School, 1913; Bachmann, 1868; Keil, 1862; Furrer in Schürer's Comm.; Watson, Expositor's Bible. (2) Arts. on "Samson" in the various Bible Dictionaries, and Encyc.; in particular those by Budde, HDB; C. W. Emmett, in E. von HDB; S. A. Cook, New Enc Brit.; Davis, Dict. of the Bible.

George L. Robinson

Samuel, sam`u-el (שָׁמוּעֵל, sh'mū'ēl; Σαμουήλ, Samouel), The word "Samuel" signifies "name of God," or "his name is El" (God). Other interpretations of the name that have been offered are almost certainly mistaken. The play upon the name in 1 S 1:20 is not intended of course to be an explanation of its meaning, but is similar to the play upon the name of Moses in Ex 6:3 and frequently elsewhere in similar instances. Thus by the addition of a few letters sh'mū'ēl becomes sh'āl mē'ēl (שָׂאלוּ מְאֵל, shōlū mē'ēl), "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 S the name of the great judge and prophet is found in 1Ch 1:45; 1 Sa 9:26; 1Ch 6:9, and in 1 and 2 Ch. The reference in Jgs 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, 1 and 2). The narrative sources and character of the history are thus presented 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 may 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 represent a single origin.

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 take him to the tabernacle 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 Kiriath-jearim, that Samuel again comes forward publicly, exhorting the people to repentance and promising them deliverance from the Philis. The main 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 at Ramah by 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 an 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 origin of Saul, his personal ambition, and 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 1:1), a meeting of which Samuel had received Divine pre-intimation (9 15); 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 herald the inauguration of the reality of his appointment and destiny; the spirit of prophecy which took possession of the future king, whereby is explained a proverbial saying which classed Saul among the prophets; and his silence with regard 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 inconsistency 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, 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 the later "prophet". Apart, 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 regard events as it were from a more primitive standpoint than the highly religious and monothetic view of the later accounts. It is possible to write off the prophet's apparent imperfections, but perhaps rather enhanced by its separate and independent position. Samuel's character is, however, best as a whole in his completed narrative at the point at which he judged most suitable. To the same source or possibly to that which preceded 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 received again formally the consecrated anointing oil from Samuel, and 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 Jehovah, if they continued to fear and serve Him (11 1-12 25). The selection and rejection of a successor to Samuel together with the lamentations of the people for him, are briefly recorded in 25 1, and referred to again in 28 3.

Samuel's life, therefore, 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 (chs 15 and 16 1-13). It narrates the commission of Samuel to anoint a successor to Saul, and the 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 is narrated on which the prophecies uttered and the prophecy came upon Saul, and again on the prophet's part. "Is Saul also among the prophets?" is quoted (19 24; cf 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 the anointing of 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 terminologies of the same composition of the latter have led most scholars to the conclusion that it has a distinct and separate origin. When 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 inferior authority and accuracy. With the second incident related in 19 18-24, the case is different. In this passage the text and context are drawn upon in such an emended form that its relation to the earlier version is suggested and passed into currency independently on two distinct occasions. It seems evident that here two independent sources or authorities were employed, which preserved hardly reconcilable accounts of the origin of a well-known saying, in one of which it has been mistakenly attributed to a similar but not identical occurrence in the life of Saul. 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 Ezel 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 characteristicly grave and measured tones he tells the sorceress of death against the king for his disobedience to Jehovah, 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 have 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 once 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 occupying the position of Moses 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 for the future and great. In nobility of character and utterance also, and in fidelity to Jehovah, 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 preceptor. 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 (נביאים נביאים, n'bh'im r'sh'hn'tm). The one book bore the title "Samuel" (נביאים, n'sh'ml', not because Samuel was the author, 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 Samuel, was continued in Kings. 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" (ββασιλεία, ββασιλεία). This name was probably due to the translators or scholars of Alexandria. The division into four books, but not the joint title, was then adopted in the Lat. tr, where, however, the influence of Jerome secured the restoration of the Heb names, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings (Regum). Jerome's example was universally followed, and the fourfold division with the Heb title found a place in all subsequent VSS of the OT Scriptures. Ultimately the distinction of Samuel and Kings each into two books was received also into 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 all 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 the 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 periods, 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 16:1).
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 Amnon and Absalom and the death of Joab (2 S 2—20).
D. Appendix; other incidents in the reign of David, the names of his thirty valiant warriors and his Song 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 Joshua and Judges, repetitions and apparently duplicate accounts of the same event are interwoven with the chronological development of the narrative. Even the main divisions, as stated above, to a certain extent overlap.

(1) Visit of Hannah to Shiloh, and promise of the birth of a son (1 S 1:3–18).
(2) Birth of Samuel, and presentation to Eli at Shiloh (1 S 1:19–25).
(3) Death of the old Eli, on the occasion of the burning of the golden calf (1 S 4).
(4) Disinfection of Dagon before the ark of God at Ashdod; return of the ark to Beth-shemesh, with expiatory offerings; anathematization of the town; its two sons slain by wild beasts at Kirjath-jearim (1 S 5:1–7 4).
(5) Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (7:1–5); Samuel established as judge over all Israel (15:17–26).
(6) Samuel’s summons to the people to judge and the consecration of the people for a king; Samuel’s warning concerning the character of the king for whom they were preparing (ch. 4).
(7) Saul’s search for the lost asses of his father and meeting with Samuel (ch. 9).
(8) Saul’s appointment by Samuel to be ruler over the people of Israel, and receives the gift of prophecy (10:1–16); second assembly of the people at Mizpah, and anointing of Saul to be king (ch. 17–27).
(9) Victory of Saul over the Ammonites and deliverance of Jabesh-gilead (11:1–15); Saul made king in Gibeon (vv 14:15).
(10) Samuel’s address to the people in Gilgal, demanding his own life and action, and exhorting them to fear and serve the Lord (ch. 12).
(11) Saul at Gilgal offers the burnt offering in Samuel’s absence; gathering of the Philis to battle at Michmash; the bribe of Saul’s son; an attempt on the life of Jonathan; the people unanimously anoint David king (ch. 13).
(12) Jonathan’s surprise of the Philis army, and their sudden panic (14:1–23); Saul’s vow, unwittingly broken by Jonathan, and his attempt to murder Jonathan (vs 24–45); victories of Saul over his enemies on every side (ch. 16–22).
(13) War against Amalek, and Saul’s disobedience to the Divine command to exterminate the Amalekites (1:15).

(a) Anointing of David as Saul’s successor (16:1–13); his summons to the court of Saul as anoint as minister before the king (vs 14–25).
(2) Reign of David and Goliath (ch. 17).
(3) Saul’s death at the hand of Jonathan (ch. 18:1–4); the former’s advancement and fame, the jealousy of Saul, and his attempt to kill David (18:5–16; 29:20); David’s marriage to the daughter of Saul (vs 17–25).
(4) David’s victory, and Saul’s renewed jealousy of David and second attempt to kill him (19:1–17; 20:1).
(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 3–6); the vengeance of Saul on those who had helped David (vs 6–23).
(8) Repeated attempts of Saul to take David (chs 23, 24).
(9) Death of Samuel (25:1); Abigail becomes David’s wife, after the death of her husband Nabal (vs 2–44).
(10) Saul’s further pursuit of David (ch. 26).
(12) David’s pursuit of the Amalekites who had raided Ziklag, and victory of his men (ch. 29).
(13) Battle between the Philis and Israel in Mt. Gilboa (28:1–6; 31:2–9).
(14) News of Saul’s death brought to David at Ziklag (2 S 1:1–16); David’s lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (ch. 31:17).
(15) David’s seven and a half years’ reign over Judah in Hebron (2 S 1:3–5 3;)
(1) Return of the ark to the city of David (ch. 6).
(2) 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).
(3) Victories over the Philis, Syrarians, and other peoples (ch. 8).
(4) David’s reception of Mephibosheth (9).
(5) Defeat of the Ammonites and Syrians by the men of Israel under the command of Joab (10:1–11:1).
(6) David and Uriah, the latter’s death in battle, and David’s marriage with Bath-sheba (ch. 11).
(7) 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).
(8) Amnon’s murder of Absalom (13:1–22); Absalom’s revenge and murder of Amnon (vs 23–36); flight of Absalom (ch. 37–39).
(9) Return of Absalom to Jerus (14:1–24); his beauty, and reconciliation with the king (vs 25–33).
(10) Absalom’s method of ingratiating himself with the people (15:1–6); his revolt and the flight of the king from Jerus (vs 7–31); meeting with Hushai (vs 32–37); Absalom in Jerusalem (vs 36–37).
(11) David’s meeting with Ziba (16:1–4), and Shimuel (vs 5–14); counsel of Ahithophel and Hushai (16:15–17:4); the latter’s death (17:13–22); flight of David (vs 18–20).
(12) David’s flight from Maon (17:24–29).
(13) The revolt subdued, death of Absalom, and reception by David of the tidings (ch. 18:1–19:8).
(14) Return of David to the king’s quarters at Hebron (18:19–40).
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 fragments of the traditions from which the historical narratives of the Pentateuch are derived, have not been successful. The 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 as representing a historical work or a collection of historical documents related to J. The style of the latter has much in common with the style of J, and is clear, vigorous and poetical, as religious conclusions also that are drawn 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 one to form any definite conclusions. It is therefore possible that J and E represent rather schools of teaching and thought than individual works, 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" would then, according to the usual view, belong to the 9th century of 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 completed form of the narratives contained in the Hebrew Canon of Scripture.

VI. Greek and Other Portions of the Bible.—The attempts to determine the approximate and understanding of the history and text of the Books of S account must further be taken of the Gr version or versions. In the LXX there is a great divergence from the Massoretic text, and it is probable that in the course of transmission the Gr text has been exposed to corruption to a very considerable extent. At least two recensions of the Gr text are in existence, represented by the Vatican and Alexandrian Codices, respectively, of which the latter is nearer to the Heb original, and has apparently been more in the main text. The rest of the text, the Massoretic Heb and B and A in the Greek. The correct form of the text recovered, would represent a text anterior to the Masoretic recension, differing from, but not necessarily superior to, the latter. For the restoration of the Gr text, the Old Lat. where it is available, affords valuable help. It is evident than 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 its 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 difficult to summarize. The books are in form a historical record of events; but they are also at the same time conceived with a definite purpose, and made to subserve 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 Jeh, to render strict and willing deference to His commands, and on this path of obedience and righteousness, national independence and prosperity be secured. With this is connected also, of course, pious and appropriate, 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 is a rebuke and a severe exhortation. Thus the same is true of the Book of Judges, the first book in the Pentateuch or the 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 of the sources, the destruction and after the fall 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 derived from other sources, and additions made by the editor or editors. This general determination of sources presents a basis upon which the idea of dependence, and upon slighter varieties of style which are neither so pronounced nor so readily distinguished as in the books of Joshua, Judges and Ruth. It is in the mind that a close and exact division or line of demarcation in essential detail is not to be drawn at this point.
and the events themselves are under the guidance and control of Jehovah, 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 estimated, not primarily as recording the great deeds of the past, but as conveying ethical teaching; that by means of the history Jehovah strengthens 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.


Sanada, san'á-as (A and Fritzsche, Zavádas, Sanásas, B, Zaqá, Sandi; AV Annaas): The sons of Sanada returned in large numbers with Zerubbabel (7,000) in Ezra 2:61. The numbers vary in each case (Ezd, 3,330 or 3,301; Ezr, 3,630; Neh, 3,930).

Sanabásaros, san-á-bas'ár (in 1 Esd 2:12,15). Sanabásaru (Sanabásar, Sanabásásaros, B, Sanamásósrá, Sanamásásrád, in 2:12[1]) (RVm Samanassar), Sanavarásró, Samanassarán, in 2:13[1], but Sanabasá-sáró, Sabanásásará, in 6:18[17] (RVm) and Sanábá-sáró, Sanabásárosaró, in 6:20 [19]: He was "governor of Judaea" under Cyrus, conveyed the holy vessels of the temple from Babylon to Jerusalem and laid the foundations of the house of the Lord for the first time since its destruction (Ezd 2:25; 12:15; 6:18-20) = "Sneshbárasar [q.v.] the prince of Judah." (Ezd 1:8).

Some identify him with Zerubbabel as AVm in 1 Esd 6:18: "Z., which also is S. the ruler." This view appears to be favored by the order of the names here, where, in case of two persons, one might expect "S., the ruler," to come first. Zerubbabel appears as "governor of Judæa also in 1 Esd 6:27-29. Ezr 3:10 speaks of the foundation of the temple under Zerubbabel and 5:16 as under Sanabásaro. "Sanbahaz" in Ezd 2:35, in the Chronicle of Sudek. "Sanabazus, in 5[4]:40, where Nehemiah and Atthisar refer to the same person, identify Sanabásaro; Zerubbabel is not a styled ruler or governor either in Neh or Ezr, but in Hag 1:14; 2:21 he is rahsh or governor of Jehovah; no exact rendering for it in the double name as in the case of e.g. Daniel. Beltshazzar; the language of Ezr 5:14 seems to refer to a title used for a different position than Zerubbabel. Nor is there any reason against supposing a first return under Sheshbazzar (Sanabasáro) and a foundation of the temple previous to the time of Zerubbabel—an undertaking into which the Jews did not enter heartily, perhaps because Sanabásar 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 Sanabásar with Sheshbazzar, the uncle of Zerubbabel in 1 Ch 3:18. But either of these identifications must remain doubtful. See Sneshbáras [q.v.]; Zerubbabel.

Sanadás, san'á-dás (Fritzsche, Zawadá, Sanazád, but B and Swete, Zavádas). A, "A'avásib (Anazád): Found only in 1 Esd 5:24, where the sons of Jedu, the son of Jesus, are a priestly family returning "among the sons of Sanadás." The name is not found in the [Ezd 2:36; Neh 7:32] and is perhaps preserved in the Vulg "Eliasaht.

Sanballat, san-bal'át (सांभल, sanbhálát; Gr and Vulg Sanbhálát, Pesh Samballat): Sanballat the Horonite was, if the appellation which follows his name indicates his origin, a Moabite, a Horonite, a city of Moab mentioned in Isa 15:5; Jer 48:21; Am, XII, xiiii; XIV, ii. He is named along with Tobiah, the Ammonite slave (Neh 4:1), and Geshem the Arabian (Neh 6:1) as 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 Eliashib, 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 aramischen Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantina, Berlin, 1905, and in later work, Aramäische Papyri und Ostraka, Leipzig, 1911; cf Stucken's convenient ed in Lietzmanns Kleine Texte 687) as regularly receiving from the governor (pahath) of Samaria some time before the 17th year of Darius (Nohous), i.e. 408-407 BC, when Bagohi was governor of Judah. His two sons, Deliah and Shelemiah, received a letter from Jehoidiah 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 (agoras) which had been erected at that place.

The address of this letter reads as follows: "Our lord Bagohi, the governor of Judaea, his servants Jehoidiah and his companions, the priests in the fortress of Yeb [Elephantine, etc.]. Say the God of heaven (who) inquire much at every time after the peace of our lord and put thee in peace in favor before Bagohi the king," etc. The conclusion of the letter reads thus: "Now, my lord and his companions and the Jews, all citizens of Yeb, may thus: If it seems good to you, think on the rebuilding of that temple [the agora which had been destroyed by the Egyptians]. Since it has not been permitted to us hitherto, do thou look on the receivers of thy benefactions and favors here in Egypt. Let a letter with regard to the rebuilding of the temple of the God Jehovah 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 Jehovah and we shall always pray for thee that thy days may be long in a land of peace and that all the Jews found here, until the temple has been rebuilt. And it will be to thee a meritorious work [erdikkh] in the sight of Jehovah, 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 baksheesh] 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 these days, Arahsham [the scribe of Egypt] has learned nothing.

The 20th of Marchesvan in the 17th year of Darius the king.

Sanballat is the Bab Sin-biballit, "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 Tallquist, NeuBABylonisches Namenbuch, 153.)

Sanctification, sanクト-ti-ti-kə shun:

Etymology:
I. The formal sense
1. 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 of we, as individuals
4. Questions of time and method
5. An element in all Christian life
6. Following from fellowship with God
7. Is instantaneous and entirety?
8. Sanctification as man's task

Literature:
The root is found in the OT in the Heb vb. עֲקַדָּת, ḫādāš, in the NT in the Gr vb. ἁγιάζω, ἁγιάζειν. The noun "sanctification"

Etymology (ἁγιάζω, hagiazoō) does not occur in south of OT and is not used in the NT, 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 of the same root, and that the point 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 ordinarily 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, as this common word is made to mean, 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 Jeh. There is "prostitute" here in the sense of 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, to the altar and that touching it (Ex 29:36), and the offering (Ex 29:27; cf 2 Macc 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 Jeh (the Sabbath, Nu 15:33; Joel 1:14). The nation as a whole is sanctified when Jeh acknowledges it and receives it as His own, "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 Jeh's (Lev 27:26).

It is this formal usage without moral implication that explains such a passage as Gen 38:21. The word translated "sanctify" is used in gen 40:8, 9. Meant meaning it, as elsewhere, the sanctified or consecrated one (kadosoh; see margin and cf Dt 9:1; 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 this word essentially belongs to its primary meaning (cf also 2 K 10:20, 26; and Jehu said, "It shall be none other... for Baal. And they proclaimed it!" cf Joel 1:14).

Very suggestive is the transitive use of the word in the phrase, "to sanctify Jeh." To understand this we must note the use of the word "holy" as applied to Jeh in the OT. Its meaning is not primarily ethical. Jeh's holiness is His supremacy, His sovereignty, His glory, His essential being as God. To say the Holy One is simply to say God. Jeh's holiness is seen in His might, His manifest glory; it is that before which peoples tremble, which makes the nations dread (Ex 15:11-18; cf 1 S 4:6-20; Ps 68:6-25; 89:7, 55). Significance is in the way in which "jealous" and "holy" are almost identified (Josh 24:19; Ezek 38:23). It is God asserting His supremacy, His unique claim. To sanctify Jeh, 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. Jeh has been profaned in the eyes of the nations through Israel's defeat and captivity. True, it was because of Israel's sin, but the nations thought it was because of Jeh'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 Jeh, and it means the assertion of Jeh's power in Israel's triumph over the vengeant of her foes (20:41; 26:25; 35:23; 38:16; 39:27). The sanctification of Jeh is thus the assertion of His being and power as God, just as the sanctification of a person or object is the assertion of Jeh's right and claim in the same.

The story of the waters of Meribah illustrates the same meaning. Moses' failure to sanctify is his failure to declare Jeh's glory and power in the miracle of the waters (Ex 15:21; cf Dt 32:40). 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). Not essentially is the same in Isa 5:16; "Jeh of hosts is exalted in justice, and God 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 5:25; 9:12.17.21; 10:4; see Justice: Justice of Ps. Isa. 8:13; 29:22 suggest the same lines by the same in which they relate "sanctify" to fear and awe. One NT passage brings us the same meaning (1 Pet 3:15): "Sanctify in your hearts 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 (Lk 21:5; cf Mt 21:13). The NT continues to use this word in the same sense of making 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 a meaning that they may not be 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 56 times. By "saint" is not meant the morally perfect, but the one who belongs to Christ, just as the sanctified priest or offering belonged to the temple. This Paul can salve the dis- ples 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" or "those who are holy" is used to designate the believers. By "the inheri- tance among all them that are sanctified" is meant the heritage of the Christian believer (Acts 20:32; 26:18; cf 1 Cor 1:2; 6:11; Eph 1:18; Col 1:12). This is the meaning in He, 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 whereby he was sanctified an unholy thing." Evidently it is not the inner and personal holiness of this apostate, but that is referred to the sacrifice of the whole, 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 a sacred and common, or 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
instances where we have the thought of sanctification in or by the Holy Spirit or in Christ; as in Rom 16 16, "being sanctified by the Holy Spirit"; 1 Cor 1 2, "to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus;" and "in sanctification of the Spirit." Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, and of God it seems to enter in, and yet the reference to 1 Cor suggests that the primary meaning is still that of setting apart, the relating to God.

II. The Ethical Sense. We have been considering what has been called the formal meaning of the word; but the chief interest of Christian thought lies in the ethical idea, sanctification considered as the active deed or process by which the life is made holy. Our first question is, How does the idea of belonging to God become the idea of transformation of life and character? The change is, indeed, nothing less than a part of the whole movement for which the entire moral and spiritual life of the believer is fitted. 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 (holy), sanctification) depends upon the nature of the God to whom man belongs. The hierarchies 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 a show of pantheism, 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 1 11-16). "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 1; 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 to the part of sanctification does not occur 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 43-48). 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 word "sanctification." 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 you were called." 1 Thess 2 12; Phil 2 27. And the end of this calling is that we are "foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son" (Rom 8 29). We must not limit ourselves to the words "saint" or "sanctify" to get this teaching, it goes along with the whole of Paul's mind and compelling moral appeal: You belong to Christ; live with Him, live unto Him (Col 3 1-4; 1 Thess 5 8). It is no formal belonging, no external surrender. It is the yielding of the life in its passions and purposes, in its deepest affections and highest powers, to be ruled by a new spirit (Eph 4 13-20; 23.24.32; cf Rom 12 1).

But we do not get the full meaning of this thought of sanctification as consecration, or belonging, until we grasp the NT thought of our relation to God. Jesus as the Father has always been that this consecration 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. This consecrated 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). The whole teaching is that the life is lived by God and good will (Mt 5 43-48). It is a life of "faith working through love" (Gal 5 6), it is having the mind of Christ (Phil 2 5). The sanctified life, then, is the life so fully surrendered to fellowship with Christ day by day, that 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 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 says that the Father may sanctify His disciples in truth (Jn 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 2 13; 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 the Christian's life belongs to God and wrought by His Spirit. "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to work" (Phil 2 13; cf Rom 8 2-3.14.16-26; Gal 5 21). 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 an uncompro- mising ideal and demand, and on the other absolute confidence in God. By 4. Questions of Time and Method 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 any 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
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and inevitable result of all Christian life and experience. Looked at from the religious point of view, it is the logical outcome of regeneration. Regeneration is the implanting of a new life in man. So far as that is a new life from God it is ipso facto holy. 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 Peter, or with the Christians of Spirit of God (Rom 8:9). His presence, therefore, is in far forth means holiness of life. From the ethical standpoint the same thing is constantly declared. Jesus builds 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 that 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 two kinds or qualities of sanctification. All Christian living meant for him clean, pure, right living, and that was sanctification. The simple, practical way in which he teaches the banish of sexual impurity in his pagan congregations shows this. This is the whole life of God, even the whole sanctification that ye abstain 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 in sanctification" (1 Thess 4:3,4). 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 this: the Christian life is this: the sanctification which is a part of all which we know as the Spirit of Christ. Such a fellowship is the supreme moral force for the molding of life, for the shaping of character. 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 the very Self. 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 example and command rather than appeal upon theological forms which may serve to comprize the truth instead of expressing it. Here are some of these expressions for this life in us that 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 2:12), "the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 3:16), "the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor 2:13), "the God of the Lord" (2 Cor 1:2), "the Lord of 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," as one in the same, as identical, and as the symbol of a new life, the general term, one of the qualities of Christ. Thus the presence of the Spirit is not evidenced in the unusual, the miraculous, the ecstatic utterance of the enthusiast, or some strange deed of power, but in the workaday quality of kindness, goodness, the love of self-sacrifice (Gal 5:22,23). With this, he notes the Spirit of 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 5:17). We are to grow up in Him and be formed in us (Gal 4:19). We are to behold Him and be changed into His image. 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 has Christ’s thoughts, His mind. See Rom 6:5-11; 8:10; 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 connection with the key idea of sanctification as a moral basis for a whole superstructure of doctrine. For the former, note Isa 6:6; Lk 3:16; Acts 3:3; for the latter, Acts 1:3-9; Acts 5:32; Tit 3:5; Heb 10:22; Rev 1:5; 7:14.) There is a two-fold danger from which we have escaped. The symbols suggest cleansing, and their over-implication has meant first a negative and narrow idea of sanctification of any change or defilement. This is a falling back to certain OT views. Secondly, these have been too 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 sublimated. 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 point. The whole life is God’s requisition and at 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 and his prayer for the Thesalonians, that God may establish the latter in the former, 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 be reached of his pagan converts. Now 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 demand 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 the right motive? Is he doing his part 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 relation thus given between the ethical and the religious. All Christian life and task are to 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. This is the principle that Wesley’s teaching is 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 (hagiosanageneia) in the fear of God” (2 Cor 7 1). 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 with God’s gift, and where God gives grace only as He lives, then He 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, “speaking truth in love, growing 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 6 5 Paul in the same verse does “quench” the Spirit, and then exHORTs “Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump” (cf. also 1 Thess 5 5 10.)

We may sum up as follows: The word “sanctify” is used with two broad meanings: (1) to devote, to consecrate to God to recognize as holy, that 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 Jeh 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 to this view it 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 Bibl. study. An exception is Beet, Holiness Symbolic and Real. Full Bibl. material in Cremer, Bibl. Theol. Lex., but treated from special points of view. See Systematic Theologies, OT Theologies (cf. esp. Smend), and NT Theologies (cf. esp. Holtzmann).

WESLEYAN DOCTRINE

1. Doctrine Stated
2. Objections Answered
3. Importance for the Preacher
4. Emendations
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 note there suddenly arose a large 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, Pr. through the stem “sanct-” (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, from a natural to a final, all-surrendering 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” etc. Thus sanctification is gradual, but entire sanctification is instantaneous (Rom 6 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 4 25, the word “sanctify” is a Gr or acr, tense, signifying 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 is in a state of final, all-surrendering act of faith in Christ, it 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, “With the preaching, no man shall see the Lord” (He 12 14), does not apply to the saints, “the holy ones.”
Sanctification

Sacramentary

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 Morod's hymn, "..."O sheer shame and sorrow!" The first response to the Saviour's call is, "All of self, and none of Thee." But after a view of Christ on the cross, the answer is faintly, "Some of self, and none 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) Paul, in Phil 3:12, declares that he is not "made perfect"; (a) in ver 15, he declares that he is perfect; (b) "made perfect" is a term, borrowed from the ancient games, signifying a finished course. This is answered one of the meanings of telicó̱, 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 before the "third day." Paul claims in ver 15, by the use of an adj., that he is perfect. In ver 12 Paul claims that he is not perfect as a victor, because the race is not ended. In ver 15 he claims that he is perfect as a racer.

(2) Paul says (1 Cor 15:51), "I die daily." This does not refer to death to sin, as some say that it does, but to his daily danger of being killed for preaching Christ, as in Rom 8:36, "we are killed all the day long." (3) Jn 1:8: "If we say that we have no sin," etc. (a) If this includes Christians, it contradicts John himself in the very next verse, and in 3:9, "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin," and Jn 8:36, "If, ... the Son shall make you free, etc., and in all those texts in the NT declaring sins forgiven.

(3) Bishop Westcott says that the expression, "to have sin," is distinguished from "to sin," as the sinful principle is considered free from the act in itself. It includes the idea of personal guilt. Westcott asserts that John refers to the Gnostics, who taught that moral evil exists outside of the soul, and never touches spirit, which is always holy; and, therefore, though guilty of all manner of evil act in their bodies, they were untouched by sin, which existed only in their bodies, as it does in all matter. When tell that this is the spirit of Gnosticism, he deny 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 Epp. 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." "O keep that second advent." "Make and keep me pure within." "To die! Thou dost this moment save, with all salvation, bless me!" 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 hamlet, and who 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, March 1741: "I felt my soul was all love. I was so stayed on God as I never felt before, and knew that I loved Him with all my heart. When I came home I was so moved that I could not sit still, and the idea of God had saved me from all my sins greater every hour. On Wednesday this was stronger than ever. I have never since found my heart wander from God." This is as explicit a testimony to his entire sanctification as his only recorded testimony to his justification in these words (May 24, 1783): "I felt my heart strangely warmed . . . and an assurance was given me, that He had taken away my sins," etc.

Daniel Steele

SANCTITY, sank'ti-ti, LEGISLATION, lej-is-la'tshun, OF. See Astronomy, I, 5, (6).

SANC'TUARY, sank'tu-ari, sank'tu-ari (κάθεσθαι, mikēdsh, υπάρχον, mikēdhash, ἤπαθος, "holy place"; ὄνομα, ἱδιόν):

1. Nature of Article
2. The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis
3. Difficulties of the Theory
4. Sacrifice, Not Necessarily Sacrificial
5. Sacrifice and Theophany
6. Alleged Inhabitants of Sanctuary
7. The Altar of God's House
8. Local Altar in Deuteronomy
9. The Alterations of the Temple
10. (a) Lay Sacrifice
11. (b) The Temple of the Urim and Thummim
12. The Elephantine Papyri
13. The Elephantine Temple
14. Literature

The present art. is designed to supplement the arts. on ALTARS; HIGH PLACE; PENTATEUCH; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE, by giving an outline of certain rival views of the of the course of law and history as regards the place of worship. The subject has a special importance because it was the turning-point of Wellhausen's discussion of the development of Israel's literature, history and religion. He himself writes: I differ from Graf chiefly in this: that I always go back to the centralization of the cultus, and deduce from it the particular divergences. My whole position is contained in my first chapter" (Prolegomena, 368). For the purposes of this discussion it is necessary to use the symbols J, E, D, H, and P, which are explained in the art. PENTATEUCH. It is said that there are three distinct stages of law and history.

1. In the first stage all slaughter of domestic animals for food 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...
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20 24–26, providing for the making of an altar of earth or stones, and emphasis is laid on the words “of earth” and “of stones.” Grammatically an equally possible rendering is “in the place” (Jgs 6 26). The question of a hypothetical altar is as a matter of necessity presupposed.

2. The Graf–Wellhausen Hypothesis. This, it is claimed, permits a plurality of sanctuaries. Illustrations are provided by the history. The patriarchs moved 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 15, etc), Joshua (Josh 8 30), Gideon (Jgs 6 26 etc), Samuel (1 Sam 7 3–5) and Manasseh (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 theophrases or other special circumstances, they are too numerous when taken together to explain them as a single phenomenon. 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. Hence the Law and the history are in 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 whereversoever 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 presented 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 of the Law of Ex 20 are in unison in permitting a multiplicity of sanctuaries. . . . Plainly the common man did not quite understand the newly drawn and previously quite unknown distinction between the religious and the profane act” (Prolegomena, 50). Accordingly, this legislator strives 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 basis falls within the scope of the 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 the blood of Josiah is rebutted 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 venison) no altar or religious rite can fairly be postulated. In 1 S 21 the slaughter 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 kid” (Jgs 6 26), it is not to be presumed that the broth of which the narrative speaks, the animals in question must have been sacrificed twice over, once when they were killed and again when the food was consumed by flames. Special importance attaches to Ex 22 1 (Heb 21 57), for there the JE legislation itself speaks of slaughter by cattle thieves as a natural and probable occurrence, and it can surely not have regarded this as a sacrificial act. Other instances are to be found in Gen 43 16; 1 S 25 11; 1 K 19 21. In 1 S 8 13 the word “cooks” means “sacrificers” (or “women-sacrificers”). All these instances are prior to the date assigned to Dt. With respect to Lev 17 1–7 also, the theory is unworkable. At any time in King Josiah’s reign or after, it would have been utterly impossible to limit all slaughter of animals for the whole race wherever resident to one single spot. This part of the theory therefore breaks down.

(2) Sacrifice and theophany. The view that the altars were erected at places that were peculiarly holy, or at any rate were subsequently sanctified by a theophany is also fraught with difficulties at an archaic age. We may refer to Gen 4 6, where the calling on God implies sacrifice but not theophanies. Abram at Bethel (12 8) and Mamre (13 18), and Jacob’s sacrifices (31 54; 33 20). Compare later Samuel’s account at Ramah, Acts 7 36 and En-rogel (1 K 1), Naaman’s earth (2 K 5), David’s cain’s sacrifice (1 S 20 6.29). It is impossible to postulate theophanies for the sacrifices of every clan in the country, and it becomes necessary to translate Ex 20 24 “in all the place” (see supra 21) and to understand “the place” as the territory of Israel.

(3) Alleged plurality of sanctuaries. The hypothesis of a multiplicity of sanctuaries in JE and the history also leaves out of view many important facts. The truth is that the word “sanctuary” is ambiguous and misleading. A plurality of altars of earth or stone is not a plurality of sanctuaries. The early legislation knows a “house of Jeh” in addition to the primitive altar (Ex 23 19; 34 26; of the parts of Josh 9 23.27 assigned to J). No eye-witness could mistake a house for an altar, or vice versa.

(4) The altar of God’s house. Moreover a curious little bit of evidence shows that the “house” had quite a different kind of altar. In 1 K 1 50; 2 28 ff, we hear of the horns of the altar of (Am 3 14). Neither earth nor unhewn stones (as required by the Law of Ex 20) could provide such horns, and the historical instances of the altars of the patriarchs, religious leaders, etc, to which reference has been made, show that they had no horns. Accordingly we are thrown back on the description of the great altar of burnt offering in Ex 27 and must assume that an altar of this type was to be found before the ark before Solomon built his Temple. Thus the altar of the House of God was quite different from the customary lay altar, and when we read of “mine altar” as a refuge in Ex 21 14, we must refer it to the former, as is shown by the passages just cited. In addition to the early legislation and the historical passages cited as recognizing a House of God with a horned altar, we see such a house in Shiloh where Eli and his sons of the house of Aaron (1 Sam 2 27) ministered. A great part of both JE and the history show us a House of God with a horned altar side by side with the multiplicity of stone or earthen altars, but give us no hint of a plurality of legitimate houses or shrines or sanctuaries.

(5) Local altars in Deuteronomy. Dt also recognizes a number of local altars in 16 21 (see ICC, ad
loc.) and 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 lay altars.

4. The Alternative View

Mosaic times customary sacrifices had been freely offered by laymen at altars of earth or stone which were not 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 24:24-28; Dt 18:11 ff. 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 assumption that 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 sanctuaries, which were regulated by immemorial custom. Dt thunders not against the lay altars—which are never even mentioned in this connection—but against the Canaanite high places. Dt 12 contemplates only the new individual offerings. The permission of lay slaughter for food was due to the fact that the in-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, though it appears to be continued by Dt for those who lived near the House of God (see 12:21, limited to the case "if the place . . . be too far from thee").

(3) Three pilgrimage festivals in J.E.—The JE legislation 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 23:19; 34:26 require these bikkurim to be brought to the House of God. It is not to a 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. It is by breaking 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 that 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 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 public worship altogether; for the synagogue with its non-sacramental form of public worship had not yet been invented. All old legislations 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, ch. I, for the criticism. H. Wiener, BPC, ch vi. PSS passim for the alternative view; POT, 173 ff.

HAROLD M. WIENER

SAND (Σαν, ἕλ; ἀμος, ἄμμος; a variant of the more usual ψάμμος, ψαμμίτης; cf ἀμαθος, ἀμαθεῖα, ἄμαθος)

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, (3).

Figurative: (1) Used most often as a symbol of countless multitude; esp. of the children of Israel (Gen 22:17; 32:12; 2 Sam 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 reserve of the land of Egypt. The modern sand gave Solomon wisdom and understanding and largeness of heart as the sand that is on the seashore (1 K 4:29); Job says "I shall multiply my days as the sand" (Job 29:18); the multitude of quails provided for the Israelites in the desert is compared to the sand (Ps 78:27); the Psalmist says of the thoughts of God, "They are more in number than the sand" (Ps 139:18); Jeremiah, speaking of the desolation of Israel, says that the number of widows is as the sand (Jer 15:8). (2) Sand is also a symbol of weight (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 FLIES, sand liz'ard (Σανάδης, κιννάρις [Ex 8:16 m; Wisd 19:10 m]): EV "lice." See Flea; Gnat; Insects; Lice.

SAND, GLOWING, gló'ing. See Mirage.

SAND-LIZARD, sand' liz'ard (Σανάδης, ἕλομετ; LXX σαχάρα, σακάρα, "lizard"; AV snail): ἕλομετ 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 héd'rin (Σανήδρινον, σανάδρινον, the Talmudic transcription of the Gr ounhádron, sunhêdrion): 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 (Théographe Hýgâphýn 11 9; Sanh. 1 6; 11 2). It is derived from σᾶν, "together," and ἡδρα, "seat." In Gr and Rom literature the sénates of Sparta, Carthage, and even Rome, are so called (cf Pausan. iii.11,2; Polyb. iii.22,1; Livy v.23,44). 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 sunèdrinai (Ant, XIV, v, 4), or sunadrai (BJ, I, viii, 5); and with the term sunde- rion for the high council in Jerus first in Ant, XIV,
Sanhedrin

ix, 3-5, in connection with Herod, who, when a youth, had to appear before the sunedrion 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 bêt-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 judiciary (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 from which Sanhedrin, Gedaliah, and Elders (1 Peter and 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; 5 21 ff.; 6 12 ff.; 22 30; 23 1 f.; 24 27). Sometimes preterition (Lk 22 66; Acts 22 6) and gerosia (Acts 5 21) are substituted for sunedrion. See Senate.

In the Jewish tradition-literature the term "Sanhedrin" alternates with yëshākhath, "meeting-place" (Mish. Ta'anith 10, compiled in the 1st cent. AC). Ani bêt-din, "court of justice" (Sanh. 11 134). As, according to Jewish tradition, there were two kinds of sunedria, viz. the supreme sunedrion in Jerusalem of 71 members, and lesser sunedria of 23 members, which were appointed by the supreme one, the words of sunedrion (teshākhath "the great Sanhedrin," or bêt-din ha-gēdūli, "the great court of justice") (Midr. 5 4; Sanh. 1 6), or sunedrion grēdhā ḫa-yōsebehēb b-ḥāshketh ha-gēdūth, "the great Sanhedrin which sits in the hall of heaven 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 then practically under home rule, and was governed by a council of Elders (1 Macc 12 6; 2 Macc 1 10; 4 44; 11 27; 3 Macc 1 8; cf Jos, Ant, XII, iii, 4; XIII, v, 8; Mish. Ta'anith 10), the head of which was the hereditary high priest. The court was called Gerosia, which in Gr always signifies an aristocratic body (see Westernmann in Pauly's RE, III, 49). Subsequently this developed into the Sanhedrin.

During the Roman period (except for about 10 years at the time of Gabinius, who applied to Judea the Roman system of government; cf Marquardt 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 the fountain of the Diaspora (cf Acts 9 25; 22 5; 25 12). According to Schürer (HJP, div II, vol 1, 171; JGFV, 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, in his times, it had no judicial power over our Lord so long as he remained in Galilee (but see G. A. Smith, Jerus, I, 416).

The Sanhedrin was abolished after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). The bêt-din (court of judgment) in Babæan (68-80), in Usæan (80-116), in Shafran (140-63), in Sepphoris (163-93), in Tibera

rass (193-220), though regarded in the Talm (cf Rôsh ha-shânhâd 32a), as having been the direct continuation of the Sanhedrin, had essentially different character; it was merely an assembly of scribes, whose decisions had only a theoretical importance (cf Sanh. 9 11).

The Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem was formed (Mt 26 35; Lk 22 46; 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 head families of the people, and priesthood), and scribes (i.e. legal assessors), Pharisees and Sadducees alike (cf Acts 4 1 ff.; 5 17; 34; 23 6). In Mk 15 43; Lk 23 30, Joseph of Arimathea is called bouleutēs, "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 ff.; 7 1; 9 1 f.; 22 5; 23 24; 24 1; Ant, IV, vii, 17; XX, x). Caiphas is president at the trial of Our Lord, and at Paul's trial Ananias is president. On the other hand, according to the Talm (esp. H. 3:2), the Sanhedrin is represented as a judicial tribunal of scribes, in which one scribe acted as nasi', "prince," i.e. president, and another as ab-bēṯ-dīn, 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 sopheret ha-todaymin, "notaries," one of whom registered the reasons for or against, and the other the reasons for confirmation. In the NT we read of ἄρχοντας, "constables" (Mt 25 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, 5; 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 question of men in name, but the Pharisees were the Elders" (Ant, XIII, ii, 2). 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, but also, in a juristic sense, some degree, criminal. It had administrative authority and could order arrests by its own officers of justice (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 Jérus. Sanh., 1 1; 7 2 p. 24); Jos, Ant, XX, i, 15.

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 its own authority, even a Roman 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; Middoth 11 3; cf Acts 21 28). The only case of capital punishment in a connection with the High Priest was that of Judas, 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 heaven stone," which, according to *Middath* 5:4, was on the south side of the great court, as the seat of the Great Sanhedrin (*P'eh* 189). But the place of Meeting last sittings of the Sanhedrin were held in the city outside the Temple area (Sank. 41a; Shabbath 15b; 'Akev ha-shanah 31c; 'Ahadahah sarah 8c). Jos also mentions the place where the bouleutai, "the councillors," met as the sibbehet, 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. In 1 Ch 20:4, the same person is called "Sippai."


**SAPHATIAS, sa-ō-thi-as (Zabarias, Saphadias, B, Zapharias, Saphathias; omitted in A):** Name of a family of returning exiles (1 Esd 8:34) "Shephatiyath" in Ezr 8:8. If Saphatias (1 Esd 8:34) = Saphat (6:9), as would appear, then part of the family went up with Zerubbabel and part with Ezra.

**SAPHETH, sāfēth:** AV = RV Saphethi (q.v.).

**SAPHIR, sāfe (םphalt, śaphir).** See Saphir.

**SAPPHUSI, sa-fáthi, sa-fáthi (A and Fritzsche, *Śaphētii, Saphēthi, B [and Swete], *Śaphii, Saphetii; AV Sapheth):** Name of one of the families of the "sons of the servants of Solomon" (1 Esd 5:33) = "Shephatiyah" in Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59.

**SAPPHIRA, sa-firá (םphalt, śaphirā):** Aram. for either "beautiful" or "sapphire": *Śaphētā, Saphēthā*; Wife of Ananias (Acts 5:1–10). See ANANIAS, (1).

**SAPHIRE, sa-īr.** See STONES, Precious.

**SARABIAS, sar-ā-bi-ās (Zaphabias, Sarabias):** One of the Levites who taught and expounded the Law for Ezra (1 Esd 9:48) = "Sherebiah" in Neh 8:7, probably identical with the "Azebebias" in 1 Esd 8:47 (Ezr 8:18).

**SARAH, sarā, Sarai, sarē**: 1. In Gen 17:15 the woman who up to that time has been known as Sarai (םphalt, śapay; *Sāpa, Sāra*) receives by Divine command the name Sarah (םphalt, śārē; *Sarah, Sārā*). (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 Israel. 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 (Rom 12:20). In later times it seems to have been adopted as a name 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 accompanying Terah. It is immediately added that "Sarah was barren; she had no child." By this simple remark in the opening 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 determined (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.

Sarah'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 move men were determined for 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 the ages (see Gen 17:17) renders this hypothesis less probable. Marriage with half-sisters seems to have been not uncommon in antiquity (see the OT 13:19).

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 freely concubine 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 foreshadowing the later 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 of their literal bearing on the barrenness that persisted. She was now far past middle life, even on a patriarchal scale of longevity, and there appeared no hope of her ever bearing that child who should inherit the promise of God. She therefore adopts the expedient of being "builded up" by her personal slave, Hagar the Egyptian (see Gen 16:2 m). That is, according to contemporary law and custom as witnessed by the (see Abraham, IV, 2), a son born of this woman would be the free-born son and heir of Abraham and Sarai.

Such was in fact the position of Ishmael later. But the language of the 12 would accord the vindictive jealousy of the mistress and led to a painful scene of unjustified exclusion. Hagar, however, returned to God's blessing and humbled 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 Sarah to Sarah when Isaac was promised has already been noted. Sarah's language indicates that 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 an assured bearing again.

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 he 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 Abimelech 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 is sealed by the birth of a child at the age of 127, at Hebron, long time her home. The grief at all this was broadly displayed in ch 23, in which he 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 lapsed from faith which resulted in the birth of Ishmael, and that land has been his. On the other hand she is a true Hebrew, as on 4:21, literally rendered. That is, in her outbreak against 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 decease, and still more clearly from her son's prolonged mourning for her (Gen 24:67; cf 17:17 and 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 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 covenanted was worshiped in Arabia under the title Duresae, i.e. Husband-of-Sarah; or, the female associate of Sin the moon-god, worshiped at Haran. On these views the student will do well to consult Baethgen, Beiträge, 94, 167, and, for the most recent point of view, Grossmann's art. "Sag und Geschichte in den Patriarchenzeitungen," J.Z.T. 1910, and Eerdmans, Alte-mendite Geschichte, 11, 13.

(2) The daughter of Raguel, and wife of Tobias (Tob 3:7.17, etc). See Tobit, Book of.
Saraias under (1). He is probably identical with the "Azarinas" of 1 Esd 8 1.

(3) AV=RV "Azarinas" (1 Esd 8 1).

SARAMEL, sar'a-mel: AV=RV ASARAMEL (q.v.).

SARAPH, sar'af, sar'af (סֶרָפ, לָאָרָפ, "noible one"); cf. סֶרָפ, "burn", "shine": A descendant of Judah through Shelah (1 Chr 4 1).

SARCHEDONUS, sar'ke'do-nus (B N, סַרְכֶדוֹנָס, Sarcheridonos, A, Сарчедон, Sarcherdion, but Сархедон, Sarchedonos in Tab 2 22): An incense-burning church; both in AV and RV, for Sacerdus in Tab 1 21 f., another form of Esar-haddon.

SARDEUS, sar'de-us: AV=RV ZARDEUS (q.v.).

SARDINE(S), sar'din, sar'din, SARDIUS. See Stones, Precious.

SARDIS, sar'diss (Σάρδης, Sárdeis): Sardis is of special interest to the student of Herodotus and Xenophon, for the Artaxerxes, the brother of Xerxes, lived there and planned to start an invasion of Greece. He was stopped and turned back by the Ionians, but the Ionians were defeated at Lade. They invaded Cilicia and Asia Minor, and when they occupied the region of the Pactolus River, they became a great power. The city of Sardis became the capital of the rulers of Asia Minor, and it grew in wealth and importance. It was the capital of Lydia, a province of Asia Minor.

The ancient city was noted for its fruits and wool, and for its temple of the god 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 it was here that gold and silver coins were first struck. During the Roman period its coins formed a beautiful series, and are found in abundance by the present-day excavations. The ruins of the buildings which stood at the base of the hill are visible from above.

The hill upon which the acropolis stood measures 990 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 Grecian lagoon. The modern name of the necropolis is Bin Tepe or Thousand Mounds, because of the large group of great mounds in which many burials were made. Many of the mounds were long ago excavated and plundered.

We quote the following from the Missionary Herald (Boston, Mass., August, 1911, pp. 361-62):

Dr. C. C. Tracy, of Masovian, has made a visit to ancient Sardis and has sent me the following information, Professor Burrows, of Princeton University, who is uncovering the ruins of that famous city of the past. Already rich "finds" have been made. The modern name of the ancient city, Sardis, is derived from the famous Sardis of the OT, the capital of Lydia, a province of Asia Minor.

The city of Sardis was the capital of Lydia, and it was a center of trade and commerce. It was a rich city, and its wealth was based on its location on the Pactolus River, which was rich in gold and silver. The city was also famous for its woolen products.

Among the ruins of Sardis is the famous temple of Cybele, which was dedicated to the goddess of fertility and nature. The temple was one of the most important religious centers in the region, and it was visited by many pilgrims and tourists.

In the year 361-362, when the city was under siege, a number of men and women were buried in the necropolis of Sardis. The bodies were carefully placed in tombs, and the tombs were sealed with stone slabs. The necropolis was surrounded by a high wall, and it was protected by a large gate.

The ruins of Sardis are an important archaeological site, and they are a reminder of the great city that once stood there. Today, the ruins are a popular tourist destination, and they are a witness to the rich history of the region.

E. J. Banks

SARDITE, sar'dit. See SERED.

SARDIUS, sar'di-us. See Stones, Precious.

SARDONYX, sar'do-niks. See Stones, Precious.

SAREPTA, sa-rep'ta (Σαρεπτα, Sareptah): The city mentioned in Luke 4:26 AV, following the Gr. of the Phoen city to which Elijah 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 in the OT: ZAREPHATH (q.v.).

SARD, sar'd (סָרָד, sarad; B, אֶסְרֹד, Arderad, Arderad, Asereb, Asereb, Asereb, Asereb, Asereb, Asereb, Sarid, Sarad): A place on the southern border of the land of Canaan (Josh 19 10). It is mentioned but not identified in Osee. Prob shall we read "sadd", and in that case may with Conder locate it at Tell Shaddad, an artificial mound with some modern ruins and good springs.
SARGON, sár'gon (722–705 BC): The name of this ruler is written 𒊉𒊏𒂗, sargôn, in the OT, Shar-ukin in the cuneiform inscriptions, 'Aprâ, Arnu, in the LXX, and Ἀρναοῦς, Arkanos, in the Septuagint. Sargon is mentioned but once by name in the OT (Isa 20: 1), when he sent his Tartan (turtanu) against Ashdod, but he is referred to in 2 K 17: 6 as "the king of Assyria" who carried Israel into captivity.

Shalmanezer 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 Kaldi, who paid tribute to previous rulers, on the change of dynasty had himself proclaimed king, New Year's Day, 721 BC. At Dur-ili, Sargon fought with the forces of Merodach-baladan and his ally Khumbanigash of Elam, but although he claimed a victory the result was apparently indecisive. Rebellions followed in other parts of the kingdom.

In 720 Ilu-bi'di (or Yau-bi'di), king of Hamath, formed a coalition against Sargon with Hanno of Gaza, Shib'a of Egypt, and with the cities Arpad, Sidiria, Damascus and Samaria. He claims that Shib'u fled, and that he captured and flayed Ilu-bi'di, burned Karkar, and earned Hanno captive to Assyria. After destroying Raphi, he carried away 9,033 inhabitants to Assyria.

In the following year Ararat was invaded and the Hitite Caremehish fell before his armies. The territory of Russas, king of Ararat, as well as a part of Mellite 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 had himself crowned as the slavemaster of Babylon.

In 706 the new city called Dur-Sharrulkh was dedicated as his residence. A year later he was murdered. It was during his reign that the height of Assyr ascendancy had been reached.

A. T. CLAY

SARON, sâr'ôn (Σαρών, Sarōn): AV; Gr form of Sharon (Acts 9: 35).

SAROTHE, sa-ro'thē (A, Saperbë, Saréthë, B and Swete, Saperbë, Sarothë): 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'sek-im (Sarék'im, Sarêk'îm): A prince of Nebuchadnezzar, present at the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the 11th year of Zedekiah (Jer 39: 3). The VSS with their various readings—"Naboushehar," "Nabousarach," "Sarscheim"—point to a corrupt text. The best emendation of the reading is "Nabûshâzibbûn" ( = Nabûshâzib-anni, "Nebo delivers me"); this is based on the reading in Jer 39: 13.

SARUCH, sârûk (Σαρούχ, Sarouch, Σαροῦχ, Sarouch): AV; Gr form of Serug (thus Lk 3: 35 RV).

SATAN, sâtân (םָטָן, sâtan, "adversary," from the vb. צָטַן, sâtan, "to lie in wait" [as adversary]; סָטָן, Satan, סָטָאָן, Satanás, "adversary," סָדָאָבּיּ, sâdâvî, sâdâvî, "adversary" or "accuser," καταγόω, katagó [altogether unclassical and un-Greek] [used once in Rev 12: 10], "accuser"): I. Definition.

II. Scriptural Facts concerning Satan.
1. Names of Satan.
2. Character of Satan.
3. Names of Satanic figures.
4. History of Satan.
5. General Considerations.
6. Conclusions.

I. Definition.—A created but superhuman, personal, evil, world-power, represented in Scripture as the adversary both of God and men.

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 their etymological significance. It is applied even to Jehovah (Nu 22: 22, 32; 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 art. is omitted it is used in the general sense. This 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 deserve specific enumeration. Tempor (Mt 4: 5; 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 (ἀδικεως, antidikos), (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 85) 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,
The fundamental moral description of Satan is given by Our Lord when He describes Satan as the “evil one” (Mt 13:19,38; cf. Is 5:19: “The Lord loved Jacob and hated Esau, and made the sons of Esau a land’s end”). 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 is in his power to maintain a kingdom of evil, in the seduction and ruin of man. The Bible and the story of the history of the world are the surest evidence of Satan’s power and presence 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 mimic its activity. The Book of Job, which contains the controversy with His opponents concerning exercise (Mk 3:22 f and Lk 11:17), is the first reference in the Bible to Satan. 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 defines the role of Satan in the history of the world. It is true that in Lk 2:29 Satan’s 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 of Tarsus says of his infirmity as a “messenger of Satan sent to buffet him.” Paul also speaks (1 Thess 2:16) 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 world among men 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 lie, namely, the emphasis upon truth. “The truth shall make you free” (Jn 8:32)—this is the way of deliverance from the power of Satan.

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 into a tendency to love and serve God and the kingdom to good effect.

The fundamental moral description of Satan is given by Our Lord when He describes Satan as the “evil one” (Mt 13:19,38; cf. Is 5:19: “The Lord loved Jacob and hated Esau, and made the sons of Esau a land’s end”). 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 is in his power to maintain a kingdom of evil, in the seduction and ruin of man. The Bible and the story of the history of the world are the surest evidence of Satan’s power and presence 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 mimic its activity. The Book of Job, which contains the controversy with His opponents concerning exercise (Mk 3:22 f and Lk 11:17), is the first reference in the Bible to Satan. 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 defines the role of Satan in the history of the world. It is true that in Lk 2:29 Satan’s 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 of Tarsus says of his infirmity as a “messenger of Satan sent to buffet him.” Paul also speaks (1 Thess 2:16) 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 world among men 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 lie, namely, the emphasis upon truth. “The truth shall make you free” (Jn 8:32)—this is the way of deliverance from the power of Satan.

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 into a tendency to love and serve God and the kingdom to good effect.
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 beginning of the end of evil that is to be, 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 (Mt 3 and Lk 1:6-11) is presented with the acceptance of a complete victory. According to Lk (10:18), when the Seventy returned from their mission flushed with victory over evil, Jesus said: “Now Satan is shown (not "fallen"; see Plummer, “Lk.” JCC. in loc.) as light- ning from heaven to pursue His power and 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 asserted (Jn 12:31). “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.” In each 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 triumph of Christ, the Good Samaritan cut off the power of Satan (Jn 18:10). The victory of Christ is the defeat of Satan; Jesus asserted (Jn 16:11) that the Spirit would convict the world of judgment, “because the prince of this world hath been cast out.” In (16:14-15) 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 3:8 it is said, “This is the Son of God, manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.” In Rev 12:9-11 it is asserted, in connection with Christ’s ascension, that Satan was cast out to the earth and to his angels, with him. According to the passage immediately following (12:10-12), this casting down was not complete or final in the sense of extinguishing his activities altogether, but it involves the potential and certain triumph of God and His saints over Satan and eventually 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 victory of Christ, He “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 26:18; Rom 16:20; Jas 4:7; 1 Jn 2:13; 5:4-8); and, finally, for the whole world (Rev 20:10). The victory 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 are certainly not, in the same time, not fairly 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 present 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 Bible, writers are primarily interested in the reality and power of the light of God’s holiness as prophetically revealed 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 emerges in the general doctrine concerning angels (see ANGELS). It has often been pointed out that the personal character of Satan is connected with the problem of forming a Divine function and having his place in the heavenly train. In the accounts of David’s numbering of Israel (1 S 24:1; 1 Ch 21:1) the tempting of David is attributed both to Jeh and Satan. This means that, though his temptation is 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 approximately 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 Jeh. In both these passages there is the hint of opposition between Jeh and Satan. In the former instance Satan assails unsuccessfully the character of one whom Jeh honors; while in the latter Jeh explicitly rebukes Satan for his attitude toward Israel (see G. A. Smith, BTP, II, 316f). The unveiling of Satan as a world-wide evil power by Jesus at the NT, and with this fuller teaching the symbolic treatment of temptation in Gen is to be 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 judgment and punishment. (cf Is 5:27; 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 willful souls have to be misled, the spirit who does so, as in Abraham’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 ultimate declaration of the morally fallen being to 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 an 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 to interact in the person of Satan, as the false teacher, or is thrown in by the Lord.

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 theodicy or philosophy of evil in the Bib. 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 sinfulness of the wares and the person of Satan corresponds, item for item, to the intellectual sainess and ethical earnestness of the Bib. world-view as a whole. It is, therefore, not mythological. The restraint of chastened imagination, not the extravagance and brutality of fancy, it is in evidence throughout the entire Bib. treatment of the subject. Even the use of terms current in mythology (as perhaps Gen 3 1.3.14; Rev 12 7-9; cf 1 Pet 5 8) does not imply more than a literary clothing of Satan in the stories commonly ascribed to malignant and disorderly forces.

(2) The second objection is that the doctrine is due to the influence of Pers dualism (see Persian Religion; Zoroastranism). The answer to this is plain, on the basis of facts already adduced. The Bib. 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 and that of men. Satan awaits his doom. Weiss says (concerning the NT representation of conflict between God and the powers of evil): "There lies in this no Manichaean 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 and the evils is dualistic and therefore untenable. But a true doctrine of unity makes room for other than God's—namely 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," JDB, IV, 412n).

LITERATURE.—All standard works on Bib. Theology, as well as Dictionaries, etc. treat with more or less thoroughness the doctrine of Satan. The German theologians of the more evangelical type, such as Weiss, Lange, Martensen (Danish), Dörner, while putting a tendency toward excessive speculation, discern the deeper aspects of the doctrine. Of monographs known to the writer none are to be recommended. It is a subject on which the Bible is its own best interpreter.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET

SATAN, DEPTHS OF (το βαθύ το Σατανά, to bathé tou Satana): Found in Rev 2 24, and has reference to false teaching at Thyatira. It is a question (that perhaps may not be decided) whether the false teacher represented in the claim is Satan, or someone else. 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"? In 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, SYNOGNAGUE OF: The expression occurs neither in the Hev nor in the Gr of the OT, but 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 σαταναίς ποιηματα, σατανήδες ποιηματα, which He then thrusts in the wilderness. In Ps 21 (22) 16, we find, "A company of evil doers [LXX σαταναίς ποιηματα, σατανήδες ποιηματα] have inclosed me." In Sir 16 6, we read, "In the congregation of sinners [LXX σατανιασαν, σατανές] 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 Jah 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 "of Satan." (4) The deposit of the Christian faith, "Satan" is 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 (CII, 3418) describing the classes of population in Smyrna, we find the expression ἵνα ἴωναί, καὶ ἵωναί, καὶ ἱωναί, which Mommsen thinks means "Jews who had abandoned their religion," but which Ramsay says "are probably survivals 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, ii.2: Mommsen, Historische Zeitschrift, XXXVII. 417.

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS

SATCHEL, satch'el. See Bag.

SATISFACTION, sat-ee-fak-shun: Occurs twice in AV (Nu 35:31,32) as a rendering of the Heb kopher (RV "ransom"). It means a price paid as consideration for the life of another. The passage cited provides a prohibition against accepting such payment in case of murder, or for the return of the manslayer. Such compensation was permitted in ancient justice among many peoples. Cf pahor, 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. wereld. 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

SATRAPS, sâ'traps, satraps (ΣΑΤΡΑΠΗΣ, 'bhabsharpaym', Exz 8:36; Est 3:12; 8:9; 9:3, AV "lieutenants"; Dn 3:23-27, 6:1ff, AV " princes"): The viceroy or vassal rulers to whom was intrusted the government of the provinces in the Persian empire. The word answers to the Old Pers khsha-thrapâvan, "protectors of the realm."

SAT'RY, sat'-er, s'ät-r, lit. "he-goat"; cf רֵעֵי, sa'ir, "hairy" (Gen 27:11, of Esau), and Arab. ʃראל, 'sha'ar, "hair;") pl. ʃר'ים, s'îrim): For sî'rîm in Lev 17:7 and 2 Ch 11:15, AV has "devils," RV "he-goats," ERV "satyrs," LXX τῶν ματαιῶν, τότε ματαιῶν, "vain things." For sî'rîm in Isa 13:21, AV and ERV have "satyrs," ERV "he-goats," ARV "wild goats," LXX Λύπαιν, doaimânia, "demons." For sîrâ in Isa 34:14, AV and ERV have "satyrs," ERV "he-goat," ARV "wild goat." LXX has ἑτέρω πρὸς τὰ τρέφων, ἑτέρω πρὸς ἑτέρων, "one to another," referring to doaimânia, which here stands for ɣôlm, "wild beasts of the desert."

The text of AV in these passages is as follows: Lev 17:7, "And they shall not make 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 calves which he had made": Isa 13:21 (of Babylon), "But wild beasts of the desert [qôlm] shall lie there; and the wild beasts of the desert shall howl, and the wild goats [wîrîm] shall dance there. And wolves [lîyim] shall dwell there, and dragons of the valleys shall howl there. And the panthers [chînîm] shall be there; and the wild beasts of the desert shallhover there, and the vultures shall sit there; and the kestrels shall be there;"

The question is whether sî'rî and sî'rîm 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 of abhorrence and that such words open the question of their nature, though it may to many minds make "devils" or "demons" or "satyrs" seem preferable to "he-goats." In Isa 13:20 we read, "neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there, neither shall the camel make his nests to lie down there." This very may 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 the "night-monster") are mentioned here, but LXX employs doaimânia, "demons," in Isa 13:21 for sîrîm and in 34:14 for ɣôlm; ἑκτεραποῦ, ἑκταναυτῷ, from ἐκ, ἐκνο, ἐκνό, "ass," and κεταναυτός, κεταναυτῷ, "centaur," in Isa 13:22 and 34:14 for ɣôlm, and again in 34:14 for ɣîlîth; ἑσερεῖ, ἑσερείν, "sirens," in Isa 13:21 for ɣîlîth ἡ γαῖανδῆ, and in 13:34 for τὰ τὰν. We must bear in mind the uncertainty regarding the identity of ɣîlîth, ἡ γαῖανδῆ, and τὰ τὰν, as well as some of the other names, and we must recall the tales that are hung about the name ɣîlîth (AV "screech owl," AVm and RV "night-monster," RVm "Lilith"), While sîrâ is almost alone among these words in having ordinarily a well-understood meaning, i.e., "the goat," there is good reason for considering that here it is used in an exceptional sense. The tr "satyr" certainly has much to be said for it. See GOAT; JACKAL.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SAUL, sôl (םָעוּל, šd'âl; ܣܘܠܐ, Saôl): (1) The first king of Israel.

I. EARLY HISTORY

1. Name and Meaning
2. Genealogy
3. Home and Station
4. Sources for Life
5. Election of Saul as King
6. Reasons for It

II. KNOWLEDGE OF FAITH

1. His First Action
2. Army Reorganized
3. Battle of Medmenah
4. Defeats the Amalekites
5. Defeat in Peace
6. David Introduced to Saul
7. Two Accounts
8. Saul's Envoy of David
9. Attempts to Get Rid of Him
10. David Spares Saul
11. Saul's Divided Energies
12. Consults a Necromancer
13. Battle of Gilboa
14. Double Accounts
15. Saul's Posthity

III. CHARACTERS

1. Book of Chronicles
2. Saul's Failings
3. His Virtue
4. David's Legacy

1. Early History—The name Saul is usually regarded as simply the passive participle of the vb. "to ask," and so meaning "asked".

2. Name (cf 1 S 8:4 ff), but the gentile adj. and Mean-

3. Saul's Battles: (Nu 26:13) would point to its

4. Saul's Divided Energies
5. Consults a Necromancer
6. Battle of Gilboa
7. Double Accounts
8. Saul's Posthity

1. 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. Saul's Battles: (Nu 26:13) would point to its

3. Saul's Divided Energies
4. Consults a Necromancer
5. Battle of Gilboa
6. Double Accounts
7. Saul's Posthity

The last verse contains a very curious scribal error, a yodh 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 20:30). This is quite common, and in some cases compulsory (20:5-9).

Saul's home was at Gibeah (q.v.), which is also called Gibeon of Saul, i.e. Saul's Hill (1 S 11:4; 1 S 30:26; also 10:5, God's Hill, or simply The Hill and Station of Benjamin or of the Benjamites (1 S 13:15; 2 S 23:29). 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
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 Samael historian to set the events out of order, e.g., the expulsion of the Philistines before the coronation of David. This was so successful that the whole Philist army was seized with panic, and the onset of Saul and the desertion of their Hebrew allies completed their discomfiture. Saul followed up his victory by making predatory excursions on every side (14:47)

5. Election as King
Saul's election was against the Amalekites under Agag, who were likewise completely defeated. The fight was carried out with all the remorselessness common to tribal wars.

6. Reorgan- tion Pronounced
The election of Saul at Michmash is recorded in the presence of the chief- tains of the clans: it is not to be 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.

7. Two Accounts
We have two accounts of Saul's rise to power. In one (1 Sam 15:24) Saul talks of the Philistines as his enemies. In the other (15:18), he says they are his allies. This confusion of Saul with his son was, no doubt, the cause of the later confusion between Samuel and David.

8. Final Conflict
The last battle of Saul was at Michmash. In dismay, Saul's troops deserted (16:6), and then all Saul was left with only 600 (16:2)

9. In this battle, Jonathan precipitated military disasters by a reckless attack upon the Philistine hosts. This was so successful that the whole Philist army was seized with panic, and the onset of Saul and the desertion of their Hebrew allies completed their discomfiture. Saul followed up his victory by making predatory excursions on every side (14:47). Saul's new enemy was against the Amalekites under Agag, who were likewise completely defeated. The fight was carried out with all the remorselessness common to tribal wars.

10. Saul's Reign
The story of Saul's reign is told in detail (1 Sam 13:1-17:58), and in the LXX, and in the Books of Samuel in the Old Testament.

11. Saul as the successor of David was a mistake, as David was not only the greater of the two kings, but he was the only king of the United Kingdom of Israel. Saul was a failure, and his story is a warning to all who would seize power by force.

12. Saul's Life
Saul's life is marked by a series of failures, and his death is a tragic end to a life of constant struggle.

13. Saul's Death
Saul died at Michmash at the hands of his own men. His life was a tragic one, and his death a sad commentary on the futility of human effort.
Saul’s Envy of David

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 whole house. In these circumstances, it was his first interest to get rid of him. His attempt to do so (omitting Saul’s actions with LXX 18:8–11) was to encourage him to make raids on the Philistines in the hope that these might kill him (18:21ff); his next, assassination by one of his servants (19:1), and then by his own hand (19:9ff). When David was compelled to fly, the quarel turned to civil war. The superstitious fear of hurting the chosen of Jeh had given place to blind rage. Those who sheltered the fugitive, even priests, were slaughtered (22:17ff). Fro 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 escape to 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 contents.

Obviously the 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 had him away by a raid on the Philis (23:27ff); 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 he 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 (28:7ff).

It says much for the man 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 a valley (of 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 Ashtarah, and their bodies hung on the wall of Bethshan, but Saul’s head was set in the temple of Dagon (1Ch 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 death and burial were, however, much more delayed than the text indicates.

Once more we have, according to most present-day critics, duplicate accounts of the death of Saul.

14. Double Accounts

Regarding this, we may note a number of particular points.

a. The accounts are common

b. The accounts differ

c. The accounts are parallel

With Saul the first Israelite dynasty began and ended. The names of his sons are given in 1S 4:49 as Jonathan, Ishvi and Malchishua. Ishvi or Ishaio (LXX) is Present.

Saul’s Posternity

Eshbaaz, 1S 1:26 called in LXX "new born", q.v.
1. Ch 8:33 adds Abinadab. Jonathan left a long line of descendants famous, like himself, as archers (1Ch 8:34ff). The rest of Saul’s posternity apparently died out.

Malchishua and Abinadab were slain at Gibeon (1S 31:6; 1Ch 10:2), and Ish-bosheth was assassinated shortly after (2S 4:2ff). Saul had also two natural sons by Rizpah who were put to death by David in accordance with a superstitious custom, as sons were the five chief Merab (2S 21:8, not Michaell; of 1S 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 (2S 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 (1Ch 10, esp. vs. 13:14).

1. Book of Samuel was rejected because he was disloyal to Jeh, esp. convicted him 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

The praises of David (1S 18:7f) 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; 25:21). His impulsive was such that he did not know where to stop. His interdict (14:24f) 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 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.

The praises of David (1S 18:7f) 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; 25:21). His impulsive was such that he did not know where to stop. His interdict (14:24f) 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 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.
ject to external influences, so that he was now a respectable man of the world, now a prophet (10: 11; 19: 24).

On the other hand, Saul possessed many high qualities. His dreads of office (10: 22) was only equalled by the coolness with which he accepted it (11: 5). To the first call to action he responded with promptitude (11: 6 ff.). His timely aid excited the last lingering doubts of the people of Jabez-gilead (31: 11 ff.). If we remember that Saul was openly disowned by Samuel (16: 30), and believed himself cast off by Jah, we cannot but admire the way in which he fought on to the last. Moreover, the fact that he retained not only his own sons, but a sufficient body of fighting men to engage a large army of Phibs, shows that there must have been something in him to excite confidence and loyalty.

It is, however, no question as to the honorable and noble qualities of Saul. The chief were his prowess in war and his generosity.

4. David's in peace. They have been set down Elegy by the man who knew him best in what are among the most authentic verses in the Bible (2 S 1: 190).

Saul of Tarsus. See Paul.

THOMAS HUNTER WEIR

SavarAN, sav'-ra:n: AV—RV AVARAN (q.v.).

SAVE, sav'v 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 (Sauia, Sauia): In 1 Esd 8: 2, for Uzzi, an ancestor of Ezra, in Ezr 7: 4.

SAVIOUR, sav'vur: (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 (2: 10, 39; 6: 8) from the vb. yhšā (Qal not used; "save" in Highb.), 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 Soter, Sôtr, is used in as technical a way as is our "Saviour." But the distribution of the 24 occurrences of the word is uncertain, 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—while the other instances are Lk 1: 47; 2: 11; Acts 5: 31; 13: 23; Eph 5: 28; Phil 3: 20 (R). And there are no occurrences in Mt, Mk, or the earlier Pauline Ep. 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) Sôtr 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 expressed by "God in Latin" (Verr. ii.2, 63, § 154). So the adoption of Sôtr 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" (Phanéria, 2 Tim 1: 10; Tit 2: 13), "love toward man" (Phanínthrôpia, Tit 3: 4), "captain" (archégós, Acts 5: 31; cf He 2: 10), etc. These terms are found in the Gr sources many times in exactly the same combinations with Sôtr. (5) In the NT Sôter is uniformly reserved for Christ, except in Lk 1: 47; Jude vers 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: 5; 2: 10; 3: 4; of Christ in 1: 4; 2: 13; 3: 6.


BURLON SCOTT EASTON

SAVOR, sâv'âr Yvû, râ'h; ómê): (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 his savor (μακρινόθεν, ìnappetent, "tasteless," "insipid," so 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 unpleasantness: 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 anthropomorphoeitic 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 15: 3; and frequently). In the NT, "savor" in the sense of smell is used metaphorically: (a) once for the metaphor borrowed from the incense 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 "leads them in triumph in Christ" (2 Cor 2: 14; 3: 18). "Turrn" is the metaphor borrowed from the fragrant 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 abhorr'd [lit. "our smell to stink"] in the eyes of Pharaoh" (Ex 5: 21). Cf the Eng. phrase, "to be in bad odor.

The vb. "to savor" means: (1) Intransitively, to taste or smell or partake of (the odor of), as in the Preface of AV, "to savour more of curiosity than wisdom," or (2) transitively, to perceive by the taste or smell, to discover: "thou sav'st the savor of God" (AV Mt 6: 23; Mk 8: 33, RV "mindest"); "savoring, phrenízomai, sa-" and "savor" (sa-vor), occurs only in Gen 27: 4, 13, 17, 18 ("savor food") and RV Isa 30: 24 ("savored").

D. MIALL EDWARDS
SAW, s6. See Tools.

SAVING ASUNDER, s6'n in a-su6nd3r. See Punishments.

SAYEST, s6'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 rabbinical idiom never found in the OT. Mark (14 62) renders by "I am." All these passages WHm punctuate interrogatively (cf 'kibb'bbk, f. 103 b).

SAYINGS, s6'ngz, DARK. See Dark Sayings.

SAYINGS, FAITHFUL. See Faithful Sayings.

SAYINGS OF JESUS. See LOGIA.

SAYINGS, UNWRITTEN, un-r'nt. See AGRAPHA.

SCAB, skab, SCABBED, skab-ed, skab'd (ギ'ギ), yallepheth, ג'גלפ, mispaaph, מ'מעפא, sappath, vb. ג'סקפ, יסמאזא, שמשא, מלת'ף, לכת'. These are generic terms for any skin disease in which there are patches of hard crusts on the surface. The commonly used terms are the formal names e'ga'ma, 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 'sma'za of LXX) did not render the bearer unclean, and they were to be distinguished by the priest (Lev 13 2 6) from the more virulent and spreading eruptions which (ver 7) were regarded as causes of ceremonial uncleanness. These severer forms are the leich'en of LXX mentioned in Lev 21 20, which disqualified any son of Aaron from serving as a 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 Aeschylus speaks of it (Choephori 281). Celsius, however, recognized that leich'en was a popular eruption, not a true scab. The name yallepheth seems to have been given to it on account of the firmness of attachment of the scales, while mispaaph refers to its tendency to spread and cover the surface. A cognate word in Ezk 13 18 is the name of a large tallith or prayer veil used by the false prophets in Israel (ttz kchurch'). 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, skab'ard, SHEATH, sketh. See Armor, III, 5; WAR, 9.

SCAFFOLD, skaf'old (ギ'ギ, kiyyor). 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, skål. See Siege, 4, (e); Weights and Measures.

SCALES, skålz ([ギ'ギ], kasketheth, "fish-scales"; [2] ג'תק, m'g'mhinuth, ג'מק'حن, maghen, "scales of the crocodile"); [3] צ'סק, lepis, with vb. צ'סק, צ'סק, "scale away" [20 3 17; 11 13]): (1) The first Heb word kasketheth means the imbricated scales of fish, which together with the dorsal fin were a distinguishing mark 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 mail (1 S 17 5 38): (2) M'g'mhinath from m'g'mhen, lit. "a backlet" or "small shield" (2 Ch 23 4; Jer 26 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 lepis, which in classical language has a much wider range of meaning than the above Heb words ("rind" "buckles" "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 or a dissipation of harassing doubt.

In Isa 40 12; RV Prov 16 11 for צ'סק, peles, in the sense of "instrument for weighing." See Balance.

H. L. E. LEUBING

SCALL, sk6l (צ'סק, nethek; צ'שקעא, thrama). This only occurs in Lev 13 and 14 where it is used 14 t o 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 scaled head is produced by a microscopic plant, Achorean schoenoleinii. In Old and Middle Eng., scall was used for scabbiness of the head (Chaucer and Spenser). See also Skent, Concise Etymol. Diet. of Eng. Language.

SCAPE-GOAT, skap'gót. See AZEKEL.

SCARLET, skar'let. See COLORS; DYEING.

SCARLET (WORM) (צ'טצ'ט, תלה'ת שון [Ex 25 4, etc]): Cermes vermilio, a scale insect from which a red dye is obtained. See Color; Dyeing; Worm.

SCATTERED ABROAD, skat'erd a-br'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 צ'ק, zekher (so MT, but the pointing is uncertain), properly "memorial," whence RVn. The Eng. tr comes through the LXX which took it as "offering of sweet savour," and so "sweet savour." For "wine of Lebanon" see WINE. If this tr is not right, the alternative is "memorial" in the sense of "renown." (2) Job 14 9; Jer 48 11 for צ'ק, צ'ק, "odor," "Scent" of the water in Job 14 9 is poetic for "contact with water." (3) Psa 13 5 says, "the smell of scattered smoke," where "scent" is used in the obsolete sense of "disagreeable odor." The tr is, however, very loose, and "scent's" is a gloss; RV "noisome smoke." BURTON SCOTT EASTON

SCEPTRE, SECEPTER, sep'ter (צ'שק, shbbhet, expanded form in Est 4 11; 5 2; 8 4; פ'בש3, rbhlo). [Ad Est 15 11; He 1 8]}
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

SCHEVA, see'wa (Σκέβα, Skewd). A Jew, a chief priest, resident in Ephesus, whose seven sons were exorcists (Acts 19:16). Ewald regards the name as being Heb shebhabhyah. He was not an officiating priest, as there were only synagogue in Asia Minor. He may have belonged to a high-priestly family, or perhaps at one time he had been at the head of one of the courses 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. This was done by omitting "both," but NAB, B, Tisch. WH, Soden, and best critics, retain the difficult reading. The explanation is that ver 14 states the custom: "who did this" being hol tolo pioinates, "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 amphoteran as "in both sides," but this is impossible. Baur understood "disciples" for "sons." D and Sprech have an interesting expansion which Blass considers original (ver 14): "Among whom also the sons [Sgr 'seven'] of a certain Seeva, a priest, wished to do the same, who were in the custom of exorcising such. And entering into the demon-possessed they began to call upon the Name, saying, 'We charge you by Jesus whom Paul preaches to come out.'"

S. F. HUNTER

SCISM, sir'in (σχίσμα, schima). Only in 1 Cor 12:28. The same Gr word as lit. "a split," in Acts 15:16; Mk. 2:21; and "divine" in Jn 7:43; 9:16; 10:19. It designates "a separation," not from, but within, the church, interfering with the harmonious cooperation and cooperation of the members described in the preceding verses (1 Cor 12:18ff). The ecclesiastical meaning is that of a break from a church organization, that may or may not be connected with a doctrinal dissent.

SCHOOL, skool (σχολή, scholē). See TYRANNUS.

SCHOOLMASTER, skool'mas-tər. 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 παιδαγός, paidagogos, lit. "child-leader." This paidagog 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 association 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 paidagogos" and "to follow one like a paidagogos" were proverbial expressions. Naturally, to the average boy a paidagogos was a tramp in the incorporation of everything objectionable. Hence St. Paul's figure may be paraphrased: "The law was a paidagogos, necessary but irksome, to direct us until the time of Christ. Then was the time of our spiritual commisions of age, that the control of the paidagogos ceased." The word paidagogos 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 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 paidagogos adequately. "Schoolmaster" is quite wrong, but RV's "tutor" (cf 1 Cor 4:15) is little better in modern Eng.

BUTKON SCOTT EASTON

SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS. See Education; Prophets.

SCIENCE, si'ens: This word as found in AV means simply "knowledge." "Science" occurs in AV only in two places, Dull 1:4, "children . . . understanding science" (γνῶσις γνώσεως, "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 error of the devil which is falsely called science." Thus at the root of this widespread Christian and Divine things, which false teachers alleged that they possessed, and of which they boasted. It was an inecipient form of Gnosticism, and it prevailed to a considerable extent in the churches of preconsular Asia, e.g. in Colossae and Ephesus. Timothy is put on his guard against the teaching of this gnosis 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, is not found either in the OT or the NT unless the passage in Dull be interpreted as meaning the scientific knowledge which the learned men of Babylon possessed of mathematics and astronomy, etc. See also ALCHEMY. 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 RUTHERFORD
SCIMITAR, sim't-tar, -tēr (ἀκτενώ, akitekē): Formerly given as “fauchion” in AV Jth 13 6; 18 9, lit., a weapon, which Judith took down from the wall of the bed at Holofernes’ head and with which she severed his head from his body.

SCOFF, skof, SCOIFFER, skof'r: The vb. indicates the manifestation of contempt by insulting words or acts; 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 1 22, etc. “Scorn” refers rather to an inner emotion based on a sense of superiority; “scoff,” to the outward expression of this emotion.

SCORN, skōrn: Fox Talbot connects this Eng. word with the Danish skørn, “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 simply 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 has feelings of superiority, awakens mingled resentment, repulsion and contempt by the hollowness of its claims and its intrinsic inferiority or weakness. Scorn is a hotter, fiercer emotion than disdain or contempt. It is obvious that scorn may—indeed, it must—arise in connection 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. bāzāh, for which “disdain” would be a nearer equivalent. In Hab 1 10 AV the word tr’ “scorn” is mishāh, “an object of laughter,” “laughing-stock.” In Ps 44 13; 79 4 the Heb word is la’agh from a root, probably meaning “to stutter,” “stammer,” for which “mocking” is a better Eng. equivalent. In AV Job 34 7; Ps 123 4, la’agh is rendered “seeming” (the rendering given in Prov 22 22 to la’agh “a word 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 la’agh is rendered “scornful”)

As a vb. the word is the tr’ given to la’agh, “to mock.” (Job 22 19; Ps 22 7; Isa 28 14; 22 19; Ps 22 7; “all laugh to scorn”; kōleth = “to scoff” (Ezk 16 31, “Gr scoffer,” but text still “scorneth”); for the noun ἐλαγή, “laugh to scorn” (RV “laughing-stock,” Job 12 4); ἐλαγὴ = “to scoff” (as used in Ethical and religious connections) (Job 16 20; Prov 3 34; 9 12, “all scoff” in RV); in Prov 19 28, “not happily (the at,” RV is warranted in substituting “scold” for “scorn” because the context indicates some form of outward expression of the 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; Ezk 16 31; 32 32; 2 Esd 2 21; Jth 12 12; 14 18; 23 19; Jer 10 17; Mt 6 24; Mk 6 40; Lk 8 53). The vb. in Apoc and the NT is usually καταγίζω, καταγίδω, but in Wisd 4 1 κεκλίσεως, κεκλίσω; in Sir 13 7 κατακόρυφος, κατακόρυφος; and in 2 Esd 2 21 κατερίδω. In addition “scorn” is retained in Est 3 6; Job 39 17 8; 2 Esd 2 21 (commonly subst. to mock at, but elsewhere invariably to “scold.”

Scorer is the tr. of the participle ἐλαγέω, and once of the participle laγέω. For “scoffer” RV everywhere substitutes—properly—“scoffer.” Outside of Proph. (and Hos 7 5) 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 “scoffer [scorcher] 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, and his character is marked by arrogance as that of the wise is characterized by devout caution.”

W. M. McPHEETERS

SCORPION, skōr'pee-on (ἀκρωτήρ, akhrotēr; of Arab.スクローサ, akhabb, "scorpion"); ἀκρώτηρ, akrotēr, "the ascent of Akribabm"; ἀκροπός, skropios. Note that the Gr and Heb may be akin; cf., omitting the vowels, 'kürb and spk). In Dt 8 15, we have, “who led thee through the great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents [nādashāsārdāh] and scorpions [akhabb],” 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), “Be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though briars and thorns are with thee, and thou shalt dwell among scorpions.” “The ascent of Akribabm,” the north end of Wādī al-ʿArabah, S. of the Dead Sea, is mentioned as a boundary 3 t (Nu 34 4; Josh 13 5; 13 15; 12 2; 15 10; 18 17). To the Seventy (Lk 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 dualts, the la, the stone, the fish and the serpent, and the egg and the scorpion, whereas in the passage in Mt (7 9 f) we have only the lion 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 dualt, the lion and the serpent, inserting some texts as authority for the omission, and reading ψέαν, ἐπών, “Thou hast sown thorns, etc.”

In Rev 9 2–10 there come out of the smoke of the abyss winged creatures (“locusts,” ἐπέτρεπαν, ἐπετρέπεαν) like war-horses with crowns of gold, with these faces of men, hair of women, teeth of lions, breastplates of iron, and with stinging tails like scorpions. In Ecclus 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 “pieces [ραχίδια, πλακίδια, diminutive of skorphos] to cast darts.” In Plutarch skorphus is used in the same sense (Liddell and Scott, s. v., “scorpio”).

In the passage cited from Dt, and probably also in the names国庆 of Akribabm, 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 sting, which, though often exceedingly painful for several hours, is seldom fatal.

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 a powerful pair of arthrodial or terminating with pincers, which make the creature look like a small crystal or lobster, and is armed behind with long sharp stings. The rest of the body consists of the abdomen, a broad part continuous with the cephalothorax, and a slender part forming the tail which ends in a short spike. The tail is usually carried curved over the back and is used for steering, as 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-uhn, CHASTISING WITH. See PUNISHMENTS, 3, (17); SCPRIONS.

SCOURGE, skôrj, SCOURAGING, skôr’jing (mâstîk, mêsîk, mästîq, mastîq; in Acts 22 25 màstév, mastév, in Mk 15 15 Mt 27 26 tròpik-Loq, Livep, Lk 18 31, 35; Mk 4 3) term implemented 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 blows 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 can usually 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 (Lk 23 18). 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 principate (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 Jesus depicted of the words of Lk 19 3, among the Jews the punishment of floggation was well known since the Egypt days, as the monuments abundantly testify. The word “scourge” is used in Lev 19 20, but ARV translates “punished,” the original was bággeth opposing the expression of 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 the 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 (NIV, shoph); Josh 23 13 (NIV, shophè), are figurative for “affliction.” Notice the common use of metaphors in the phrase “overflowing scourge” (Isa 18 15.18).

HENRY E. DOKSER

SCRABBLE, skrâb’l: Occurs only in 1 S 21 13, as the tr of נֵפָר, tawâh: “David . . . feigned himself mad and scrawled on the doors of the gate.” “To scrabble” (modern Eng. “scrawl”) is here to make unmeaning marks; tawâh means “to make a mark” from tên, “a mark,” esp. as a cross (Ezk 9 4), a signature (Job 31 35, see RV), the name of the letter נ, originally made in the form of a cross; RVm has “made marks” and LXX has μαντισσα, “to beat as the LXX,” which bears resemblance to Drucker and others follow (“beat upon” or “drummed on the doors of the city,” which seems more probable).

SCREECH, skrâch, OWL. See NIGHT-MONSTER.

SCRIRES, skrîz. 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 (גניך, gánhêkh). 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 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 of their fathers more or less and arousing the scribes to opposition. Thus the scribes and not the priests were now the zealous defenders of the Law, and hence were the true teachers of the people. At the time of Christ, this distinction was complete. The scribes formed a solid profession which held undisputed sway over the thought of the people. In the NT they are usually called ᾪπαματας, γραμματεῖς, i.e. “students of the Scriptures,” “scribes,” corresponding to the Heb גניך, gánhêkh, nêmôth = honorables literati, who 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 γραμματικός, nomikós, 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 not only know the Law but also teach it they are called ἀποστόλος, aposthôl, “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 appellative “rabbî” or “my lord.” (Mt 23 7 and otherwise). This word of polite address gradually became a title. The word “rabboni” (Mt 10 31; Lk 20 19) is an extensive form, and was employed by the disciples to give expression to their veneration of Christ. In the Gr NT “rabbi” is tr as ῥαββί, rhâbbî, i.e. “master” (Mt 8 6.8.21-25 and otherwise), or bârrâ, bârâkâ, bârâkâ (Mt 8 9 and otherwise), in Lk by τὸν ῥαβδὸς, ῥαβδόν (Lk 5 5; 9 24.45; 9 31-32; 17 13). Besides these, we find suggh, pater, “father,” and καθηγητής, kathēghêtês, “teacher” (Mt 23 9.5).

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” (Abbâhô 4.12). “The honor of thy teacher must surpass the honor bestowed on thy master; for son and father are both in duty bound to honor the teacher” (Kritthôth 6 9). Everywhere the rabbis demanded the position of first rank (Mt 23 6f; Mk 12 38; Lk 11 45; 12 12; 20 40), that of the nobility. They wore στολὰς, stolàs, “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 as a school and school work in it, 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 gravity was professedly carried out in practice even 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 with pay (Mt. 10:10; Mk. 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. 11:8-9; 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 gravity was not the rule; and in Christ's Pharisees against the scribes and Pharisees. He makes special mention of their greed (Mt. 23:14), and although 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 Judea. 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, grammatici are frequently mentioned; and the Bab scribes of the 5th and 6th cent, were the authors of the most monumental work of rabbinical Judaism—the Talmud.

Since the separation of the Pharisaic and the Sadducean teachers into two classes, 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 endeavored to press as the binding rule of life. Since, however, scribes are merely "students of the Law," there must also have been scribes of the Sadducee type; for it is not to be imagined that this party, which recognized only the written Law as binding, could 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. 23:5; Lk. 6:50; Acts 18:23, 24) 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 and school was to make him familiar with the code 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 everywhere, even the most they held 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 objective 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; 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 formalism. All religious and moral life was dragged down to the level of the Law, and this must necessarily lead to the following results: (1) The individual is governed by it, and hence he can have 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 emotion, and of conduct. (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. The scribes' principle was 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 the development of this attitude in the face of our Jewish religious life through the "precepts of the elders" which called forth Christ's repeated denunciation of the work of the scribes.

FRANK E. HUSCHE

SCRAP, scrap: 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 the first enemy killed 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 Caucasus 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 Ashkelon, bought them off by rich gifts, but they remained in the Negeb 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. Potter

SCYTHOPOLIS, sī-thŏp’ŏ-lis, si-thôp’ŏ-lis. See BETH-SHEAN.

SEA, sē (Σaviour, sēlēs, sēlēs; in Acts 27 5 παλαις, παλαις): The Mediterranean is called ha-sēn ha-gūdōh, “the great sea” (Nu 34 6; Josh 1 4; Ezek 47 10, etc); ha-sēn ha-hā’drōn, “the hinder,” or “western sea” (Dt 11 24; 34 2; Joel 2 20; Zec 14 8); sēn yis-hūtin, “the sea of the Philistines” (Ex 23 31); AV translates yām yāhōh in Ex 3 7 by “sea of Joppa,” perhaps rightly.

The Dead Sea is called yām ha-mēlekh, “the Salt Sea” (Nu 34 3; Dt 3 17; Josh 3 16, etc); ha-sēn ha-ta-kênōw, “the east sea” (Ezek 18 17; Joel 2 20; Zec 14 5); yām hā-gūdōh, “the sea of the Arabah” (Dt 3 17; Josh 3 16; 12 3; 2 K 14 25).

The Red Sea is called yām yēqōh, lit. “sea of weeds” (Ex 10 19; Nu 14 25; Dt 1 1; Josh 2 10; Jgs 11 16; 1 K 9 26; Neh 9 9; Ps 106 7; Jer 49 21, etc); yām yēl-šāsa, erṣēf yām ha-gūdōh, “the sea of the Arabah” (Wisd 19 7; Acts 7 30). He 11 29; yām mi-nir-yōm, “the Egypt sea” (Isa 11 15).

Yām is used of the Nile in Nah 3 8 and probably also in Isa 19 5, as in modern Arab. bahr, “sea,” is used of the Nile and its alluviums. Yām is often used for “west” or “westward,” as “look from the place where thou art,” “westward” (Gen 13 14); “western border” (Nu 34 6). Yām 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 kinnērēth, “Chinnereth” (Nu 34 14; Jgs 11 20, etc); kinnīrēth, “Chinnereth” (1 K 15 20); yām kinnērēth, “the sea of Chinnereth” (Nu 34 11; Josh 13 27); yām kīn-nērēth, “the sea of Chinnereth” (Josh 12 3); ḫānān yēfēnē, ḫānān yēfēnē, “the lake of Gennesaret,” “the lake of Gennesaret” (Lk 5 2; and yām yēfēnē, yēfēnē, “the water of Gennesaret” (1 Mace 11 67), from late Heb ḫēnē, ḫēnē; or ḫēnē, ḫēnē; ḫēnē of the Gallalais; ḫēnē of the Galiilais, “the sea of Galilee” (Mt 4 18; 15 29; Mk 1 16; 7 31; Jn 6 1); ḫānān yēfēnē, “the lake of Gennesaret; ḫēnē of the Galiilais, “the sea of Tiberias,” “the sea of the lake,” “the sea of Tiberias” (Jn 21 1; Codex Sinaiticus).

In mishbar yām, “the wilderness of the sea” (Isa 21:1), there may perhaps be a reference to the Pers Gulf.

**SEA, ADRIATIC, a-dri-ät'ic, ad-ri-at'ik.** See Adrià.

**SEA, BRAZEN, bră-z'n.** See Sea, The Mourtén.

**SEA, DEAD; EASTERN, es'térn.** See Dead Sea.

**SEA, FORMER, för'mér.** See Dead Sea; Former.

**SEA, HINDER, hin'dér; UTMOST, ut'móst; UTTERMOST, ut'-ér-móst; WESTERN, wes'térn.** See Mediterranean Sea.

**SEA, MEDITERRANEAN.** See Mediterranean Sea.

**SEA-MEW, sōn'mū (נָּבָר, shābāph; λάρος, lāros; 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 shābāph 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 in flight, so daring in flying directly into the face of fierce winds, that the Moslems believed them to be terrors of the sea. Moses was raised 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, jisus, or hoopoe.

**GENE STRATTON-PORTER**


**ALFRED ELY DAY**

**SEA OF CHINNERETH, kin'theth.** See Galilee, Sea of.

**SEA OF GALILEE.** See Galilee, Sea of.

**SEA OF GLASS.** See Glass, Sea of.

**SEA OF JAZER (יָם יָזֶר, yām ye'zēr):** This is a scribal error (Jer 48:32), yām (“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-om'r-ish).** See Dead Sea.

**SEA OF THE ARAВAH.** See Dead Sea.

**SEA OF THE PHILISTINES.** See Mediterranean Sea.

**SEA OF THE PLAIN (Aravah, ar'a-ba).** See Dead Sea.

**SEA OF TIBERIAS, ti-bē'ri-as.** 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 (גָּדְלַיָּה הַיָּם, ha-yām ha-gādēh):** 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 47:19; 48:28). It is also called “the hinder sea” (Heb ha-yām ha-abdēn), i.e., the western sea (Dt 11:24; 34:2; Jos 2:23; Zec 14:8), and “the sea of the Philistia” (Ex 23:31), which, of course, applies esp. to the part washing there of the 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 13:29, etc.). It was the largest sheet of water with which the Hebrews had any acquaintance. Its gleaming mirror, stretching away to the sunset, could be seen from many an inland height.

It bulked 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; Jos 5:1, etc.). Its mystery and wonder, the raging of 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, Manasseh, Dan and Judah. Many of the cities along the shore were the sanctuary of sea-gods, and much of the land. The coast line offered little facility for the making of harbors. The one seaport of which in ancient times the Hebrews seem to have made much use was Doppar—the modern Jaffa (2 Ch 2:18, etc.). From this place, probably, argoses of Solomon turned their prows westward. Here, at least,
“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 the 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 of the sea slips down the slopes and the higher strata 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, mōl'thın, or BRAZEN (יוֹם הַקּוֹדֶשׁ, yôm ha-kōḏesh); 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, toward 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 Tithath and Cun. It replaced the layer of the tabernacle, and, like that, was used for storing the water in which the priests washed their hands and 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, sē‘ā (סֵאָה, sē‘āh): A dry measure equal to about one and one-half pecks. See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

SEAL, sēl (subst. מְדִינָה, mōḏīnā, “seal,” “signet,” בַּרְבָּת, barḇa’taḥ, “signet-ring”; Aram. נְצֻר, nēṣūr; עָטָה, ʿātā, inornament, signet; סְפּוֹרָה, sopheraḥ; vb. סָפַר, saphar, “to seal”); also סְפָר (Arab. سُفَر, ṣafar); סְפָרָה (ṣferaḥ, סְפָרַד, sferad, kataphrugoniti, “to seal”). 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 (1.95) records the Babylon custom of wearing signets. In Babylonia the seal generally took the form of a cylinder cut in clay, with 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 waist (cf RV “cord” in Gen 35:18; “thou shalt put upon thine arm,” i.e. on the Antiquity.

1. Prevalence in


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 terra-cotta. In the West the wax came early into use as the material for receiving the impression of the seal, but in the ancient East clay was the usual medium (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; 8:10.11; 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 28:30; 39:30), and breastplate (39:14). Ben-Sirach mentions as a distinct occupation the work of engraving on signets.
Sealed Stone at Entrance to a Tomb.

Sealskin, s’dél: Skin of rams or goats, from which were made seals: The rendering of RV (Ex 25:5; Ezk 16:10) for שֵׁלֶּשׁ כַּפַּר, “or toshah. RVm “peccary-skinned,” AV “lizards’ skin.” A seal, Μοναχος αἰγίπτεως, is found in the Mediterranean, though not in the Red Sea, but it is likely times a metaphor for sorcery. That which is beyond the comprehension of the unintimated is usual to be called “a book that is sealed” (Isa 29:11 ff.; Rev 5:1 ff.). 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 12:4; cf. Rev 10:4). Elsewhere it stands for the ratification of prophecy (Jer 33:14). The exact meaning of “a book that is sealed” is sometimes ambiguous (as in Job 33:16; Ezk 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” (1Jn 3:35), 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 (Jn 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,” Ps 132:13). His seal was His offering with the sign of a holy covenant” (also Tg Cant 38: “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 distribution of the Gentiles as “sealed” to them this fruit” (Rom 15:28); 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 Jerusalem converts 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 as His own, and guarantees them, by eternal 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” (σφαῖρα) 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 Geburah-Hebrews, i.e. across the foot on 2 Clem 7). Harnack and Hatch maintain that the name “seal” for baptism was taken from the mysteries, but Ancher and Sanday-Headlam hold that it was borrowed from the Jewish view of circumcision as a seal. See MYSTERIES.

D. MIALL EDWARDS

SEALE, s’dél: FOUNTAIN: These words, applied to the bride (Cant 4:12), find their explanation under SEAL (q.v.). Anything that was to be authoritatively protected and preserved 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, s’dél’skin: The rendering of RV (Ex 25:5; Ezk 16:10) for סֵלֶשׁ כַּפַּר, “or toshah. RVm “peccary-skinned,” AV “lizards’ skin.” A seal, Μοναχος αἰγίπτεως, is found in the Mediterranean, though not in the Red Sea, but it is likely

(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 prove that the predominating type was the Babylonian, and that to a less degree the Egyptian.

(1) One of the most important uses of sealing in antiquity was to give a proof of authenticity and authority to letters, royal commands, etc.

3. Uses of—It served the purposes of a modern signature at a time when the art of writing was only known to a few. Thus Jezebel "wrote letters in Ahab's name, and sealed them with his seal" (1K 21:8); the written commands of Ahasuerus 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); cf. with which are affixed their seal to the written covenant between God and His people (Neh 9:38; 10:1 ff.). (3) An additional use was the preservation of books in security. A roll or other document intended for preservation was sealed up before it was deposited in a place of security (Jer 32:14; cf. the book "...close sealed with seven seals," Rev 5:1). 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; 1Macc 6:15). (5) Closed doors were often sealed to prevent the entrance of any unauthorized person. So the door of the lion's den (Dnl 6:17; cf. Bel ver 14). Herodotus mentions the custom of sealing tombs (ii.121). So we read of the chief priests and Pharisees rolling a stone at the mouth of Our Lord's tomb in order to "make the sepulchre sure" against the intrusion of the disciples (Mt 27:66). 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 (Isa 48:14).

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, or possession. Sir 38:11 is not to be understood 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 unassailable maiden is "a spring shut up, a fountain sealed" (Cant 4:12). To seal is some-
that *takhash* means the dogong, which is found in the Red Sea. See *Bagdaz; Porpoise.*

**SEAM, sém**, **SEAMLESS, sém-les**: The coat or inner garment (חֵלֶד, *chilôn*) of Jesus is described in *John* as "without seam" (*קָטָרֶה, *katārēph*), i.e. woven in one piece.

**SEAR, sér**: In *1 Tim* 4:2 for *κατευθύνουμαι,* *kataeuθynoun,* "burn with a hot iron" (cf. "cauterize"); AV having their conscience seared with a hot iron, and... in this construction means "made insensible," like the surface of a deep burn after healing. 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 conns.

**SEARCH, sērch**: Some peculiar senses are:

1. In the books of Moses, esp. in Nu, "searching out the land!" means to spy out (*תֵאר*, *te'ar*), 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 (*תֵאר בֵּיתוُ", bakër);
   - *Jn* 5:39; 1 Pet 1:11 (*קַאֲדוּר, *kādūr*), it means to examine, to study out the meaning.
   - In Acts 1:10, *examine* (*הִטָּשׁ, *hīṭash*), of AV. See SEARCHINGS.
3. "Search out!" often means to study critically, to investigate carefully, e.g. Job 8:8; 29:16; Ecel 1:13; Lam 3:50; 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 *קַאֲדוּר, *kādūr*, 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 *דְּקֵלֵתו, *dekēlo, "ye think," 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 ff), 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 tr. it; which by the reproof following secondly also to apply to God's searching the heart or spirit, as Cyril long ago hath observed." So Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, in his *Johnnine Grammar* (London, 1906, §2439 [i]). See also Transactions American Philological Association, 1901, 641. J. E. Harry

**SEARCHINGS, sēr'chings** (*תֵארשֵׁים, *te'arshēm*), *birkēl* (*תְּבַרְסְקֹל*), from *bāqar, to search, explore, examine thoroughly*): In the song of Deborah the Reubenites are taunted because their great resolves of heart, *birkēl* (*תְּבַרְסְקֹל*), led to nothing but great "searchings of heart, *birkēl* (*תְּבַרְסְקֹל*), and no activity other than to remain among their flocks (*Jgs* 5:15). 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" (of the expressions *hākham lēb, nḇān 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 *lightgalahd* in *Jgs* 6:16, lit. "for the water courses of Reuben, great the searchings of heart!"

**SEASONS, sē'zn** (summer: *יָמִים, *yāmîm, Chal d *yāmîy*; *Dnl* 2:35); *θερός, *thēros; winter: *יָמִים, *yāmîm, *θερός* [*Cant* 2:11], *hèreph; χειμῶν, *cheimōn*): 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 the rain lasting from November to May. "The winter is past, the rain is over" (Cant 2:11). See RAIN. The temperature at sea-level in Pal reaches freezing-point occasionally, but seldom is less than 40° F. On the hills and mountains it is colder, depending on the height. The people have no means of heating their houses, and suffer much from the cold. They wrap up their necks and heads and keep inside the houses out of the wind as much as possible. "The sluggard will not plow by reason of winter" (Prov 20:4). Jesus in speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter" (Mt 24:20). Paul asks Timothy to "come before winter" (2 Tim 4:21) as navigation closed then and travel was virtually impossible.

Summer is very hot and rainy. "When the fig tree . . . putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh" (Mk 13:28); "The harvest is past, the summer is ended" (Jer 8:20). It is the season of harvesting and threshing (Dnl 2:35). "He that gathereth in summer is a wise son" (Prov 10:5). See COLT; HEAT; ASTRONOMY, 1, 5.

**SEAT, sēt**: This word is used to translate the Heb words *בְּכָרָה, *bēkārāh, *בְּכָרָה, *bēkārāh; *סֶבֶא, *sēbāh; *סָבָא, *Sabā, Gen 17:10; 1 Ch 1:9); *Gr* ἂν, but B has *Σαβάν, *Sabān*;

1. Son of first son of Benjamin.
2. Brothers
   a. Forms of being Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Name, and Sabtecha.
   b. In Ps 72:10 and Isa 43:3 Parentage (where the Gr has *Σέφρα, *Sēphrā, *Σέφρα, *Sēphrā*).
   c. Of Seba (Gen 7:19). Seba is mentioned with Egypt and Ethiopia, and the Septuagint before have been a southern people. In Is 19:1 we meet with the gentile form, *Σαβάζαυ, *Sabāzāv (Sabtēza, Sabachīm), rendered "Sabaean," who are described as "men of stature" (i.e. tall), and were to come over to Cyprus 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.

SEATS, sēts, CHIEF. See CHIEF SEATS.

SEBA, sēbā (גְּבָא, *gēbāh*; *Σαβά, *Sabā; Gen 10:7; 1 Ch 1:9); Gr *βάν, but B has *Σαβάν, *Sabān*;
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 Zambesi and the Limpopo, which was utilized as a waterway by the states in that region, though, through silting, 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 Sebaim. (See Th. Bent, The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland, 1892.) The ruins of this tract are regarded as being the works of others than the black race and the country. Dillmann, however, suggests (on Gen 10 7) that the people of Seba were another branch of the Cushites E. of Napatha by the Arabian Sea, of which Strabo (xiv. 4, 8, 10) and Ptolemy (iv. 7, 7 f) give information. See SHEBA and HBD, s.v.

T. G. Pinches

SEBAM, seb'am (סבַמ, s'hbam; סָבָאָם, Seba'am; 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 50). It is probably the same place as Simnah (AV "Shimah") (so also Josh 13 19). In the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah it was a Moabite town, but there is no record of how or when it was taken from Israel. It appears to have been famous for the luxuriance of its vines and for its summer fruits (Isa 16 8 f; Jer 48 22). Onam calls it 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 Swatin, which stands on the south side of Wady Hesbon, about 2 miles from Hesbān. The ancient ruins are considerable, with large sarcophagi; and in the neighboring rock wine presses are cut (PEF, "Eastern Palat", 221 f).

W. Ewing

SEBAT, se-ba't, se'bat (Zec 1 7). See SHEBAT.

SECAH, se-kā'ḥa, sek-a-ka (סְכַה, s'khāhāh; B, sêqâjâ, A, sêqâjâ, Sochochd): 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 pasturage is still obtained by wandering Bedouin tribes. There are many signs in this district of more settled habitation in ancient times, but the name Secah is lost. Conder proposed K. el Dikkeh (also called Kh. es Sikkeh), "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 (PEF, III, 111, Sh XVII). E. W. G. Masterman

SECHENIAS, sek-ên'êas: (1) (A, סְכֵנִית, Sochenias; omitted in B and Swete): 1 Esd 8 29 = "Shecaniah" in Ezr 8 3; the arrangement in Ezr is different. (2) (A, Sochenias, but B and Swete, Ecceiasia, Ecciehiasia, Ecciehiasia): Name of a person who went up at the head of a family in the return with Ezra (1 Esd 8 32) = "Shecaniah" in Ezr 8 5.

SECHE, se'kê (סָכֶה, seehê). See SCHE.

SECOND COMING, sek'und kom'ing. See PAROUSIA; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NT, V.

SECOND DEATH. See DEATH; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NT, X, (6).

SECOND SABBATH. See SABBATH, Second.

SECONDARILY, sek'un-da-li: AV for sek'dere, deuteron (1 Cor 12 28). Probably without distinction from "secondly" (so RV, and so RV also for deuteron in 2 Cor 3 23). Still AV may have wished to emphasize that the prophets have a lower rank than the apostles.

SECRET, sek'ret: In Esd 7 22, RV has 'secret' for הֵסְדָה, 'hids,' 'treasure.' A correct tr ? 'secondly.' They shall have a name mar. 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, sek't: (a) apópeic, hairiness): "Sect" (Lat secta, from sequi, "to follow") is in the NT the tr of hairises, from hairis, "to take," "to choose"; also tr "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 tr "sect" (Acts 5 17, of the Sadducees; 15 5, of the Pharisees; 26 5, 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 tr "heresies" (1 Cor 13 19, "sects"); AV "factions," m "Gr heresies"; ERVm reverses the ARV text and margin; Gal 5 20, ARV "parties," m "heresies"; ERVm 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 that would make them "destructive." Hairis occurs in 1 Mace 8 30 ("They shall do it at their pleasure," i.e. "choice"); of LXX Lev 22 18.21. See HERESY.

W. L. Walker

SECU, sekk'ū (סֹכּוֹ, sêkkihā; B, iv ṭe Secel, en ṭo Sephel, iv ṭo Sephel, A, iv Socho, en Sochoh; 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 lay between the residence of Saul at Gibeah and Ramah. It is impossible to come to any sure conclusion regarding its identity. Conder suggested its identification with Khirbet Suwike, 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 ṭo 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, sek'und-us (WH, Σεκούνδος, Se-koundos, TH, Σεκούνδος, Sekoundos): 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, travelling with Paul to the western tributaries to Jerusalem (Acts 24 17; 2 Cor 8 3), he probably accompanied Paul as far as Jerusalem. The name is found in a list of palliarchins on a Thessalonian inscription.

SECURE, sek'ûr, SECURITY, sek'ûr-i: the word ἰάπα and its derivatives in Heb point to se-
SEDECAS, sed-e-kas'as: AV = RV SEDEKIAS (q.v.).

SEDEKIAS, sed-e-khi-as: (1) (B A, Zedekias, Sedecias; AV Zedekias): 1 Esd 1 46 (44)=Zedekiah king of Judah; also in Bar 1 8 where AV reads "Sedecias." (2) In Bar 1 1 (AV "Sedecias"), an ancestor of Baruch, "the son of Asadius," sometimes (but incorretly) identified with the false prophet "Zedekiah the son of Massah" (Jer 29 21).

SEDITION, sed-i-shun: The tr in Ezr 4 15.19 for ἐσθάσειν, "esthaddar, "struggling," "revolt;" in 2 Esd 15 16 for inconstabilitio, "instability;" with "be seditious" for στάθηκα, "standing up," "revolt" (RV "insurrection") in Lk 23 19-20; Acts 24 5, with διστασθησθαι, "a standing asunder" (RV "division") in Gal 5 20. An "sedition" does not include open violence against a government, the word should not have been used in any of the above cases.

SEDUCE, sed-us', SEDUCER, sed-us'er (Hipil of γυναίκα, or γυναῖκα, γυναῖκα, "to err;" of γυναῖκα, παθητε, "to be simple"; παθητε, παθητε, παθητε, "a perjurer;" to lead astray, to "lead away"; "to cause to err," as from the paths of truth, duty or religion. It occurs in AV and RV Exe 13 10; 2 K 21 20; 1 Tim 4 1; Rev 2 20; in AV only, Prov 12 26 (RV "cause to err"); Isa 19 13 (RV "caused to go astray"); Mk 13 22; 1 Jn 2 26 (RV "lead astray"). The noun "seducer" (2 Tim 3 13 AV, γυναῖκα, γυναῖκα) is correctly changed in RV into "imposter." (2) It is not found in its specific sense of "to entice a female to surrender her chastity." Yet the crime itself is referred to and condemned.

Three cases are to be distinguished: (a) The seduction of an unbetrothed virgin: In this case the seducer according to JE (Ex 22 16) is to be compelled to take the virgin as his wife, if the father consents, and to pay the latter the usual purchase price, the amount of which is not defined. In the Deuteronomical Code (Dt 22 28) the amount is fixed at 50 shekels, and the seducer forfeits the right of divorce. (b) The seduction of a betrothed virgin: This case (Dt 22 23-27; not referred to in the other codes) is treated as virtually one of adultery, the virgin being regarded as pledged to her future husband as fully as if she were formally married to him; the penalty therefore is the same as adultery, viz. death for both parties (except in the case where the girl can reasonably be assumed to have consented, which case the man only is put to death). (c) The seduction of a betrothed bondmaid (mentioned only in Lev 19 20-22): Here there is no infliction of penalty, but the woman was not free and the seducer shall make a trespass offering, besides paying the fine. See Crimes; Penumishments.

D. MIALL EDWARDS

SEE, sē: In addition to the ordinary sense of percieving by the eye, we have (1) γυναῖκα, ἔκτοθ, "to see" (in vision): "Words of Amos . . . . which he saw concerning Israel" (Am 1 1). The revelation was made to his inward eye. The word of Jeh . . . , which he saw (Micah 3 14) is concerning the king (Mic 1 1), describing what he saw in prophetic vision (cf Hab 1 1); see Revelation, III, 4; (2) ἰδον, ἰδον, "to take heed": "See thou say nothing" (Mk 1 44); (3) ἵδον, ἵδον, "to know," to note with the mind: "Jesus made it answeringly" (Mk 12 34); (4) θέαν, θεόθροι, "to view," "to have knowledge or experience of": "He shall never see death" (Jn 8 51). M. O. EVANS

SEED, sēd (OT always for גַּנֵה, זְדֶא, Aram. [Dan 2 43] גַּנֵה, זְדֶא, except in Joel 1 17 for דְּרָעַד, חַרְבָּד [pl. RV "seeds," AV "seed"]; and Lev 19 19 [AV "mingled seed"] and Dt 22 9 [AV "divers seeds"]) for דְּרָעַד, חַרְבָּד, lit. "two kinds," RV "two kinds of seed." Inherantly in Gr Apoc and usually in the NT for σπέρμα, σπέρμα, but Mk 4 26-27; Lk 8 11; 2 Cor 9 10 for σπέρμα, σπέρμα, and 1 Pet 2 25 for σπέρμα, σπέρμα: (1) For "seed" in its literal sense (i.e. "what was sowed that he answered discreetly" (Mk 12 34); (2) [the word] 'seed,' except for the word 'seed' in the sense of a biological entity, it is the method of measuring land by means of the amount of seed that could be sown on it (Lk 17 26). The prohibition against using two kinds of seed in the same field (Lev 19 19; Dt 22 9) undoubtedly rests on the fact that the practice had some connection with Canaanitish worship, making the whole crop "consecrated" (taboo). Jer 31 27 uses "seed of man" and "seed of beast" as a figure for the means by which God will increase the prosperity of Israel (i.e. "seed yielding men"). (2) For the transferred physiological application of the word to human beings (Lev 15 16, etc) see CLEAN; UNCLEAN. The conception of Christians as "born" or "begotten" of God (see REGENERATION) gave rise to the figure in 1 Pet 1 23; 1 Jn 3 9. If the imagery is to be stressed, the Holy Spirit is meant. In 1 Jn 3 9 a doctrine of certain Gnostics is opposed. They taught that by learning certain formulas and by submitting to certain rituals God and salvation could be attained without holiness of life. St. John's reply is that union with a righteous God is meaningless without righteousness as an ideal, even though shortcomings exist in practice (1 Jn 1 8). The logical use of "seed" the transition to the sense of "offspring" was easy, and the word may mean "children" (Lev 18 21, etc) or even a single child (Gen 4 25; 4 8 11 RVm). Usually, however, it means the whole posterity (Gen 3 15, etc), of "seed royal" (2 K 11 1, etc), and "Abraham's seed" (2 Ch 20 7, etc) or the "holy seed" (Ezr 9 2; Isa 6 13; 1 Esd 8 70; cf Jer 21 21) as designations of Israel. So "to show one's seed" (Ezr 2 59; Neh 7 63) is to display one's genealogy, and "one's seed" may be simply one's union with Jehovah, conceived of as a single family (Est 10 3). From this general sense there developed a still looser use of "seed" as meaning simply "men" (Mal 2 15; Isa 1 4; 67 4; Wisd 10 15; 12 11, etc).

In Gal 3 16 St. Paul draws a distinction between "seeds" and "seed" that has for its purpose a proof that the promises to Abraham were realized in Christ and not in Israel. The distinction, however, overstates the language of the OT, which never uses "seed" as a designation of "many ancestors" (pl. only in 1 S 8 15; cf Rom 4 18; 9 7). But in an argument against rabbinical adversaries St. Paul was obliged to use rabbinical methods (cf Gal 4 25). For modern purposes it is probably best to treat such an exegetical method as belong-
ing simply to the (now superseded) science of the times.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

**SEER**, sə'ér, sêr: The word in EV represents two Heb. words, יָשָׁר, yəšār, and יָשָׁר, yəšār (1 S 9:11,18,19; 2 S 15:27; 1 Ch 9:22, etc.), and יָשָׁר, yəšār, hōzēk (2 S 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 S 9:9 that 'seer' (yəšār) was the older name for those who, after 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 yəšār 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 S 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 ff., ET), but it is not easy to fix a precise distinction. See Prophecy, PROPHECY.

JAMES ORS

**SEETHE**, sēth: Old Eng. for "boil;" past tense, "sod" (Gen 25:29), past participle, "sodden" (Lam 4:10). See Ex 23:19 AV.

**SEGUB**, sə'gūb, səgūbb [K'tîb], sə'gūb, səgūbb [K'tîb]; B, Zegovō, Zegobā, A, Zegovō; Segobā:

(1) The youngest son of Heiel, the builder of Jericho (1 K 16:34). 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 Gezza. 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 Heiel's oldest and youngest sons with a curse said to have been pronounced by Joshua to the land that should venture to rebuild Jericho (Josh 6:26).

(2) Son of Hezron and father of Jair (1 Ch 2:21).

HORACE J. WOLF

**SEIR**, sə'îr:

(1) (םֵיֵר, sə'îr), har sə'îr, "Mt. Seir" [Gen 14:6, etc.]. יֶשׁ "ר, 'eres sə'îr [Gen 29:3, etc.]; 7 בֵּי סֵיֵר, bēh se'îr; 7 בֵּי סֵיֵר, bēh se'îr]: 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 Horites, who succeeded the ancient Horites (Gen 14:6; 36:20), "came-dwellers" or "in possession. For a description of the land see Edom.

(2) יֵשׁ "ר, yəshēr; B, Assārā, Assārā, A, Sgeṭēr, Sēdēër]: A landmark on the boundary of Judah (Josh 15:10), not far from Kiriath-jearim and Chesalon. The name means "shaggy," and probably indicates a wooded height. It may be that part of the range which runs N.E. from Sārās by Kārēd-el-'Anab and Bēyda to the plateau of el-Ib. Traces of an ancient forest are still to be seen here.

W. EWING

**SEIRATH**, sə'îr-ôth, sə'î-ôth: [םֵיֵר, sə'îr], ho's-sə'î-rôth; B, Segobodā, Sefi'robā, Sefi'robā, A, Segobodā, Segobodā: AV Seirath; the place to which Ehud escaped after his assassination of Eglon, king of Moab (Jgs 3:20).

The name is from the same root as the Hebrew words for "wood," 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.

**SEIRATH**, sə'î-rath, sə'î-rath. See Seirah.

**SELA**, sə'î-lə, sə'î-lə, ho's-sə'î-lə [with the art.]: 'sela, petra, ĕh 'sela, hă petra; AV Selah (2 K 14:7). EV renders this name of a valley in 2 K 14:7; Isa 16:1. In Jgs 1:36; 2 Ch 25:12; and Ob ver 3, it translates lit. "rock;" but RVm in each case "Selah." 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 Māsā. In Jgs 1:36 its association with the Ascent of Arakabbin 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," ICC, 50), writing of Buḥ, noting the south-es-Sē‘lāth, "a bare and dazzlingly white sandstone promontory 1,000 ft. high, E. of the mud flats of es-Sebkah, and 2 miles S. of the Dead Sea." A more probable identification is a high cliff which commands the road leading from Buḥ to the Dead Sea, "valley of Salt," to Edom, over the pass of Akabrim. 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 Ahab was won in the Valley of Salt. He would naturally turn his arms at once against this stronghold (2 K 14:7); and it may well be the rock from the top of which he hurled his prisoners (2 Ch 25:12). He called it Jokneam, a name the meaning of which is obscure. Possibly it is the same as Jekuthiel (1 Ch 4:18), and may mean "preservation of God" (OHL, 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 wild eden clambered run out from Syria upon the desert, some hundred miles wide, twenty, on the E. They are said to be the finest rock scenery in the world. "Salvator Rosa never conceived so savage and so suitable a haunt for the handiwork of God." The cliffs are overhanging by defiles so narrow that two horsemen may scarcely ride abreast, and the sun is shut out by the overhanging rocks. . . . Little else than wild fowls' nests are the villages: human erryls 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, vii, 1) tells us that among the kings of the Medes who fell before Moses was one Reken, king of Rekem (akre, or rekeme), 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 Jechthoel; but the Syrians call it Rekem. Jokneam, as we have seen, must be sought elsewhere. There can be no doubt that Jos intended the city in Wady Māsā. Its OT name was Bozrah (Am 1:12, etc.). Wetstein (Ecclesiast in Delitzsch's Int., 696 f) hazards the conjecture that the ancient name was Bozrah has-Seira, "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
exploring parties. Of the descriptions written the best is undoubtedly that of Professor Dalman of Jerus (Petra und seine Felsfriedgärten, Leipzig, 1908). An excellent account of this wonderful city, brightly and interestingly written, will be found in Lithby and Hoskins' book (The Jordan Valley and Petra, New York and London, 1905; see also National Geographic Magazine, May, 1907, Washington, D.C.). The ruins lie along the sides of a spacious hollow surrounded by the many-hued cliffs of Edom, just before they sink into the Arabah on the W. It is near the base of Jebel Harân, about 50 miles

from the Dead Sea, and just N. of the watershed between that sea and the Gulf of Akaba. The valley owes its modern name, Wâdy Mâa, "Valley of Moses," to its connection with Moses in Moham-

medan 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 Sîk, "shaft," about a mile in length. In the bottom of the Sîk flows westward the stream that rises at A'in Mâa. E. of the cleft is the village of El'î, an ancient site, corresponding to Gaia of Onom. Passing this village, the road threads its way along the shadowy wind-
ing 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—Hadrians. 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 intro-
duced, 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 Bedawy families.

SELÂ, sê-lâ. See Music, II, 1.

SELED, sê-led (םלד, seledh): A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 2 30 bis).

SELEMA, sele-mâ'â: One of the swift scribes whose services Ezra was commanded to secure (2 Esd 14 24). The name is probably identical with Selémias of 1 Esd 9 34 (q.v.).

SELEMIA, sel-e-mí-a: One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esd 9 34) = "Selémiash" in Ezra 10 39, and probably identical with "Selémia" in 2 Esd 14 24.

SELEUCIA, sele-'u-kî-a (Seleucia, Seleukia): 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. Rhoous or Pleria, the modern Jebel Músâ, a spur of the Amanus Range. Built by Seleucus Nicator (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.55). 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 IV Epiphanes, who then rebuilt and adorned it. Captured again by Ptolemy Philometor 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, N. H. v.15), 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, on whose site the City and its suburbs 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 running 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

SELECTUDES, se-lo’si’dé. See Seleucus.

SELEUCUS, se-lo’kus (Σαλακος, Šéleukos): (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 310 BC, 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 Mac 1:6 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 Greek 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 Dnl 11:5 usually referred 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 Dnl 11:7–9, who was expelled from his kingdom by Ptolemy Euergetes.

(3) Seleucus III (Ceranus, "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 Dnl 11:5–6.

(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 Mac 3:3), a title claimed by the Seleucidae even after their serious losses in Asia Minor (see 1 Mac 8:6; 11:13; 12:29; 13:32). He was present at the decisive battle of Magnesia (190 BC). He was murdered by Heliodorus (q.v.), one of his own courtiers whom he had sent to plunder the Temple (2 Mac 3:1–40; Dnl 11:20).

For the connection of the above-named Seleucidae with the "ten horns" of Dnl 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. Hutchison

SELF-CONTROL, self-kon-trôl (ὑγράπτεια, egkôría): Rendered in AV "temperance" (cf Lat temperatio and continentia), but more accurately "self-control," as in RV (Acts 14:25; Gal 5:23; 2 Pet 1:6); adj. of same, ἐγκράτεια, egkrateia, "self-controlled" (Tit 1:8 RV); cf vb. forms in 1 Cor 7:9, "have . . . continency"; 9:25, the athlete "exerciseth self-control." Self-control is therefore repeatedly set forth in the NT as among the important Christian virtues.

SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS, self-r’chus-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 regarded themselves as righteous 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 8:19). See also sanctification. William Owen Canver

SELF-SURRENDER, self-su-ren’der: 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.
1. 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) and it was both under God's command. Abraham's offerings (Gen 22 1-19) were characteristic of self-surrender. Abraham left home and native country to go to a land unknown to him, because God called him to do so (12 1). He would give up all his cherished hopes in his only son Isaac, at the voice of God (22 1-18). Moses, at the call of Jeh, surrendered self, and undertakes to deliver his people, but not on his own account (Ex 3 11, 14; cf He 11 25). He would be utterly cast out of God's book, if only the people might be spared destruction (Ex 32 32).

The whole Levitical system of sacrifice may be said to imply the doctrine of self-surrender. The nation itself was a people set apart to Jeh, a holy people, a surrendered Levitical nation (Ex 19 5-6; 22 31; Lev 20 7; Dt 7 6; 14 2). The whole burnt offering implied the complete surrender of the worshipper to God (Lev 1). The ceremony for the consecration of priests emphasized the same fundamental doctrine (Lev 8); so also the law as to the surrender of the firstborn child (Ex 13 13 ff; 29 63).

In the Divine call to the prophets and in their life-work self-surrender is prominent. The seer, as such, must be receptive to the Divine impress, and as mouthpiece of God, his mouth speaks not his own words, but God's: "Thus saith the Lord." He was to be a "man of God," a "man of the spirit." The hand of the Lord was upon me (Ezk 1 3; 3 14) implies complete Divine mastery. Isaiah must submit to the Divine purification of his lips, and hearken to the inquiry, "Who will go for us?" with the surrendered response, "Here am I; send me" (Isa 6 8). Jeremiah must yield his protestations of weakness and inability to the Divine wisdom and the promise of endowment from above (Jer 1 1-10). Ezekiel surrendered to the dangerous and difficult task of becoming messenger to a rebellious house (Ezk 1 3-3). Jonah, after flight from duty, at last surrenders to the Divine will and goes to the Ninevites (Jon 3).

On the return of the faithful remnant from captivity, self-giving for the sake of Israel's faith was dominant, the people enduring great hardships for the future of the nation and the accomplishment of Jeh's purposes. This is the spirit of the great Messianic passage, Isa 53 7: "He was oppressed, yet when he was afflicted he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that before its sheurers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." Nehemiah surrendered position in Shushan to help reestablish the returned exiles in Jerus (Neh 2 5). Esther was ready to surrender her life in pleading for the welfare of her people (Est 4 16).

1. Christ's Teaching and Example.—As presented in the Gospels, give to it special emphasis. It is a prime requisite for becoming His disciple (Mt 10 38 f; 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; Mt 20 20; Lk 9 26; 15 27). His followers must so completely surrender self, as that father, mother, brother, self-kindred, and one's own life must be, as it were, hatred 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 self-hood (Mt 8 35; Mt 10 39). Our Lord not only taught self-surrender, but practised it. As a child, He subjected Himself to His parents (Lk 2 51).

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 34 35 37). Stephen and Apollos 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 24).

The Epps 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 and to the service of Paul 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 15 16), 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). Peter is the Christian is saved not by his own wisdom but 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).

Self-will, self-will (παραστασίς, ἀναθεματισμὸς, ἀπολύτρωσις): Found once in the OT (Gen 49 6, "In their will they have 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 rota around dignitaries (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, sel'fer. See Trade; Lydia.

Selvedge, sel'vej. See Trade; Lydia.

Selvedge, sel'vej. See Trade; Lydia.
These were “coupled” at the center by 50 loops of blue connected by “clips” (q.v.) with 50 others on the opposite side. The “sewedges” (self-edge), is the extremity of the curtain in which the loops were.

SEM, sem (נֵיס, סֵנָ); AV from the Gr form of Shem; thus RV (Lk 3:30).

SEMACHIAH, sem-ah-kia (סְמַכְּיָה, שֶׁמוֹקָה), “Jeh has sustained”: A Korahite family of gatekeepers (1 Ch 26 7). Perhaps the same name should be substituted for “Ismachiah” in 2 Ch 31 13 (see HPN, 201, 205).

SEMEI, sem-`ei: (1) (א, שֵׁ thiểu, ב, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ-more), One of those who put away their “strange wives” (1 Esd 9 33) “Shimei” of the sons of Hashum” in Ezr 10 33. (2) AV = RV “Semein” (Ad Est 11 2). (3) AV form of RV “Semeina” (Lk 3 26).

SEMEIAS, sĕ-mĕ-`as (ת, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ-more; ב, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ-more; AV Semei): An ancestor of Mordecai (Ad Est 11 2) “Shimei” (Est 2 5).

SEMEIN, sĕ-mĕ-in (ת, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ-more, א, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ-more, ת, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ-more; AV Semei): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk’s genealogy (Lk 3 26).

SEMEIS, sem-`e-is (א and Fritzsche, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ_more; ב, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ_more, ת, שֵׁ_MINOR, שֵׁ_more; AV Semesi): One of the Levites who put away their “strange wives” (1 Esd 9 23) “Shimei” in Ezr 10 23.

SEMELLUS, sĕ-mĕl`-lus: AV = RV Semellius (q.v.).

SEMIS, sem-`ysis: AV = RV Semeis (q.v.).

SEMITES, sem`-its, SEMITIC, sem`-it`-ik, RELIGION:

1. Biblical References
2. The Five Sons of Shem
3. Original Home of the Semites
4. Confusion with Other Races
5. Reliability of Gen 10
6. Semitic Languages
7. Semitic Religion
   (1) Its Peculiar Theism
   (2) Personality of God
   (3) Its View of Nature
   (4) The Moral Being of God

LITERATURE

The words “Semite,” “Semitic,” do not occur in the Bible, but are derived from the name of Noah’s oldest son, Shem (Gen 5 22; 6 10).

1. Biblical
   9 15 23 ff; 10 1 21 ff; 11 10 ff; 1 Ch References 1). Formerly the designation was limited to those who are mentioned in Gen 10, 11 as Shem’s descendants, most of whom can be traced historically and geographically; but more recently the title has been expanded to apply to others who are not specified in the Bible as Semites, and indeed are plainly called Hamitic, e.g. the Babylonians (Gen 10 10) and the Phoenicians and Canaanites (vs 15-19). The grounds for the inclusion of these Bib. Hamites among the Semites are chiefly linguistic, although political, commercial and religious affinities are also considered. History and the study of comparative philology, however, suggest the inadequacy of a linguistic argument.

The sons of Shem are given as Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud and Aram (Gen 10 22). All except the third have been readily identified, Elam as the historic nation in the highlands E. of the Tigris, between Media and Persia; Asshur as the Assyrians; Lud as the Lydians of Asia Minor; and Aram as the Syrians both E. and W. of the Euphrates. The greatest uncertainty is in the identification of Arphaxad, the most linguistic ancestor of the Semitic tongue, of those of Bib, and more recent importance.

2. 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 (Ἀρφάχθαδ, Arphaxad) has given endless trouble to ethnographers. Most critics divide the two sons, Arpach or Arpeth, unidentified, and kessed, the sing. of kasdim, i.e. the Chaldeans; Schrader also holds to the Chaldaean interpretation, and the Chaldeans themselves traced their descent from Arphaxad (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 Arrapachaitis, 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 Arphaxad as the most northeasterly of the five Sem tribes (Gen 10 22), we are still faced by the problem of the primitive racial and cultural roots 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 conserva- 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 Arphaxad still farther north. It is not difficult to understand a racial movement from the moun- tains of the N.E. into the lowlands of the South and West. But the primitive Arabs 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 hillsides and in the interior of Asia Minor. The majority of the eldest branch migrated in prehistoric times south- ward to become historic Elam; Lud moved west- ward into Asia Minor. Asshur found his way down the Tigris to become the sturdy pastoral people of the middle Mesopotamian plain; Aram poured into the highlands of the Bab colonists and civilization; Aram found a home in Upper Mesopotamia; while Arphaxad, 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 confinement 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 dis- tinctive and virile elements which were to impress the Sem face to the world at any time, 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 in turn their fertile valleys of early Babylonia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Pal. Thus who settled Arabia sent further migrations into Africa, as well as rehoming into the desert west of the Euphrates, Syria and Pal. Thus Western Asia became the arena of Sem life, whose influences also reached Egypt. Although Phoenicia, the far-western Mediterranean.

While we properly may call Western and Southwestern Asia the home of the Sem peoples, there still remains the difficulty of separating the language of the Sem occupants of the Levant from those of the Hamites who went earlier toward the South and as their younger relatives, the Aravans, 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.

The phrase Sem 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 the customary inference that nations using the same or similar languages are necessarily of common stock. There are other explanations of linguistic affinity than racial, as the Indians of Mexico may speak Spanish and Sem have developed a language such as the Semitic languages of the modern Hebrew, or Arabic, or the Assyr-

4. Confusion with Other Babylarians, e.g., were Sem; yet 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 therefore which gods, customs, laws, etc., of the Babylarians were Sem, and not adopted from other Sem races which they superseded.

Assyria was racially purely Sem, but her laws, customs, literature, and religion of the Sem peoples were acquired from Babylonia; to such an extent was this true that we are indebted to the Sem people for much that we know of Bab Sem religion, literature and history. In Syria also the same mixed conditions prevailed, for throughout the whole area of the Euphrates lay the highway of the nations, and Hittite and Mitannian at times shared the land with her, and left their influence. Possibly in Arabia Sem blood ran purest, but even in Arabia there were tribes from other races; and the table of the nations in Genesis divides that land among the descendants of both Ham and Sem (see Table of Nations). In Palestine, in the borderland of the Semic historic period, we find an intermingling and confusion of races and religions such as no other Sem center presented. A Hamitic people gave one of its common Sem names to the country—Canaan, while the pagan and late-coming Philistines left the country and the Canaanites. The archaic remains of Horite, Avite and Hivite are being uncovered by exploration; these races survived in places, go doubt, long after the Sem invasion, contributing their quota to the customs and religious practices of the land. The Hittite also was in the land, holding outposts from his northern empire, even in the extreme south of Pal. If the blue eyes and fair complexion of the Americans pictured on Egyptian monuments are true representations, we may believe that the gigantic Aryans of the North had their portion also in Pal.

It is customary now in Bib. etymology to disregard the classification of Gen 10, and to group together the Canaanite and the Semitic languages. Along with the Hebrew, McCurdy postulates the Canaanite and the Phoenician 5. Reliability of Gen 10 in the Standard BD treats the various origin of the Semitic races and religious customs of Pal as though they were all Sem, although uniformly these are represented in the OT as persecutions and enormities of alien races which the Hebrews were commanded to exterminate. The adoption of this would be, and was, inimical to their own ancestral faith. Because the language of the Canaanite, appropriated his art and empowers, did traffic in his ships, and in Ahab's reign adopted his Baal and Anat, we were not warranted at all in rushing to the conclusion that the language of the Phoenicians represented a primitive 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 pagan and even the later 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 Sem and the practice of 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 Cau-

6. Semitic Languages

The Semitic languages are a group of languages which have marked features in common, which also set them off from other languages. We must avoid the customary inference that nations using the same or similar languages are necessarily of common stock. There are other explanations of linguistic affinity than racial, as the Indians of Mexico may speak Spanish and Sem have developed a language such as the Semitic languages of the modern Hebrew, or Arabic, or the Assyr-

7. Semitic Religion

In the study of Sem Religion there are two tendencies toward error: (1) The Western pragmatical and unreflecting view of Oriental Nature-symbols and vividly imaginative speech. Because the Semite used the figure of the rock (De 32:18,30) in describing God, or poetically conceived of the storm and its effect as the beam and the flash of lightning, he 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 of the essence of Sem religion, e.g. the golden calf following the Egyptian bondage, and the sexual abominations of the Canaanites, brought to the lose.

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 prehistorical. Our sources of information are the Bab and Assyry tablets and monuments, the Egyptian inscriptions, Phoen history, Arabian traditions and inscriptions, etc., pertaining to the Semites. We can never know perhaps how much the Semites of Babylonia and Assyrians were diverted and corrupted by the developed civilization which they invaded and appropriated; Egypt was only indirectly affected by Sem life; Sem development in Arabia was the latest in each group, upon which the monuments and ruins of Arabian antiquity
which have come down to us are comparatively few; and the Phoen development was corrupted by the intrusions of the ancient Canaanitish cults, while the Bible of the Hebrews probably differed a good deal from the unw hose 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 important features of an ancient belief, 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 we are to believe evidence to reform its name monotheism, and to rate the later polytheistic representations of Babylonia and Assyria as local perversions. If the old view that Sem religion was essentially monothelitic be incapable of proof, it is true that the development of the concept of God must ultimately arrive at monotheism. 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 pre-dominantly, 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 Jeh, 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 thinly abstract and etherealize him and so eliminate him from the experience of man as did the Grecian; but to him the universal was also the 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 rejoicing, the home-rite. 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. Simile, parable and Nature-marvels cover the pages and tablets of their records. Unfortunately this poetic conception of Nature's quaternity was encroached upon by a ready path in which wayward feet and carnal minds might wander toward Nature-worship with all of its formalism and its degrading excesses. This feature of Sem religion offers an interesting commentary on its religious 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 sunshine 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 millennia. 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 theirism. 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 5-6; Jsa 6 1-8; De 7 6-25).

While these elements are not absent altogether from other ancient religions, they are pronouncedly characteristic of the Sem to the extent that we have given to it its permanency of development, and its primacy among the religions of the human race. To know God, to hear His eternal voice, to clothe Him with light as with a garment, to establish His throne in righteousness, to perceive in the holiness of His universe the all-pervading atmosphere 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_, _Abraham_, _Moses_, _Pharaoh_, _Sanad_, _Sennacherib_, _Semites_, _Sennacherib_, _Sanad_, _Sennacherib_, _Sennacherib_, _Sennacherib_, _Sennacherib_, _Sennacherib_, _Sennacherib_, _Sennacherib_. The children of Sem are mentioned by a few old and 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 Sanah, A V and _Aram._ The name Sanad, A V, _Aram._ In Neh 3 3 the name occurs with the def. art., ha-sanah. The people may be identical with the Benjamite clan Hassehna (1 Ch 9 7). Onom speaks of Magdal-senta, a village about 7 miles N. of Jericho, which may be the place intended, but the name is not known. W. EWING

_SENATE_ sem'at, _Senator_, sem'at-tar: in 1 Po 105 22, "teach his senators [IVV "advice""] wisdom.", 1 Th 5 21, "the Heb is ?", 2 Th 3 1, "by LXX perebore, presbiteroi." In Acts 5 21, "called the council together and all the senate of the children of Israel." The Gr _γεωργία, γεωργία, is here evidently used as a more precise equivalent of the foregoing "council" (_συνέδριον, συνέδριον_), to which it is also rendered by ral, le, etc. Biblical has not to the Sanhedrin. See _SANEDRIN._ This term _γεωργία_
occurs in LXX Ex 3:16, etc., and in 1 Mac 12:6; 2 Mac 1:10; 44 of the supreme council of the Jews (see Government). In 1 Mac 8:15; 12:3, Boulethorpos, bouleutherion, is used of the Rom senate, which is said to consist of 320 members meeting once a month; the council, when not convened, is supposed to be the supreme magistrates, to which the people are to go in case they may be well governed. These statements are not quite accurate, since the senate consisted normally of 300 members, and met not daily, but on call of the magistrates. Originally, like the gerousia of the Jews, the representatives of families and clans (genetes), the senators were subsequently the exmagistrates, supplemented, to complete the tale of members, by representatives of patrician (in time also of plebeian) families selected by the censor. The tenure was ordinarily for life, though it might be terminable for cause by the censor. Although constitutionally the senate was only an advisory body, its advice (senatus consultum, auctoritas) in fact became in time a mandate which few dared to disregard. During the republican period the senate practically ruled Rome; under the empire it tended more and more to become the creature and subservient tool of the emperors.

William Arthur Heidel

Seneh, sen'ne (סנה, seneh; Σαννά, Sanná): This was the name attaching to the southern of the two great cliffs between which ran the gorge of Michmash (1 S 14:4). The name means "acacia," and may have been given to it from the thorn bushes growing upon it. Jos (BJ, V, ii, 1) mentions the "plain of thorns" near Gabathasaul. We may hear an echo of the old name in that of Wady Saueinih, "valley of the little thorn tree," the name by which the gorge is known today. The cliff must have stood on the right side of the valley, see Boenz. Conder gives an excellent description of the place in Tent Work in Pal, II, 112-14.

W. Ewing

Senir, se'nir (סניר, 8nir; Σαννήρ, Saneir): This was the Amorite name of Mt. Hermon, according to Dt 3:9 (AV "Shenir"). But in 1 Ch 5:25; Cant 4:8, we have Senir and Hermon named as distinct mountains. It seems probable, however, that Senir applied to a definite part of the Anti-Lebanon or Hermon range. An inscription of Shalmaneser III, king of Damascus, fortified Mt. Senir over against Mt. Lebanon. So in Ezek 27:5, Senir, whence the Tyrians got planks of fir trees, is set over against Lebanon, where cedars were obtained. The Arab geographers give the name part of Jebel Ser, to the part of the Anti-Lebanon range which lies between Damascus and Homs (Yakut, c 1225 AD, quoted by Guy le Strange in Pal under the Mamelons, 79. He also quotes Maasudi, 943 AD, to the effect that Baalbek is in the district of Senir, 205).

W. Ewing

Sennacherib, se-nak'er-ib (סנָכַּרְוּ, gınkarthih; Σανναχερίμ, Sennacherîm, Assyr Sin-akkî-erba, "the moon-god Sin has increased the brothers"): Sennacherib (704-682 BC) ascended the throne of Assyria after the death of his father Sargon. Appreciating the fact that Babylon would be difficult to control, instead of endeavoring to conciliate the people he ignored them. The Babylonians, being indignant, crowned a man of humble origin, Nergalushshu, as king by name. He ruled over a month, having been driven from power by the ascendancy of Merodach-baladan, who again appeared on the scene.

In order to fortify himself against Assyria the latter sent an embassy to Hezekiah, apparently for the purpose of inspiring the W. to rebel against Assyria (2 K 20:9-19).

Sennacherib in his first campaign marched into Babylonia. He found Merodach-baladan intrenched 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 massacred a Babylonian, named Bêl-ibni, on the throne.

This campaign was followed by an invasion of the country of the Cassites and Isubigalleans. In his third campaign he directed his attention to the W., where the people had become restless under the Assy yoke. Hezekiah had been victorious over the Philis (2 K 18:8). In preparation to withstand 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 Assyria, had made provision to resist Assyria. The first move was at Ekron, where the Assy governor Padi was put into chains and sent to Hezekiah at Jerusalem.

Sennacherib, in 701, moved against the cities in the W. He ravaged the environs of Tyre, but made no attempt to take the city, which was supported by a naval force. After Elulaeus 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 Assyria. Askelon and other cities were captured. The king of Babylon was routed at Eltekeh, and Ekron was destroyed. He claims to have conquered 46 strongholds of Hezekiah'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 18:13-19:17; 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 Assy king (see Expos T, XII, 225, 405; XIII, 236).

In the following year Sennacherib returned to Babylonia to put down a rebellion by Bêl-ibni and Merodach-baladan. The former was sent to Assyria, and the latter soon afterward died. Ashur-nadin-shum, the son of Sennacherib, was then crowned king of Babylon. A campaign into Cilicia and Cappadocia 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 Nergalushshu 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 Khaldûth 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 Shanitzer). Eshar-haddon their younger brother, who was at the time conducting a campaign against Ararat, was declared king in his stead.

A. T. Clay

Senses, sen'zē: The tr of ἀκοῆς, ακοθήριον (He 6:4, 14, "those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good"). The word means, primarily, the seat of the senses, the region of feeling; in the LXX of Jer 4:19, it represents the Heb בור, "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 Esdr 10:36 we have "Or is my sense deceived, or do I see in a dream?" Lat. sensus, here "mind," rather than "sense." W. L. Walker

SENSUAL, sen'shə-nil (ψυχικός, psuchikós, "animal," "natural"): Bib. psychology has no English equivalent for this Gr original. Man subject to the lower appetites, sarkikos, "fleshly," in the communion of his spirit with God he is πνευματικός, pneumatikós, "spiritual." Between the two is the ψυχή, psuchē, "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 (psuchē) 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, poiesma).

The subjection of the soul to the animal nature is man's debasement, to the spirit indwelt of God is his exaltation. The Gr. 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 psuchē, "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" (Jud 20:10). It ranges all the way from sensuality to self-indulgence to gross immorality. In the utter subjection of the spirit to sense it is the utter exclusion of God from the life. Hence "the natural [psuchikos] man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2:14). This term is equivalent to "the mind of the flesh" (Rom 8:7) which is "not subject to the law of God." See PSYCHOLOGY. Dwight M. Pratt

SENT (σήμα, shēlāh; σαρτόλα, apostēlah): "Sent!" in the OT is the tr of shēlāh, "to send!" (of presents, messengers, etc., Gen 32:18; 44:3; Josh 6:14; 1 K 14:6; Est 3:13; Prov 17:11; Jer 49:14; Ezek 3:23; 40: Dtn 10:11, 12; Ob 1:7). Of ἁπλώνshēlāh, "sending" (Ex 15:13), ἀποστέλλειν, "to send off or away," "to send forth" (Jn 9:7), "the pool of Siloam [which is by interpretation, Sent]" (cp. Lk 13:4; Neh 3:15, the "pool of Siloah," RV Shēlēkha; Isa 8:6, "the waters of Shiloah that go softly," where LXX has Siloah for Heb shēlāh, in sending," which rather than "Sent," is the original meaning—a sending forth of waters. See Siloam. "Sent!" is also the tr of ἀπόστολος, "one sent forth" (the original of the familiar word "apostle"); cp. in Jn 13:16, "one that is sent" (m Gr an apostole,); of He 1:14. W. L. Walker

SENTENCE, sen'tens: Eight Heb and three Gr words are thus tr. In AV: Sometimes it points to a mystery (Dtn 5:12; 8:29); then again to the contents of the Law (Dt 17:11); then again to the idea of judgment (Ps 17:2) or of a judicial sentence (2 Cor 1:9; Lk 23:24), or of judicial advice (Acts 15:19, ARV "judgment").

SENUAH, sēnū'a, sēn-ū'-a (סנוא, sō'nā): In AV "A Benjamite" (Neh 11:9); RV has "Hassenuah," transliterating the def. art. AV is to be preferred (cf 1 Ch 9:7).

SEORIM, sē-ôrîm, sē-ôrîm (סֵ֫וֹרִים, sō'rim): The name borne by one of the (post-exilic) priestly courses (1 Ch 23:8).

SEPARATE, sep'a-rat: The tr of a number of Heb and Gr words, יָ֫זֶר, yāzer, bāḥāl (Lev 20:24, etc), and ἄφωνομ, aphōnōμ (Mt 26:32, etc), being the most common. "To separate" and "to consecrate" were originally not distinguished (e.g. Nu 6:1-3), and probably the majority of the Gr. words "separate" in EV connote "to set apart for God." But precisely the same term that is used in this sense may also denote the exact opposite (e.g. the use of ναζαρ in Ezek 14:7 and Zec 7:3). See HOLY; NAZRITE; SAINT.

SEPARATION, sep'a-rā'shun: In the Pent the word niddah specially points to a state of ceremonial uncleanness (Lev 12:2-5; 15:20f; Nu 6:4f; 12:13; 19:21). For a description of the "water of purification," used for cleansing what was ceremonially unclean (Nu 19), see ḤEIPHER, RED; UNCLEANNESS. For "separation" in the sense of nēzer, see NAZRITE.

SEPHER, sep'fär: Only in Gen 10:30 (תֵ֫פֶ֫ר, tōfēr, "toward Sephar"), as the eastern limit of the territory of the sons of Yoktan (Joktan). From the similarity between the names of most of Yoktan's sons and the name of his great-grandsons, towns or districts, it can hardly be doubted that Sephar is represented by the Arab. Zafār. The appropriateness of the site seems to outweigh the discrepancy between Arab. شَفَر and Heb שָׁבְר. But two important towns in South Arabia bear this name. The one lies a little to the S. of Ṣanʿa. According to tradition it was founded by Shammar, one of the Sabaeans kings, and for a long time served as the royal seat of the Tubbas. The other Zafār stands on the coast in the district of Shahr, E. of Ḥodra-munt. The latter is probably to be accepted as the Bib. site. A. S. Pezron

SEPHERAD, sep'fə-rad, sep'-fə-rad (שֵ֫פֶ֫רְד, shōphērād, "toward Sephar"): Mentioned in Ob 20 as the place of captivity of certain "captives of Jerus," but no clear indication is given of locality. Many conjectures have been made. The Tg of Jonathan identifies with Spain; hence the Spanish Jews are called Sepharadim. Others (Pusey, etc) have connected it with the Ḥepārī of the Babylonian Inscriptions, and some have even identified it with "Sardis." The now generally accepted view is that which connects it with the "Separdas" of the Assyrian inscriptions, though whether this is to be located to the E. of Assyria or in Northern Asia Minor is not clear. See Schrader, "Sepphar" in DB, 145-46; Sayce, HCM, 482-84; arts. in DB, HDB, EB, etc.

JAMES OHR

SEPHERVAIM, sep'er-vā'im, sep'-ər-vā'im (שֵ֫פֶ֫ר-וֹאִים, šōphērō'ā'îm): Identified with the Šeppharvaim, Šēphērāvaim, Seppharoam, Sepharvaim, the Two Baby- i. Formerly φαροίν, Seppharōn, Šēphērāvōn, the first two being the forms in MSS A and B respectively, of the second in MSS and the last two in Isa): This city, mentioned in 2 K 17:24; 18:34; 19:13; Isa 36:19; 37:13, is generally identified with the Sept(p)ar of the Assyry-Bab inscriptions (Zimūr in Sumerian), on the Euphrates about 15 miles S.W. of Baghdad. It was one of the two great seats of the worship of the Bab sun-god Šamaš, and also of the goddess Ishtar and Anunit, and seems to have had two principal districts, Sippur of Šamaš, and Sippur of Anunit, which, if the identification were correct, would account for the dual termination -ayin, in Heb. This is the modern Inshād el-Bah, which was first excavated by the late Hormuzd Rassam in 2721 THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA Senach Sepharvaim
1881, and has furnished an enormous number of
1. The manuscripts, Later
2. Difficulties: Sepharvaim is referred to, and, as
   it is not at all surprising, the Reb Sippur never
   identified
3. Another
   Hamath, implying that they lay in Syria.
   Joseph Hâlevy therefore suggests (2 A. II, 401 f) that
   it should be identified with the Shream of
   Ezk 47 16, between Damascus and
   another
   Hamath (the dual implying a frontier
   suggestion town), and the same as the
   Sabarâ'în of the Bab Chronicle, there referred to
   as having been captured by Shalmaneser. As,
   however, Sabarâ'în may be read Sâmarrâ'în, it
   is more likely to have been the Heb Sha'marâ'în (Sa-
   maria), as pointed out by Fried. Deltitzch.
   LITERATURE—See Schrader, COT, I, 71 f; Kittel on
   Κ; Dillmann-Kittel on Isd, ad loc.; T. G. Pinches
   SEPHARVITES, sephâr-vîts, sephâr-vîts (Σεφάρβιτοι,
   g-pharwim): in 2 K 15 7, the inhabitants of
   Sepharvaim (q.v.), planted by the king of Assyria
   in Sâmarrâ'. They continued there to burn their
   children to their nativ gods.
   SEPPHORIS, sephô-ris: a city of Galilee, taken by
   Josephus (Vita, IX, lvii, 71) and later de-
   stroyed by the son of Varus (Ant, XVII, x, 9).
   SEPTUAGINT, sep'tu-a-jint:
I. Importance
II. Name
III. Traditional Origin
   1. Letter of Aristobulus and Philo
   2. Later Accretions
   3. Criticism of the Arian Story
   4. Date
   5. Credibility
IV. Evidence of Prologue to Sirach
V. Transmission of the LXX Text
   1. Early Corruption of the Text
   2. Official Revision of Hebrew Text c 100 AD
   3. Transmission of the LXX by Christ
   4. Alternative 2d-Century Greek Versions
   5. Alexandrian
   6. Theodotion
   7. Symmachus and Others
   8. Origen and the Hexapla
   9. Hexaplaric Manuscripts
   10. Receptions Known to Jerome
   11. Hesychian Recension
   12. Lucianic Recension
VI. Reconstruction of LXX Text, 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. Old Testament
   2. New Testament
   3. Bipartition of Books
   4. Grouping and Order of Books
   5. Characteristics of the Version and Its Component Parts
    1. Grouping of Books on Internal Evidence
       (a) The Hexateuch
       (b) The "Latter" Prophets
       (c) Partial Version of the "Former" Prophets
       (d) Historical Books
       (e) The Pauline Epistles
       (f) The Latest LXX Translations
    2. General Characteristics
   IX. Salient Differences between Greek and Hebrew Texts
      1. Writings
      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 revi-
   sion of the Heb which took place early in the 2d
   cent. AD. It supplies the materials for the recov-
   ering 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 inter-
   national 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 Alex-
   andria, 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 introducing the outside world to a know-
   ledge 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 were the majority
   of their express citations from Scripture borrowed
   from it, but their writings contain numerous
   reminiscences of its language. Its words are house-
   hold words to them. It laid for them the founda-
   tions of a religious and legal language which
   became a potent weapon for missionary work, and, when
   VSs of the Scriptures into other languages became
   necessary, it was in most cases the LXX and not
   the Heb from which they were made. Preeminent
   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, trans-
   mitted 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 proof-
   texts to both parties in the Arius controversy. Its
   language gives it another strong claim to recog-
   nition. Undecided and unchristian 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 con-
   temporary 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 "Hebraic" or "common
   language." i.e. the international form of the Heb
   since the time of Alexander, replaced the old dia-
   lect, and of which the spoken Gr of today is the
   literal descendant. The VS was made for the
   populace and written in large measure in the lan-
   guage of their everyday life.
II. Name—The name "Septuagint" is an abbrevi-
ation of Interpretatio secundum (or iuxta) Sep-
quinta seniorum (or viros), i.e. the Gr tr of the OT
of which the first installment was, according to
the Alexandrian legend (see III, below), contributed
by 70 (or 72) elders sent from Jerusalem to Alex-
andria 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 N T translators refer to them under the abbreviation of ⲳⲧⲧ Ⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ ("the seventy"), or ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ ("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 "Ω.

III. Traditional Origin.—The traditional account of the tr of the Pent is contained in the so-called letter of Aristeas (see Gr text, F. Wendland, Teubner series, 1890, and Thackeray in the App. to Swete's Intro to the OT in Gr, 1900, etc; Wendland's sections cited below appear in Swete's Intro, ed 2; ET by Thackeray, Macmillan, 1904, reprinted from JQR, XV, 357, and H. T. Andrews in Charles's Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT, II, 58-122, Oxford, 1913).

The writer professes to be a high official at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 BC), a Greek interested in Jewish antiquities.

1. Letter of Aristeas.—In his Philemometer (182-146 BC), writes the letter to Philadelphia at the request of the Jewish leaders, including Eleazar. Aristeas describes an embassy to Jerusalem in which he has recently been sent with another courtier Andras. According to his narrative, Demetrius 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 text at the same time, to propitiate the nation from whom he was asking a favor, composed, on the suggestion of Aristeas, to liberate all Jewish slaves in Egypt; we severely", 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 the names of the selected translators are appended to his letter.

The translators arrive at Alexandria, bringing a copy of the Law written in letters of gold on rolls of skin, and are honorably received by Ptolemy. A seven days' banquet follows, at which the king tests the proficiency of each in the task handling. Three days later Demetrius conducts them across the mole known as the Heptastadion to the island of Pharos, where, with all necessaries provided for their convenience, they continue their task, as by a miracle, in one day, "we seventy", 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 desire that Gr writers had remained in ignorance of its contents; he directed that the books should be preserved with scrupulous care.

To set beside this account we have two pre-Christian allusions in Jewish writings. Aristobulus, addressing a Ptolemy who has been identified as

2. Evidence from Ptolemy Philadelphus and Irenaeus. — A large number of the main features of the story were believed at Alexandria within a century of the date assigned by "Aristeas" to the tr. Philo (Vit. Mose, ii.5 ff) repeats the story of the sending of the translators 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 letter should have occurred and spread among the translators. Philo's evidence seems therefore to rest in part on an independent tradition. His account in one particular paves the way for later acceptions; he hints at the inspiration of the translators and the miraculous acquisition of their separate parts, as if they prophesied like men possessed, not one in one way and one in another, but all producing the same words and phrases as though some unseen prompers were at the ears of each. At the end of the 1st cent. AD one his rare MSS (XI, ii. 1 ff) large portions of the letter, which he paraphrases, but does not embellish.

Christian writers accepted the story without suspicion and amplified it. A catena of their evidence is given here, an abbreviated list of the MSS.

3. Later Accretions.—Principal additions to the narrative, all clearly baseless fabrications.

(1) The translators worked independently, in separate cells, and produced identical versions. Ptolemy proposing this test of their genuineness, at the head of a list of Alexandria, Augustine, the Chronicon Paschale and the Epitome of Eusebius (wrongly attributed to the author of the last work asserts that he had seen the books of the Law while in Alexandria and had secured a copy of the original tr. A modification of this legend says that the translators worked in pairs in 36 cells. So Epiphanius (d. 403 AD), and later G. Syncellus, Julius Pollux and Zonaras. Epiphanius' account is the most detailed. The translators were locked up in sky-lighted cells in pairs with attendants and shorthand writers; each pair was entrusted with one book, the books were then circulated, and 36 identical VS of the whole Law, as well as apocryphal books, were produced; Ptolemy wrote two letters, one asking for the original scriptures, the second for the translations. The immediately, the two embassies appears already in the 2nd cent. AD, in Justin's Apology (XIII, viii.3-4), as the estimation of the translators and the confirmation of the fact by the Prophets and the whole Bible recurs in the two Cyril and in Chrysostom. (5) The miraculous agreement of the translators presents the most striking evidence for the authors (Brennan, etc. of Philo). (6) As regards date, Clement of Alexandria omits the translation, with a note referring the VS back to the time of the first Ptolemy (522-385 BC); while Chrysostom brings it down to "a hundred or more years elsewhere, "not many years" before the coming of Christ." Justin ably states that Ptolemy's embassy was sent to King Herod: the Chronicon Paschale calls the high priest of the time Onias Simon, brother of Eleazar.

Jerome was the first to hold these later inventions up to ridicule, contrasting them with the older and genuine traditions in Jewish circles at Alexandria. The origin of the legend of the miraculous consensus of the 70 translators has been reasonably sought in a passage in Ex 54 LXX to which Epiphanius expressly refers. We there read of 70 elders of Israel, not heard of again, who with Aaron, Nadab and Abihu form a link between Moses and the people. After reciting the Book of the Covenant Moses ascends to the top of the mount; the 70, however, ascend a little way and are hidden from view:

According to the LXX text "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood . . . and of the elect of Israel not one perished" (ver 11), i.e. they were privileged to escape the usual effect of a vision of the Deity (Ex 33 20). But the vb. used for
"perish" (diapathomai) was uncommon in this sense; "not one disagreed" would be the obvious meaning; hence apparently the legend of the agreement of the translators, the later intermediaries between Moses and Israel of the Dispersion. When the translations were recited, "no difference was discoverable," says Epiphanius using the same word, cave-dwellings in the island of Pharsus probably account for the legend of the cells. A curious phenomenon has recently suggested that there is an element of truth in one item of Epiphanius' obviously apocryphal narrative, viz. the working at the translators in pairs. The Greek books of Jer and Ezek fall into two nearly equal parts, apparently the work of separate translators (see VII, 1, [2], below); while in Ex, Lev and Psalms orthographical details indicate a similar division of the books for clerical purposes. There was, it seems, a primitive custom of transcribing each book on 2 separate rolls, and in the case of Jer and Ezek the practice goes back to the time of tr (TS, IV, 245 ff., 398 ff.; LS, 85 ff.).

Beside the later extravagances, the story of Aristaeus appears problematical. Yet it has long been recognized that much of the story is unhistorical, in particular the professed date and nationality of the Aristaeus writer. Its claims to authenticity are those of the later, not the earlier, Ptolemaic age.

The letter was used by Jos and probably known to Philo. How much earlier is it? Schurer (HJR, II, iii, 309 f. [614], III, 698-16), relying on the passage (1), the surgeon of Philo, and the tradition that the age of the translator is one of Palestinian translators is likewise fictitious. Dr. Swete acutely observes that Aristaeus, in stating that the tr was read to and welcomed by the Jewish community before being presented to the king, unconsciously reveals its true origin. It was no doubt produced to meet their own needs by the large Jewish colony at Alexandria. A demand that the Law should be read in the synagogues in a tongue "understood of the people" was the originating impulse.

IV. Evidence of Prologue to Strach.—The interesting, though in places tantalizingly obscure, prologue to Ecclesiastes throws light on the progress made with the tr of the remaining Scriptures before the end of the 2nd cent. BC.

The translator dates his settlement in Egypt, during which he produced his VS of his grandfather's work, as "the 38th year under Euergetes the king." The records have kept the subject of the tr before the majority of critics, we may interpret this to mean the 38th year of Euergetes II, reckoning from the beginning (1 Macc. 5, 3) of his joint reign, i.e. 132 BC. Euergetes I reigned for 25 years only. Others, in the absence of the superscription, suppose that the age of the translator is intended, but the superscriptional form of expression is not unparalleled. A recent explanation of the date (Hart, Ecclus in Gr) that the 38th year of Philadephos which was also the last year of Euergetes I (i.e. 247 BC) is more ingenious than convincing.

The prologue implies the existence of a Gr VS of the Law, the Prophets and "the rest of the books." The translator, craving his readers' indulgence for the imperfections of his work, due to the difficulty of reproducing Heb in Gr, adds that others have experienced the same difficulties and that the work itself and the prophecies and the rest of the books have no small difference when spoken in their original language. From these words we may understand that at the time of writing (132-100 BC) Alexandrian Jews possessed Gr VSS of a large part (probably not the whole) of the "Prophets," and of some of the "Writings" or Hagiographies. For some internal evidence as to the order in which the several books were tr see VIII, below.

V. Transmission of the LXX Text.—The main value of the LXX is its witness to an older Heb text than our own. But before we can reconstruct this Heb text we need to have a pure Gr text before us, and this we are at present far from possessing. The Gr text has had a long and complex history of
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 are now more certain of the rabbin of the *ipsissima 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 "doubts" 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 Aristeus (III, 5, [0] above). Traces of corruption appear in Philo's *Corruption of Text* (e.g. his comment, in *Quis Rer. Div.* Her. 56, on Gen 16, 15, shows that already in his day *taφες*, "buried," had become *τραφεσ*, "nurtured," as in all our MSS); doubtless also Symmachus, the NT author of He quotes (12 15) a corrupt form of the Gr of Dt 29 18.

But it was not until the beginning of the 2nd cent. AD that the divergence between the Gr 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 Jerusalem. 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 an official text.

But another cause widened still farther the distance between the texts of Jews and Christians.

This was the adoption of the LXX by the Christian Church. A做的事c. AD 50 the Christian LXX writers, and in proof of their doctrines, the Jews began to question its accuracy. Hence mutual recensions 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 *γενικην* in Is 7 14, where they claimed with justice that "young woman" would be more accurate. Justin retaliates 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 canons of interpretation which were set 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 Pella, he was friends with Herod the Great and was thus to a certain extent under Hadrian (117-38 AD) and was related to that emperor: there is no possibility that Epiphanius' statement that Hadrian intrusted to Aquila the supervision of the building of the temple, which was only completed when he was certain that there he was converted to Christianity by Christian exiles returning from Pella, but that refusing to abandon his astrological he was forced on to Rome and to Jew and was actuated by a bias against Christianity in his revision of the OT, is that in certain cases of the new rabbinical school, 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 lit., if it can be classed under that category at all. No jot or tittle of the Heb might be neglected, and a manuscript 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 text (Gen 1 1) may be rendered: In heading forth God said, God created heaven and earth."

"or "summary" was selected because the Heb word for "beginning" (Monda) represents the same word prefixed to the accusative case, but indistinguishable from the proposition "with" (Gen 1 1). Though the Textual Gr was not the text, but written in archaic Heb characters, a slave to the *ipsissima verba* as Origen has been aptly described by a modern writer as "a colossal crip" (Burkitt, *JQR*, October, 1906, 207 ff). Yet it was a success in the days of the young Church. It was taken in part by the Jews, figures in the Antiochian *Septuagint*, and continued in use for several centuries; just as the Gr, 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 compiler shows a considerable command, its importance lay in its being the closest (as far as it was 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 bold attempts have been made to make it an authoritative text, it cannot be charged with being intentionally antagonistic to Christianity. If the origin of the "seven variant" is due to the fact that only from extracts in MS, some palimpsest fragments were recovered from the Cairo Genizah in 1897 and edited by E. C. Burkitt (*Critical Edition of the Books of Psalms, 1909*), and by C. Taylor (*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, 1897*; *Hebr-Gr Psalters*) 1000. The student of Swete's OT will trace Aquila's unmistakable style in the footnote to the Books of S and K; the longer and shorter Texts in those books has to a great extent been supplemented in the text from Aquila. A longer specimen of his work occurs in the Heb Psalter of the Sectarians, there 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 revised ed of this book. An early MS hand of an unrevised Heb text (McIntire, *Int. Text to Eccl, Cambridge, 1904*, App. 14) and the supposition of Dr. Onkelos, the editor of the Tg of that name, has not been generally accepted.

Aquila's comments on the dates and history of Theodotion and Symmachus is untrustworthy. He has to be reversed or probably misled by the order of the translations 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 agreed, preceded Symmachus and probably flourished under M. Aurelius (161-80), whereas Symmachus lived under Commodus (180-192). Irrelevant notes of Aquila and Theodotion, and that of Symmachus had in his day other baseless or at least not widely circulated. According to the modern sect of the 13th and 14th centuries, 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 supplements (labyrinth of *laiacan* in the LXX and the fact that the older VS of some books did not aim at completeness is one of the more curious and least popular among Theodotion. The text of Heb is preserved by Cod Q in Jer. As regards the additional matter contained in LXX, Theodotion is inconsistent. He has admitted, e.g., that the book of Job (138) was in the LXX, but did not apparently admit the non-canonical books and adopted his own in the LXX, which has survived in only one MS; but the date when the changes took place is unknown and the early
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historv of the two Gr texts is obscure. Theodotion's renderings have been found in writings before his time (180-92), 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 an alternative VS. Theodotion is free from the barbarisms of Aquila, but is addicted to transliteration. He inverts the order of the Heb words and substitutes Gr letters. His reasons for this habit are not always clear; ignorance of Heb will not account for all (cf VIII. 1, 2 below).

Beside the two VSS produced by, and primarily intended for, the Jewish Christian sects, there was a third, probably intended to meet the needs of a Christian sect that was dissatisfied with the LXX. Symmachus, as his author, wrote a commentary on MT, a copy of which was given to Origen by Juliana, a lady who received it from its author (Euseb., HE, VI. 17). Epiphanius' description of him as a Samaritan convert to Judaism may be rejected. The date of his work, as above stated, was probably the reign of Commodus (180-92 AD). In one respect the VS he produced in its faithful adherence to the sense of the current Heb text, a style, however, which was flowing and literary, was a revolt against Aquila's monstrosities. It seems to have been a revising of Aquila's VS, with free use of both LXX and Theodotion. It carried further a tendency apparent in the LXX to refine away the anthropomorphisms of the OT.

Of the other three MSS discovered by Origen (one at Nicopolis in Greece, one at Jericho) and known from the Hexaplar, the Septuagint, Symmachus' text and the later manuscripts (of the LXX), little is known. There is no reason to suppose that Symmachus endeavored to produce yet another version, which is characterized by Field as the most elegant of the Gr VSS. F. C. Burkitt has discussed the so-called 'text of 4 Kings' in the SFA. The Christian origin of Symmachus is traced by Epiphanius in his Hexapla 11 ("Thou wentest forth to save the people for the sake of (or "by") Jesus thy anointed one").

These later VSS play a large part in the history of the text of the LXX. This is due to the labors of the greatest LXX scholar of antiquity, the celebrated Origen of Alexandria, who was a pupil of the first half of the 3rd cent. Origen, most of his works, who was the spiritual and the Hexapla recognized, and wished Christians to recognize, the merits of the later VSS, and the divergences between the LXX and the current Heb. He determined to provide the church with the materials for ascertaining the true text and meaning of the OT. With this object he set himself to learn Heb—a fact probably unprecedented among non-Jewish Christians of that time—and to collate the Heb VSS. The later VSS, however, were not available to Origen, nor did he have access to them, and the amends he conceived for the LXX seemed to him an inspiration: 'By the gift of God we found a remedy for the divergence in the copies of the OT, namely to use the other editions as a criterion' (Comm. on Mt. 15. 14). The emphasis which he laid on the researches of his labors was known as the Hexapla or "six-column" edition. This stupendous work has not survived; a fragment was discovered toward the end of the 19th cent. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (Swete, Intro. to LXX) and another among the Cairo Genizah palimpsests (ed. C. Taylor, Cambridge, 1900).

The material was arranged in six parallel columns containing (1) the current Heb text, (2) the same in Gr letters, (3) the VS of Aquila, (4) that of Symmachus, (5) the divisions of the Heb text, (6) the column of Theodotion. The text was broken up into short clauses; not more than two words, usually one only, stood in the first column. The order of the columns doubtless represents the degree of conformity to the Heb text of Aquila's, or the LXX, that of Symmachus is on the whole a revision of Aquila as Theodotion's is of the LXX. But Origen was not content with merely collating the VSS; his aim was to revise the LXX and the 5th column (Symmachus). The text discovered in 1949 was the current Alexandrian text of the 5th cent. AD; this was supplemented or corrected where necessary by the other VSS. Origen, however, deprecated alteration of a text which had received ecclesiastical sanction, without some indication of its extent, and the construction of the 6th column presented difficulties. There were (1) numerous cases of words or paragraphs contained in the LXX but not in the Heb, which could not be wholly rejected, (2) cases of omission from the LXX of words in the Heb, (3) cases of two Heb parallel passages in the LXX; (4) variations in the order of words or chapters. Origen here had recourse to a system of critical signs, invented and employed by the grammarian Aristarchus (3rd cent. BC) in his ed of Homer. Passages of the first class were left in the text, but had prefixed to them an obelus, a sign of which the original form was a "spit" or "spear," but figuring in LXX MSS as a horizontal line usually with a dot above and a dot below (\(\overline{\mathbf{\alpha}}\)); other varieties are \(\overline{\mathbf{\alpha}}\), \(\overline{\mathbf{\alpha}}\), the sign in Aristarchus indicated censure, in the Hexapla the doubtful authority of the words which followed. The close of the obelized passage was marked by the met abolus, a colon (\(\,:\)) or, in the Syr VSS, a vallum (\(\mathbf{\nu}\)). Passages missing in the LXX were supplied from one of the other VSS (Aquila or Theodotion), the beginning of the extract being marked by an asterisk (\(X\))—a sign used by Aristarchus to express special approval—the close, by the metabolus. Where LXX and Heb widely diverged, Origen occasionally gave Heb, LXX and the other VSS, the corrector being the one that of LXX obelized. Divergence in order was met by transposition, the Heb order being followed; in Prov, however, the two texts kept their respective order, the discrepancy being indicated by a combination of signs. Minor supposed or real corruptions in the Gr were tacitly corrected. Origen produced a minor edition, the Tetrapla, without the first two columns of the larger work. The Hexapla and Oecolapla, occasionally mentioned, appear to be a partial revision of the Hexapla at points where the number of columns was increased to receive other fragmentary VSS. This gigantic work, which according to a reasonable estimate must have filled 5,000 leaves, was probably never copied in extenso. The original was preserved for some centuries in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea; there it was studied by Jerome, and thither came owners of Bib. MSS to collate their copies with it, as we learn from some interesting notes in our Syr MSS (e.g. an addendum to Est in cod. 8). The Library probably perished c. 638 AD, when Caesarea fell into the hands of the Saracens.

But, though the whole work was too vast to be copied, it was simple task to copy the 5th column. This task was performed, partly in prison, by Pamphilus, a martyr in the Diocletian persecution, and his friend Eusebius, the great bishop of Caesarea. Copies of the "Hexaplaric" LXX, i.e. Origen's doctored text with the critical signs and perhaps occasional notes, were, through the initiative of these two, widely circulated in Palestine in the 4th cent. Naturally, however, the signs became unintelligible to a later generation, and until Eusebius of Caesarea explained them; scribes neglected them, and copies of the doctored text, lacking the precautionary symbols, were multiplied. This carelessness has wrought great confusion; Origen is, through others' fault, indirectly responsible for the production of MSS in which the current LXX text and the other VSS are hopelessly mixed. No MSS give the Hexaplaric text as a whole, and it is preserved in a relatively pure form in very few: the uncials G and H (Pent and Jer), the two codices of SS and SS of Antioch, and the cursive S6 and S8 (Prophet). Other so-called Hebrew MSS, notably cod. Q (Marchalianus: Proph.) preserve fragments of the 6th and of the other columns of the Hexapla. (For the Syro-Hexaplar see below, VI. 1.) Yet, even did we possess the 5th column.
entire, with the complete apparatus of signs, we should not have "the original LXX," but merely, after removing the asterisked passages, a text current in the 3rd cent. The fact has to be emphasised 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 Hebr. The modern critic recognizes that the LXX on the whole represents the older text, the divergences of which from the Heb are largely due to an 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 have recourse to other authorities beside Origen.

Such assistance is partly furnished by two other recensions made in the century after Origen. Jerome (Proef, in Paralip.; cf. Adv. Ref., ii. 27) states that in the 4th cent. three recensions circulated in different parts of the Christian world: "Alexandria and Jerome Egyptian in their Septuagint acclaim Hesychius as their authority, the region from Constantinople to Antioch approves the copies of LXX which they received, the Punjab and Palestinian provinces read 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 of Thmuis, and it is thought that these two were engaged in revising the LXX 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 Egypt 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 cursives, 44, 74, 78, 84, 106, 154, etc., and states that the first instalments of the Hebrew Cambridge LXX 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 rest (Ex xii. 16) speaks of the infinite variety of old LXX, though they may ultimately prove all to fall into two main families, African and Egyptian. The recension of patristic quotations from the Old Lat is still useful, though verified by recent editions of the Fathers. Of Old Lat MSS one of the most important is the cod. Lugdunensis, edited by U. Robert (Penatiuechi e cod. Lug., versio Lat., antiquissima, Paris, 1831; Novi lnterpret.: parte post. versio Lat. antiqu. e cod. Lugd., Lyons, 1890). The student should consult also Burkitt's ed. of The Rules of Tyrconnus ("Texts and Studies," 1, l, Cambridge, 1894) and The Old Latin and the Itala (60, IV, 3, 1836).

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 Psalter. This later VS from the Heb, and some details in our Prayer-book Psalter are usually derived from the LXX (e.g. Ps 93:2) and not from the LXX. Parts of the Apocalypse (Wisd, Ecclus, Bar. I and 2 Macc) are also pure Old Lat, untouched by the LXX.

The early date (3d cent. AD) once claimed for the LXX or Codex VSS (Bongers, E. J. Gr and in part at least from an earlier text; Rahlfis (Sept-Stud., ii, 1907) identifies the Bohemian Psalter as the Hesychian recension. The Sahidic VS of Josias has fortunately preserved the shorter text lacking the later insertions from Theodotion (Lagarde, and J. Gr; E. J. Gr). Rahlfis in this does not conclusively prove that it is pre-Origenic; it may be merely a Hesychian text with the later passages omitted (Burkitt, E. B., IV, 5027). The influence of the Hexapluar is traceable elsewhere in this VS.

The Ethiopic text was made in Egypt 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-Hegelian.

The Vulg or Peshitta Syriac VS was made from the Heb, though partly influenced by the LXX, as we shall see below. Another VS of primary importance is the LXX text, viz. that of Paul, bishop of Tella (Constantine in Mesopotamia), executed at Antioch, known as the Syro-Hexapla. This is a hald Syr VS of the LXX column of the Hexapla, containing the LXX passages, the MS of the present printed books is in the Ambronas Library at Milan and has been edited by Ceriani (Manuscripte e cod. Oxyrhynch., lxxxv-1000). Fragments of the historical books are also extant (Lagarde and Rahlfis, Bibliotheca Syriaca, Gottingen, 1892). This VS supposes the Gr Hexapla as the principal authority for Origen's text. For the original VS of Dsl, which has survived in only one late MS, the

pars prior, Göttingen, 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 as an approximate reconstruction. It is evident, however, that the Lucianic LXX possessed much the same qualities as the Syrian revision 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, all that was suitable to be written down, and consequently numerous. While this "confabulation" of texts detracts from its value, the Lucianic revision gains importance from the fact that the sources from which it gleaned include an element of accuracy which the Hexapla lacked; 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 (Suetio, Irod, i. iv; III, vi).

Among the chief aids to restoration are the daughter VSS made from the LXX, and above all, the texts of the Hexapla (pre-Hieronymian) VS, for the earliest text of Old Lat MSS, Old 1 and the 20th cent. AD, i.e. before Origen, and contains a text from which the ascribed Hexapla passages in Hexapla VS are absent. It thus 'brings us the best independent evidence that we have that the MSS introduced by Origen can be relied on for the reconstruction of the LXX' (Burkitt). The Old Lat also enables us to recognize the ancient element in the Lucianic recension. But the Lucian evidence itself is by no means uncontaminated. In Ps 82, verses 16 speaks of the infinite variety of old LXX, though they may ultimately prove all to fall into two main families, African and Egyptian. The influence of patristic quotations from the Old Lat is still useful, though verified by recent editions of the Fathers. Of Old Lat MSS one of the most important is the cod. Lugdunensis, edited by U. Robert (Pentatiuechi e cod. Lug., versio Lat., antiquissima, Paris, 1831; Novi interpret.: parte post. versio Lat. antiqu. e cod. Lugd., Lyons, 1890). The student should consult also Burkitt's ed. of The Rules of Tyrconnus ("Texts and Studies," 1, l, Cambridge, 1894) and The Old Latin and the Itala (60, IV, 3, 1836).

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 Psalter. This later VS from the Heb, and some details in our Prayer-book Psalter are usually derived from the LXX (e.g. Ps 93:2) and not from the LXX. Parts of the Apocalypse (Wisd, Ecclus, Bar. I and 2 Macc) are also pure Old Lat, untouched by the LXX.

The early date (3d cent. AD) once claimed for the LXX or Codex VSS (Bongers, E. J. Gr and in part at least from an earlier text; Rahlfis (Sept Stud., 1, 1904) considers its text of S-K, with that of cod. B, to be pre-Hegelian.

The Vulg or Peshitta Syriac VS was made from the Heb, though partly influenced by the LXX, as we shall see below. Another VS of primary importance is the LXX text, viz. that of Paul, bishop of Tella (Constantine in Mesopotamia), executed at Antioch, known as the Syro-Hexapla. This is a hald Syr VS of the LXX column of the Hexapla, containing the LXX passages, the MS of the present printed books is in the Ambronas Library at Milan and has been edited by Ceriani (Manuscripte e cod. Oxyrhynch., lxxxv-1000). Fragments of the historical books are also extant (Lagarde and Rahlfis, Bibliotheca Syriaca, Gottingen, 1892). This VS supposes the Gr Hexapla as the principal authority for Origen's text. For the original VS of Dsl, which has survived in only one late MS, the

pars prior, Göttingen, 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 as an approximate reconstruction. It is evident, however, that the Lucianic LXX possessed much the same qualities as the Syrian revision 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, all that was suitable to be written down, and consequently numerous. While this "confabulation" of texts detracts from its value, the Lucianic revision gains importance from the fact that the sources from which it gleaned include an element of accuracy which the Hexapla lacked; where it unites with the Old Lat VS against all other authorities its evidence is invaluable.
Syr.-Hexaplar supplies a second and older authority of great value.

The Armenian VS (ascribed to the 5th cent.) also owes in the whole a troubleshooting antecedent; its text of the Octateuch is largely Hexaplaric.

A bare mention must suffice of the Arabic VS (of which the text is conjecturally rendered from the LXX); the fragments of the Gothic VS (made from the Latin recension), and the Slavonic (particularly the Russians and Georgians) are more digraphic.

For a full description of the Gr MSS see Swete, *Intro., I, ch. v.*, the *Gnomon* of 1911; the text (a culmos of collations or minuscules) into uncials and cursive is, according to the former ranging from the 4th cent. (Alexandrinis, Constantinopolitan, etc.), to the 3rd cent. (Nestle in *P.E., XXIII*); the latter, if not against the 3rd, at the latest to the 16th cent. Complete Bibles are few; the majority contain groups of books only, such as the Pentateuch (Gen-Ruth), the later historical books, the Psalter, the 3 or 5 "Solomonic" books, the Prophets (major, minor, and the common section), the common-codices, and the Pauline letters (in the ed of Holmes and Paternoster Roman figures); cursive, of which over 300 are known, are part of Arabic; in the larger Cambridge LXX the selected cursive are denoted by small Roman letters.

The following are the chief uncials containing, or which in whole or in part (Bible, Vulgate, at Rome, 4th cent. AD, adopted as the standard text in... and the evidence of the older 6th cent. underlies a medial gr of works of Euphem the Syrian. For the Octateuch and the historical books: D (Cottonianus, Heptameron, etc.), 3rd cent. AD, is the only one to which the evidence of the MS can be attributed; the MS does not contain a variant: P (Ambrosianus, Milan, 6th cent. AD, fragments of the Octateuch; D: (Sarasinianus, fragments of Leiden, Paris, and St. Petersburg, 4th to 5th cent.), important as containing parts of the Gospel of Nicodemus. Illuminated Gen, the hulk of which perished in a fire at Alexandria in 1721, but earlier collations of Graebe and others are extant, which for the lost portions are cited in the Cambridge texts as D (Diff.i.e. ed. 1712). The Smi-Deissel text of the MSS, it is believed that the MS did not contain a variant: P (Ambrosianus, Milan, 5th cent. AD, fragments of the Chief, by which the translation from uncial to cursive script occurs, until his death. The long-concealed fact that the second edition of a part of a set of MS cameral light through Swete's identification of the Cambridge Lexicon, which the MSS still represent, but which has not been resolved. Much of the MSS still vary in respect of the MSS are generally regarded as the oldest MSS. The use of the LXX for lexicographical purposes was inherited by the church from the Jews. The MSS in the text of the LXX are agreed to represent an old system; light may also be expected from them on the local distribution of various types of text.

Of the printed texts the first four editions were (1) the Complutensian Polyglot of Cardinal Ximenes, 1514-17, comprising the Heb and Vulgate texts in the middle place of honor being compared to Jesus in the midst of the chief by the Roman ed of 1519, based on Venetian MSS. (2) The ed of 1522, published at Rome in 1522, under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V and frequently reprinted. (3) The ed of 1523, based on the cod. Dalmatian, the authority of which text is justly recognized in the interpolated sin plasm (printed in Swete's *Intro.*). (4) The ed of 1527, begun by the same Printer of the cod. Dalmatian, the script of which text is justly recognized in the interpolated text of the ed (id. 1712) was based on the cod. Alexandrinus, with aid from other MSS. and had the advantage that it employed Origen's emendation and different sizes of text, to show the divergence between the Gr and the Heb. Of more recent importance: (5) The great Oxford ed of Holmes and Paternoster (Oxford, 1887-1837, 5 vols. folio) was the first attempt to bring together in a gigantic apparatus of the evidence of the codices and current MSS (upward of 200). VSS and early citations from P. and R. and the evidence of the ed of 1837. Other important ed of materials: "H. and P." will not be wholly superseded by the latest of 1913. The serviceable ed of Swete's *Text ed. 3*, 1901-7, 3 vols. Svo), is in the hands of serious LXX students. The text is that of B, or (where B fails) of A.

4. Reconstr. of the LXX

The task of reconstructing the oldest text is still unaccomplished. Materials have accumulated, and much preliminary "spade-work" has been done, yet the best of the MSS of the LXX are not in the text. The MSS of the LXX are divided into two groups: (1) the 3rd to the 6th cent. (2) the 9th to the 15th cent. The latter, which is the shakiest, the task of reconstructing the LXX is the most difficult. Clearly no single MS presents the oldest text. That of cod. B, as in the NT, is preserved in the whole LXX. It has been possible that from the 1st to the 3rd cent. (1-2 K), e.g., it has escaped the Occipital defacement which has been introduced in more recent MSS. The LXX is, however, of unequal value, and many MSS are inferior. In some MSS, the text is undoubtedly late, in some earlier. In others, the text is the primitive text. In some MSS, the text is the older and more primitive text.

VII. Notes, Titles, and Order of Texts

In addition to the Heb and Vulgate texts, the LXX includes the books in the Eng. Apoc.

1. Contents except 2 Esd (Pr Man only finds a place among the canopies appended in some MSS of the Ps) besides a 3rd and 4th book of Macc. Swete, *Intro.* pp. 368-393. See his series of Gr books on the borderland of canonicy the Ps of Sol (found in some cursive and mentioned in the list in cod. A.), the Gr fragments of the Book of En and the ecclesiastical canopies above mentioned. The MSS in quoting freely from these additional books are not necessarily lost; they only 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," and the names of a few of the later 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 Ezagqan ("leading out") by Philo and by the Hellenist 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 S and K, viz. the four Books of Kingdoms or the four volumes of the Prophets given in the first place to a partial VS including only the reigns of the first few monarchs. Jerome's influence in this case restored the old Heb names as also in Ch (= Heb "Words of Days," "Diaries"), which in LXX bear the titles Paralipomena, "omissions," as being a supplement to the Books of Reigns.

Another innovation, due apparently to the Gr translators or later editors, was the breaking up of some of the long historical narratives in volumes of more manageable size. In the Heb MSS, S, K, Ch, 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 other arrangement 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 a mere translation of the Persian 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 4.

3. Bipartition of Books

Ezr-Neh form respectively one book

4. Grouping Heb Bible, representing three stages in and 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 prophetic book (Dan). Alexandrian scholars instrumental in the subsequent literary system, 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 was kept undisturbed, 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 similar and transferred to the end of the historical group. This group, from chronological considerations, is followed by the poetical and other "Writings," the Prophets coming last (so in B, etc.; in SA prophets predece poets). The internal order of the Gr Hagiographa, which includes quasi-historical (Est, Tob, Jth) and Wisdom books, is variable. Dan now first finds a place among the Prophets. The 12 minor prophets usually precede the major (Jer, Lam, etc.—Westerhausen in order of precedence), and 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 satellites, Bar, Lam (transferred from the "Writings") and Ep. Jer; Sus and Bel consort with the other names; a deviation 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 bundle, hence hierarchy would be in the two principal parts of this order. We may inquire whether the order of these separate items until the copying of large groups in book-form came into vogue (Swete, *Intro.,* 225 f., 229 f.).

VIII. Characteristics of the Version and Its Component Parts. Notwithstanding the uncertain state of the text, some general characteristics 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 VSS and Gr compositions covering well-nigh 400 years and the jurisdiction of different compilers, of whom the hitherto closest approximation to the order of rendering is not an infallible proof that different hands have been employed, since the invariable uniformity in its arrangement of the text and indeed was not the aim of the translators, but may rather to have studied variant readings. If, however, a Heb word is consistently rendered by one Gr word in one version and by another elsewhere, and if each of the two portions has other features peculiar to itself, then, on this basis the two portions are the work of different schools. Among "test-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 doxological and apocryphal portions of the Ptolemaic age. The trs were written in the koine or "common" Gr, most of them in the vernacular, a translation into the vernacular exhibiting the new cosmopolitan language was in the making; the abundant dated papyrus enables us to trace its evolution. Some, the Petrie and Hibeh papyri of the 3d cent. BC afford the closest parallels to the Gr Pent. The following centuries witness a tendency to "coherence" or "degeneracy" in the language, of which traces may be found in the Gr of the prophetic books. Beside the vernacular, in the 1st cent. BC was the literature of the "Atticist" school which persistently struggled, with indifferent success, to recover the lost forms and styles 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 literalism; the later books show an increasing reverence for the letter of the scripture, recognition of the pedantic literalism of the 3d cent. AD in the barbarians of Aquila. Some of the "Writings" were freely handled, because they had not yet obtained canonical rank at the time of tr. Investigation of the evidence lines good to the conclusion that the tr was approximately that of the Heb Canon. The Gr Hexateuch may be placed in the 4th cent. BC; the Prophets mainly in the 3d and 2d cent. BC. The tr of the Pent.

(1) The Hexateuch.—The Gr Pent should undoubtedly be regarded as a unit; the Aristotelian view that the books should be regarded as a single unified work at a level of the "common" vernacular style, combined with faithfulness to the Heb, was retained. It was no longer seen as a "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 was more securely established in this period, and substantial variant readings are relatively few. The latter part of Ex is an exception; the Heb had
Chapter 1—3 obscure. Free 12—21 11, the probably the anthropomorphisms the Lucian's 2730 They the interesting the in inherited Ezk times, 24-38) the sages being being thus; understand occurs have earlier certain attributable the nearly Pent. nearly Pentecost, the first Jews.—even two-thirds of the Lord."

The last ch (52) is probably a later addition in the Gr. The translator of the second half of Jer also tr² the first half of Bar (1 1—3 8); 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. Ezk is similarly divided, but here the translator of the first half (chs 1—27) undertook the difficult labor of dividing the text, and remained being 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; it is chieflv by the Gr of Ezk and is perhaps 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 synagogues. Lectionary requirements occasioned the earliest VSS of the Prophets, possibly of the Pent as well. Two indications of this have been traced. There exists in four MSS a Gr VS of the Psalm 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 Ezk 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, XIII, 191; 177). 3 Partial version of the "Former" Prophets (1—3 B).—The Gr style indicates that the history of the monarchy was not all tr² 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 unedifying 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 embraced only (1) 1 K (2) 2 R 1 1—11 (David's early reign), (3) 3 R 2 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 tr² in the Eng. Bible (JTS, VIII, 262). 4 The "Writings."—The Hagiographa at the end of the 2d 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 (Dt 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; Aristean, the historian of the 2d cent. BC, seems to have been the author (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, 1889, 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 Esl) was probably composed by the Gr translators (e.g. the Neh. group 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. T. Torrey, Ezra Studies, Chicago, 1910). The Gr is obviously earlier than Esl B and is of great value for the reconstruction of the Heb. The same translator appears from peculiarities of diction to have produced the edifying treatise on morality in the Heb. Ps 3, 19—22 (Ps 11, 20—22, 1904—6, 1906, 1909, 1912) which was expanded into a longer work. The Heb of this treatise has been traced in a fragmentarily preserved copy, included in the collection of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew was the original, the Gr version was made later. The Gr version uses the Heb with great freedom, incorporating extraneous matter (The Three Children, Sus, Bel). The Gr text has been traced to the 2d cent. BC, and is preserved only from ch-Dnl. group round a fable of non-Jewish origin, the story of the 3 youths at the court of Darius. 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 liberties 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 possibly based before St. Paul's time (Rom 3 13 ff), or else taken from Rom. The little Ps 151 in LXX, described in the title as an "auto- graph" work of David and as "outside the number," is clearly a late Gr production, perhaps an appendix added after the VS was complete. 5 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," for instance, were translated by Theodotion, perhaps, or by one of his school; the later portions (2 R 11 2—3 R 2 11, David's downfall, and 3 R 22—1 R end, the downfall of the monarchy) are by one hand, as shown by pecu-
liarities in style, e.g. "I am with child" (2 R 11 5) = "I am with child," a use which is due to a desire to distinguish the longer form of the pronoun 'ānōkhī ("I," also used for "I am") from the shorter 'ānī. A complete VS of Jgs was now probably the "two hands" of the Alexandrian mt 11; the VSs were 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 (Ed B), though the older VS retained its place in the Chalc. on account of the interesting legend imbedded in it; the new VS is here again possibly the work of Theodotion; the numerous transliterations are characteristic of him (Torrey, Ezra Studies; the theory had previously been advanced by Sir H. Howorth). In the Gr Edc we have a specimen of Aquila's style (see McNeile's ed, Cambridge, 1904). Canticles is another late VS.

A marked feature of the whole tr is the scrupulous avoidance of anthropomorphisms and phrases derogatory to the Divine transcendence, thus 2 16, "Now 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 stood" (cf "the God of Israel"); ver 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 common; the words used 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 sons of God" in Gr (cf J 2), e.g. slight amplifications, interpretation of difficult words, substitution of Gr for Heb coinage, tr of place-names, see Swete, Intero, 323 ff. Blunders in tr are not uncommon, but the difficulties which these pioneers had to face must be remembered, esp. the palaeographical 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 division of the stanzas (nāōa and yōdēh) 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 by the translators, e.g. the confusion of 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. colloquialism (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 (of Swete, Intero, 251 ff).

The most extensive discrepancies in arrangement of materials occur in (1) Ex 35—39, the construction of the Tabernacle and the ornaments of its ministers, (2) 3 R 4–11, Solomon's reign, (3) Jer (last half), (4) Prov (end). (1) In Ex 40 the LXX gives precedence to the priests' ordinances, 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 is omitted. The last portions of the Pent and the text had 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 the two of tithing, is one of the clearest examples of editorial revision in the MT (Wellhausen, Hist of Israel, 67, 250, etc.). At the end of 3 R LXX places chs 20 and 21 in their proper order; MT reverses this, interposing the Naboith story in the connected account of the seven wars and justifying the change by a short preface. (3) In Jer the chapter numbers differ from the middle of ch 25 to the end of ch 51, the historical appendix (eh 26) concluding both texts. This is due to the different position assigned to a group of prophecies against the nations: LXX places them in the center, MT at the end. The items in this group are also rearranged. The diversity in order is earlier than the Gr tr; see JTS, IV, 245. (4) The order of some groups of maxims at the end of Prov was not finally fixed at the time of the Gr tr; like Jeremiah's prophecies against the nations, these little groups seem to have circulated as late as the 2d or 1st cent. BC as separate pamphlets. The Ps numbers from 10 to 147 differ by one in the LXX and 146 in the Gr, due to the lines of demarcation between individual pss.

Excluding the end of Ex, striking examples of divergence in the Pent are few. LXX alone preserves Cain's words to his brother, while not preserved in the Pent, or into the fiction (cf 8 8).

2. Subject-Matter

The close of Moses' song appears in an expanded form in LXX (Dt 32 43). Similarly Hannah's song in 1 R 2 7 (originally a warrior's triumph-song) has been rendered more appropriately as a near homily by LXX, with her 8c of words about the answer to prayer, and enlarged by the insertion of a passage from Jer; the changes in both songs may be connected with their early use as canticles. In Josh the larger amount of divergence suggests that this book did not share the peculiar sanctity of the Law. But the books of "Reigns" present the widest differences and the fullest scope for the textual criticism. The LXX here proves the existence of two independent accounts of the time and its events, one of the kingdom; 16 26a–h a second summary of Jehoshaphat's reign (cf 22 41 ff); 4 R 1 18a another summary of Joram's reign (cf 3 1 ff). Conversely in 1 R 17–18, MT has apparently preserved two contradictory accounts of events in David's early history, while LXX presents a shorter and consistent narrative (Swete, Intero, 245 f). An "addition" in LXX of the highest interest appears in 3 R 5 536, where a stanza is put into the mouth of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple: it takes from the "Song-book" (probably the Book of Psalms) the MT gives the stanza in an edited form earlier in the chapter (8 12f); for the reconstruction of the original Heb see JTS, X, 439; XI, 518. The last line proves to be a title, "For the Sabbath—On Alamoth" (i.e. for soprano), showing that the song was set to music for liturgical purposes. In Jer, besides transpositions, the two texts differ widely in the way of excess and defect; the verdict of critics is mainly in favor of the priority of the LXX (Struven, Hist of Jer). The most important differences in the "Writings" see VIII, above; for additional titles to the Ps see Swete, Intero, 250 ff.

Literature.—The most important works have been mentioned in the body of the article. See, further, the
very full lists in Swete's Intro and the bibliographies by Nettie in PEP, III, 1-24, and XXIII, 207-10 (1913); *HDB*, IV, 453-54.
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SEPHUR, sep'ul-kär (2 Ch 21 20; 32 33; Jn 19 41f; Acts 2 29, etc.). See BURIAL; JERUSALEM, VIII.
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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 4 verses of the latter are wanting in the former. On the side of Lk there are 35 + 17 verses quite lacking in the Sermon of Lk, amounting in all to 52 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. Many of the two distinct discourses dealing with the same general theme but spoken on different occasions, or are they simply different reports of the same discourse. If it be held that the Sermon was delivered but once, which of the aspects of the theme were the essential 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 a number of scholars who regard the sayings 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 sayings represent a single historical discourse. The Sermon as recorded in Mt bears such marks of inner unity of theme and exposition as to give it a kind of uniqueness. Jesus should deliver a discourse of this kind accords with the circumstances of the time. His ministry. 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 exposition of the kingdom, the burden of His first preaching. Such a marked interruption of important discourses should have been preserved is altogether probable.

On the other hand, it may be conceded that the accounts need not necessarily be regarded as a full or exact reports of the discourse but possibly and probably much summaries of its theme and substance. Our Lord was accustomed to teach at length, but this discourse is more closely connected in a few paragraphs. While His popular teaching was marked by a unique wealth of illustration the Sermon is largely gnomic in form. His general style and the gravity 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.

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 easy to understand that other occasions may have become 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 have picked it up and distributed 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 that 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 the Sermon in both 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 because to the situation in Galilee 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 resorted 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. In the Sermon on the Mount, we find Him teaching in the direction and fits naturally into the circumstances to which it has been assigned. Luke probably gives the true historical occasion, i.e. the appointment of the Twelve.

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 Karm Hoffin, a two-peaked hill on the road from Capernaum to Tiberias to which 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 of the multitudes from the disciples is an instance of technical procedure. Jesus’ 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 people of Judaea, Jesus and the coast country, the healing of great numbers, 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 said, . . .’ 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 of the appointment to 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, as in the case of the Sermon on the Mount, the words 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.
Sermon on Mount

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

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 first considered in outline. There is some degree of opinion among scholars as to the precise nature of the outline, but generally the following analysis and, consequently various outlines have been presented by different writers. Those of C. W. Votaw in BDB, Canon Gore in The Sermon in the Mount, and H. C. Kline in The Ethics of Jesus are worthy of special mention. The following arrangement of the Sermon as presented by Matthew is given as the basis of the present discussion.

1. Analysis

1. The subjects of the kingdom (5 3-16).
   a. The quality of character essential to happiness and influence (vs 3-12).
   b. 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).
   i. (1) The higher law of brotherhood judgements ill will as murder (vs 21-26).
   ii. (2) The higher law of purity condemns lust as adultery (vs 27-32).
   iii. (3) The higher law of truth forbids oaths as perjury and evil (vs 33-37).
   v. (5) The higher law of love demands universal goodwill as evidence of a supernatural quality like that of the Father (vs 45-48).

2. The new righteousness. Its motives as applied to religious (practical and social) duties, or the principles of conduct (6 1-7 12).
   a. Reverence toward the Father essential in all acts of worship (vs 1-18).
      i. (1) In all duties (ver 1).
      ii. (2) In unwaveringness (vs 2-4).
      iii. (3) In prayer (vs 5-15).
      iv. (4) In fasting (vs 16-18).
   b. Loyalty toward the Father fundamental in all social relations (7 1-12).
      i. (1) Critical estimate of self instead of censorious judgment of others (vs 1-5).
      ii. (2) The communication and communication of spiritual values (vs 6-8).
      iii. (3) Kindness toward others in all things before the Father's kindness toward all His children (vs 7-12).

3. Love toward the Father dynamic in all social relations (7 1-12).
   a. Critical estimate of self instead of censorious judgment of others (vs 1-5).
   b. Communication and communication of spiritual values (vs 6-8).
   c. Kindness toward others in all things before the Father's kindness toward all His children (vs 7-12).

   a. The two gates and the two ways (vs 13-14).
   b. 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 with 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 being 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, 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: meekness 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." They are not happy, but they are not on that account to withdraw from the world. On the contrary, by the leaven 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. See BEATITUDE.

(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 continuity 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 social virtues. It abrogates the law, but not its social virtues, 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 the righteousness 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, not 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 that the Father would have His children look 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, communion with God or spiritual enrichments. 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 the acts performed with 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 benefits can be set by Christ. 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 supreme and effectual motive.

(c) In social relations (7 1—12): Then again brothership of 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 too great reverence for spiritual values to cast them carelessly to the winds. Therefore in all His acts and all personal and social conduct is judged by the quality of the motives.

(d) In religious teaching (7 13—27):—(a) The narrow way (7 13—14): In the hortatory conclusion (7 13—27), Jesus first of all warns His hearers that the way into the kingdom is a narrow one. It might seem that it ought to be different; that the way of destruction should be narrow and there is wail way to life broad and easy, but it is not so. The way to all worthy achievement is the narrow way of self-control, self-sacrifice and infinite pains. Such is the way to the righteousness of the kingdom, the supreme object of our fathers. "No one is "I", and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life." (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 concluding with a beautiful parable the five 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 the present. 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.

VII. Principles.—The Sermon on the Mount is neither the golden rule, nor are the set of fixed legal regulations. It is, instead, a statement of the principles of life essential in a normal society. Such a society is possible in so far as men attain the character and live the life expressed in these principles. Their correct interpretation is therefore important.

Many of the sayings of the Sermon are metaphorical or proverbial statements, and are not to be understood in a literal or legal sense. In them Jesus was illustrating principles in concrete terms. Their interpretation literally and strictly is contrary to the intention and spirit of Jesus. So interpreted, the Sermon becomes in part a visionary and impractical ideal. But rather the principles behind the concrete instances are to be sought and applied anew to the life of the present, as Jesus applied them to the life of His own time.

The following are some of the leading ideas and principles underlying and expressed in the Sermon:

(1) Character is the sum of strength. Men of the qualities described in the Beatitudes are called "blessed." Happiness consists, not in external blessings, but in the inner peace of a normal life. The virtues of the Beatitudes are also the elements of strength. Righteousness, self-control, purity and loyalty are the genuine qualities of real strength. Men of such qualities are to inherit the earth because they are the only ones strong enough to possess and use it.

(2) Righteousness is grounded in the inner life. Character is something not imposed from without but a life that unfolds from within. The hope of a perfect morality and a genuine fulfilment of the law lies in the creation of a sound inner life. Therefore the inner acts and all personal and social conduct is judged by the quality of the motives.

(3) The inner life is a unity. The spiritual nature is all of a piece, so that a moral slump at one point imperils the whole life. Consequently, all spiritual asceticism, even to the extent of extreme mortification, is a dangerous experiment. The right eye casteth thy stumbling block out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into Gehenna (Mt 5 29).n)

(4) Universal love is the fundamental social law. It is the dynamic principle of true character and right conduct. In this respect, at least, the perfection of the Father is set as the standard for men. Kindliness in disposition, in word and in set is an obligation binding on all. We may not feel like it, but we must be set to do good even to our enemies. In this the supernatural quality of the Christian life may be known.

(5) The Sermon is the very heart of the Father's teaching. It is the center of life. Character and life exist in and for fellowship with the Father. All work is to be directed toward God. His service is the supreme duty. His perfection is the standard of character. His goodness the ground of universal love. Given this fact, all the essentials of religion and life follow as a matter of course. God is Father to all men are brothers. God is Father, all duties are sacred. God is Father, infinite patience is the heart of the world and life is of infinite worth.

(6) Fulfilment of the final promise. The blossoms of promises must ripen into the fruit of abiding character. The leaves of empty professions have no value in the eyes of the Father. Doers and thinkers of things that ni       dle, and endurance is the final test. The life of perfect character is the narrow way through the ages. See further ETHIC; ETHICS OF JESUS; KINGDOM OF GOD.

LITERATURE.—The standard comm. and Lives of Christ. Among the most important encyclopaedic ars are those of C. W. Votaw in DBB, James Moffatt.
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, that event is generally 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.
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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 daboia, Tropidonota tessellataus which is often found in pools and streams. 

Cerastes melanocephalus, the small, nearly toothless snake with the crown of the head coal black. Among the somewhat poisonous snakes, a very common one is Coelopeltis mosepsulana, Arab. n'hosheih, 'afa, which is about two meters long, as large as the black snake. It is uniformly reddish brown above, paler below. Another be snake is Fenatikhis schokari.

al-baitay ul-barakat, which is about two meters long, as large as the black snake. It is uniformly reddish brown above, paler below. Another be snake is Fenatikhis schokari.

Arab. n'hosheih, 'afa, which is about two meters long, as large as the black snake. It is uniformly reddish brown above, paler below. Another be snake is Fenatikhis schokari.

As stated above, all of the Heb and Gr names except kippōs, which occurs only in Isa 34 15, are used of snakes actually or supposedly poisonous. This absence of discrimination 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 little evident difference in name to Arab. names to Arab. names.

(1) The commonest Heb word is נָחָשׁ, nāshāh, 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 68 4; 140 3; Prov 33 32; Ecc 10 8.11, Isa 14 29; Jer 8 17; Am 5 18. According to BDB it is perhaps from an onomatopoetic נָחַשׁ, nāshāh, "to hiss." It may be akin to the Arab. خَنَصَ, hanash, which means "snake" in general, or esp. the black snake. Cf. Ir-nahash (Ch 4 12); Nahash (a) (1 S 11 1; 2 S 10 2), (b) (2 S 27 17), (c) (2 S 17 25); also עָנָשׁ, mānashūth, "copper" or "brass"; and עָנָשׁ, mānashūth (Nehustah), the brazen serpent (2 K 18 4). But BDB derives the last two words from a different root.

(2) נָעִי, na'āy, apparently from נָעַפ, na'âph, "to burn," is used of the fiery serpents of the wilderness. In Nu 21 8, it occurs in the sing.: "Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a standard." In ver 6 we have נָעִי נָעִי נָעִי נָעִי, na'āy na'āy na'āy na'āy, "fiery serpents"; in Dt 8 15 the same in the sing.: נָעִי, na'āy, nāshāh na'āy, also tr."fiery serpents"; in Isa 14 29; 30 6 we have נָעִי נָעִי נָעִי נָעִי, na'āy na'āy na'āy na'āy, "fiery flying serpent." The same word in the pl. נָעִי נָעִי נָעִי נָעִי, na'āy na'āy na'āy na'āy, is tr."seraphim" in Isa 6 2.6.

(3) נַעְרָי, na'ārī, elsewhere "dragon" or "sea-creature," (q.v.), is used of the serpents into which the gods of Aaron and the magicians were transformed (Ex 7 9.10.12), these serpents being designated by נַעְרָי in Ex 4 3; 7 15. Taninn is rendered, "serpent" (AV "dragon") in Dt 32 33, "Their spears of poison of serpents," and Ps 91 13, "The young lion and the serpent shalt thou trample under foot." On the other hand, nāshāh 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); ". . . they will be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent, and it shall bite them" (Am 4 3).

(4) נִזֹּה, nizzôh, is tr."crawling things" in Dt 32 24 (AV "serpents") and in Mic 7 17 (AV "worms").

(5) נָעִי, nāy, occurs only in Ps 140 3, where it is tr."adder" (LXX δράκων, asps, Vulg aspis), "adders' poison is under their lips." It has been suggested (BDB) that the reading should be נִזָּה, nizzôh, "adder" (q.v.). The word is in the previous line is nābāsh.

(6) נָעֶה, na'ēh, like most of the other names of a word of uncertain etymology, occurs 6 t and it is tr."asp," except in Ps 91 13. "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder." According to Liddell and Scott, aspis is the name of the Egyptian cobra, Ναϊα ἱαταί, which is not included in (2) above, because it does not certainly appear to have been applied to any of the snakes which are encountered are harmless. Aspis occurs in Rom 3 13 in a paraphrase of Ps 140 3 (see (5) above), it occurs frequently, though not uniformly, in LXX for (2), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (10).

(7) נֶפֶשׁ, nēfset, or נֶפֶשׁ, nēfseth, "coptacatre," occurs in Prov 23 32. At the last it biteth like a serpent [nābāsh], and stingeth like an adder[ xiphtēn]. In Isa 11 8; 59 5, and Jer 8 17, ARV has "adder," while AV has "coptacatre" and ERV has "basilisk.

(8) נֶפֶשׁ, nēfset, or נֶפֶשׁ, nēfseth, "coptacatre," occurs in Prov 23 32. At the last it biteth like a serpent [nābāsh], and stingeth like an adder[ xiphtēn]. In Isa 11 8; 59 5, and Jer 8 17, ARV has "adder," while AV has "coptacatre" and ERV has "basilisk.

(9) נֶפֶשׁ, nēfset, "shyphilōn, occurs only in Gen 49 17: "Dan shall be a serpent [nābāsh] in the way. An adder [ kēfipēnōn] in the path. That biteth the horse's heels. So that his rider falleth backward."

This has been thought to be Cerastes cornutus, on the authority of Tristram (NNB), who says that the serpent in the path it will attack the passer-by, while most snakes will glide away at the approach of a person or large animal. He also 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. سُفَع, suff, or حَرَطَفَ, ḥaraf, "suff" which denotes a spotted and deadly snake.

(10) נֶפֶשׁ, nēfset, "epheh," is found in Job 30 6; Isa 30 6; 59 5, and in EV is uniformly tr."viper." It is the same as the Arab. نِفَحَ، nēfah, "a'qa, which is usually tr."viper," though the writer has never found anyone who could tell what snake the name belongs. In Arab. as in Heb a poisonous snake is always understood.

(11) נֶפֶשׁ, nēfset, kippōs, 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
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 ἐχίνα, echinas, "hedgehog," and Vulg ericus, "hedgehog." The rendering of AV "great owl" seems preferable to the others, because the words "make her nest, and lay, and hatch them under her shades" are as a whole quite inapplicable to a mammal or to a reptile. The derivation from θηρ, ὑγιαῖς; cf. Arab. ʾḥāṣ, ʾḥāṣ, "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," מִיִּים, δαργάθ; cf. Arab. ʾḥāṣ, ʾḥāṣ, ʾḥāṣ, "to dart.

See BITTERN; OWL; PORCUPINE.

(12) ὁπίς, a general term for "serpent," occurs in numerous passages of the NT and LXX, and is fairly equivalent to ναῦθας.

(13) ἀσίς, aspis, occurs in the NT only in Rom 3 13 | to Ps 140 3. See under (5) ἄσιασθίν (6). Then found in LXX for these words, and also for ἐχίνος (Isa 30 6).

(14) ἐρίξαω, ἐχίνα, occurs in Acts 28 3. "A viper came out . . . and fastened on his [Paul's] hand," and 4 t in the expression "offspring [AV generation]" (cf. Job 26 13, 27 10, 28 20, 30 26, 37 18; Hengstenberg's note supra). In LXX, for these verbs, and also for ἐχίνος (Isa 30 6).

(15) ἐφέρον, ἐρέπτην, "creeping thing," AV "serpent," is found in Jas 3 7.

That the different Heb and Gr names are used without clear distinction seen from several examples of the employment of two different names in t expressions:

Their poison is like the poison of a serpent [ναῦθας]; they are like the deaf adder [πεθεν] that stoppeth her ear (Ps 38 4).

They have sharpened their tongue like a serpent [ναῦθας]; Adders' [πεθενιμι] poison is under their lips (Ps 140 3).

For, behold, I will send serpents [πεθενιμι], adders [ἰχθυοκούναμα], among you, which will not be charmed; and they shall bite you, saith Jeh (De 8 15, 20).

They shall lick the dust like a serpent [ναῦθας]; like crawling things of the earth [τῇ ἐξοχῇ οἰκονομίαν] and wormwood shall be the dwelling places of their close places (Mic 7 17).

He should teach the poison of asp [πηθήν]: The viper's [ἐχίνος] tongue shall slay him (Job 30 16).

"Their wine is the poison of serpents [καμαλίμαμ], and the venom of adders [ἰχθυοκούναμα], the deaf adder's (Dt 8 15).

And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp [πηθήν], and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's [ἰχθυοκούναμα] den" (1sa 11 8). See also (8) and (9) above.

Most of the Bib. references to serpents are of a figurative nature, and they usually imply poisonous qualities. The wicked (Ps 66 4), the persecutor (Ps 140 4), and the enemy (Jer 8 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; Rev 12 9; 20 2). The term "serpent" (either as a unit or as a group) is applied to Judas 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 of the horse's head (Gen 44 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" (Mk 16 18; cf.Acts 28 5). It is said of him that trusts in Jeh: "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; 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, בֹּשָׁן. See NEHEMIAH.

SERPENT-CHARMING. -charm'ing: 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 Orientalists, is found in Ps 68 5; Ex 31 11; Jer 8 17; Sir 13 13, perhaps in Jas 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, krook'ed: With reference to the constellation round the North Pole, in the latter part of the passage, AV "serpent," is changed in RV to "swift serpent," in "gliding" or "slithering." See Astronomy, 11, 1.

SERPENT, FIERY. See Serpent, 3, (2).

SERPENT WORSHIP, wū'ship: Traces of this superstition are thought by certain critics to be discernible in the religion of Israel. Stade mentions that W. R. Smith supposed the serpent to be the totem of the house of David (Geschichte, 1, 465). H. P. Smith says: "We know of a Serpent's Stone near Jerusalem, which was the site of a sanctuary (1 K 10 19) and this sanctuary was dedicated to Jeh" (Hist of OT, 238, 240). Special reliance is placed on the narrative of the bruised serpent, which, according to Hengsten-kiah is recorded to have destroyed as leading to 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 area (Jer 5 24, etc); and its execution, 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. H. Gray, Nu, 275-76. The fancifulness of these deductions is obvious. See NEHEMIAH. JAMES O'NEILL

SERUG, se'rug (Σέρογ, st'ērōq; Σερογ, Scroth): Son of Reu and great-grandfather of Abraham (Gen 11 20; f 1 Ch 1 26; Lk 3 35).

SERVANT, sərv'vant (ἀσθενής, 'ebhēth; δοῦλος, 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 workman 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
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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 had fought 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 laid a heavier hand than on the city ofJerusalem 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 Babylonia, whether 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 Babylonia which is reflected and they 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 likely does it seem that their author penned them 150 years before the time with which they are usually connected. It is obviously impossible to treat that problem by a live theory, but one may sum up the arguments by saying that in theological ideas, in style, and 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 city.

The exile is assumed in what is said. These chapters do not prophesy the exile, do not say it is coming, they all the time speak as though it had come. The exilic is not that an exile is to be, but beginning with the fact that the exile already is, it foretells deliverance. Now of course it is conceivable that God might inspire a man to put himself forward 150 years, and with some grace to prophesy the life, knowing 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 an ease 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 settled by NT times.

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—

The out of this time comes the voice most full of gladness and abounding hope—

The prophet of the Exile of all the voices from the OT life. In the midst of the proud, confident civilization of Babylonia, with its teeming wealth and exhaustless splendor, came a man who dared to speak for Jehovah—a man of such power to see reality that to him Babylonia 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 a different author, a later date and a different author. In the background it is claimed is not Bab; it is the Exile which is the author's home and which he addresses when at home in Judaea, and in which one or more of the passages are said to be witness to the fact that the temple at Jerusalem seems to be standing, and that the Jewish theocracies 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 prophecies which we can recognize, and the suggestion that some of the difficult passages may be quotations from other older prophecies which are not preserved to us, I think an exceedingly good one. The quotation of passages from the Book of Hosea and the Ezekiel prophesy of the prophet's feeling of the need of the people, would seem to me not at all unnatural. If a later hand was 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 and has not been Shirred.

The questions regarding the Servant Passages as affecting the unity of the book will be treated later.

The first part of this section vividly contrasts Jeh and the idols worshipped with such splendor and ceremony. All the resources of irony and satire are used to give point and effect to the contrast. Cyrus the Median conqueror is already on the throne, and he is Jehovah's 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 Jeh, with illimitable foresight and detached wisdom, sees the deliverance, and 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 hurls a taunt song at the proud but impotent city.

Israel—the people of Jeh—the elect of God—is given the prophet's message. The past is called up as a witness to Jeh's dealings. His righteousness—His faithfulstness to His people—shall not fail. They are wretched, with a meekness that is felt, and out of it community 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 color of glory and richness of imagery at the prophet's command. And it is the one thing which, if we have a world-mission, It 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 chs 40, 41, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 this comes out clearly. And the mood of these chapters is expressed as well. And feeling 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
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 (cf Jer Servant— 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 are portrayed.

There are several incidental 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 (43 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 hands." In 42 19 we find the failure and inadequacy of Israel presented in the words, "Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, 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 7f 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 1f leaving the unworthiness of the actual Israel, there comes what seems to me a summons in the name of the ideal. The prevailing thought here 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 1–9a; 60 4–11; 62 13—63 12. 61 1–4 perhaps represents words of the Servant, but may refer to words of the prophet as a whole; 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."

DuBose quotes Cheyne that 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 in line with the generation of prophets? 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 the recent growth 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 being attached to them. The fact that the passages are not always a part of a connected narrative may, however, have if made a universal principle of discrimination as to authorship in the prophecies of the OT. If we succeed in giving the fundamental ideas of the passages a place in relation to the thought of Deutero-Isa, an argument for which cogency might be claimed will be dissipated. But this is by no means conclusive. To deny certain ideas to an author simply because he has not expressed them is not writing acknowledged to him is pernicious business. A message of hope surely does not preclude an appreciation of the dark things.

The truth of the matter is that even by great scholars the temptation to a criticism of knighth-servantry is not always resisted. And I think we shall not make any mistake in believing that this is the case with the attempt to throw doubt upon the Deutero-Isalian authorship of the Servant-passages.

(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. In His 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. Jeh's glory is not to be given to another, nor does He promise to give Him images. Former 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 1–9a: 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 in which he almost lay in vain, followed by insistence on his trust in God. Then Jeh promises him a larger mission than the restoration of Israel, viz. to be a light to the Gentiles. Jeh speaks of the Servant as one despised, yet to be triumphant as the new friend of earth and princes. He is to lead his people forth at their restoration, "to make them inherit the desolate heritages; saying to them that are bound, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves."

Clearly the Servant is distinct from the people Israel in this passage. Yet in ver 3 he is addressed as Israel. The word Israel here may be a gloss, which would solve the difficulty, or the Servant may be addressed as Israel because he gathers up in himself the meaning of the ideal Israel. If it is true that the prophet gradually passed from the conception of Israel as a nation to a person through whom its true destiny would be realized, this last suggestion would gain in probability.

One notices here the emphasis on the might of the Servant, and in this passage we come to understand that he is to pass through a time of ignominy. The phrase "a servant of rulers" is a difficult one, which would be clear if the prophet conceived of him as one of the exiles, and typically representing them. The Servant's mission in this passage seems quite bound up with the restoration.
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 judgment. This, because of his obedience. He was not rebellious and did not turn back from his mission. Faintly he set his face to the thing which was assigned him, after language vivid with a sense of nearness, assured consciousness of victory and faith in God are expressed.

In vs 10-11, according to Delitzsch, Jeth speaks, first entering into the idea of the Servant, then addressing those who despise his word. Cheyne thinks that Delitzsch misreads the passage. "In vs 10, May be the prophet, but I prefer Delitzsch's view.

53 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 Jeth 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 it.

Entering upon ch 53 we find the people of Israel speaking confessing their former unbelief, and giving as a reason the repulsive aspect of the Servant—despised, sad, sick with a visage to make men turn from him. It is said 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 death, or its relation to them. His grave even was an evidence of ignominy.

Beginning at ver 10 the people cease speaking, according to Delitzsch, and the prophecy becomes the organ of God who acknowledges His Servant. The reference to a trespass offering in vs 10 is remarkable. Nowhere else is prophecy so connected with the sacrificial system (A.B. Davidson).

It pleased God to bruise the Servant—his soul having been made a trespass offering; that time of humiliation is a time of exaltation that has come.

By his knowledge we are told—here a momentary reversion to the time of humiliation taking place—by his knowledge he shall justify many and bear their iniquities. Then comes the picture of exaltation—his exalted glory—there are stinging words—there is no home in 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 accept the idea that the prophetic 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 suggestive survey of the whole field of Biblical knowledge as it 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 are not come in the restoration. The Servant, if a real person, must be one whose work lies in the past or the present, as there is not room in the future for him, for the restoration which is at the door brings felicity, for the Servant can only come in the past and not in the future. Hence the Servant cannot be to the prophet's mind a real person (see CONIAB).

Of course Davidson relates the result to his larger conception of the prophet's task. As the Servant the Messiah, as the Servant of the Servant the Messiah, as the Servant of the Servant of the Servant the Messianic signification of the passages in relation to the fulfillment of the prophecy. The ideas they contain are realized in Him.

But coming back to the prophet's mind—if the Servant was not a person to him, what is the meaning of the Servant? The answer according to Davidson is, He is a great personification of the ideal Israel, an inner Israel according to its idea. "To quote more fully, "The prophet has created out of the Divine determinations imposed on Israel, election, creation and former, endowment, endowment with the word or spirit of Jeth, and the Divine purpose in these 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 obedience makes all Israel to become a true servant" (cf Davidson, OT Prophecy, 136).

Now it seems to me that Davidson is more effective in his destructive than in his constructive work. One must confess that his discussion presents real difficulties in his holding to a personal Servant as the prophet's conception. But on the other hand when he offers a more adequate conception I do not think he conscientiously succeeds.

The greatest of the Servant-pasages (it seems to me) presents more than can be successfully dealt with under the 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 flavor of reality in describing the suffering of a personification. The case of sin being atoned for 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 take a passage out of context, fitting it in an environment in which one believes it belongs. As Cheyne in other days said, "In the abstrusest of the descriptions of the Servant I am unable to resist the impression that we have the presentment of an ideal Servant and a historical Servant torn 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 have here been lift to a height of prophetic receptiveness where he received and uttered what went beyond his capacity to comprehend.

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 his Professor Hermann Schultz are worth quoting: "If it is true that 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 type for a greater, wondrously to appear. As John the Baptist on the Jordan watched for the coming One whom he knew not, yet who was "future," 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 have dawned 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—its wisdom 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 51, the Servant is brought nearer to the king than we sometimes 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 is.

But whatever our view of the meaning of the prophet, we must agree (cf Mt 8 17; 12 18-21; 26 67; Jn 12 41, et al.) that the conception he so boldly and powerfully put upon his canvass had its reality 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 places of his own heart, can feel a strange companionship.

8. Larger Messianic Significance with the Exilic prophet whose of the
Servant-
Passages slowly moving years. In the light of the restoration of that hour he may be trusted to know what the prophet meant. Professor Deltzsch 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, sdr-vis: Six Heb, two Aram. and four Gr words are so rendered.

In the OT the word most used for 'service' is (1) 'abbahdáh, from 'abhadh, which is the general word, meaning "to work" and so "to serve," viz.

1. In the OT

The word "service" is used in describing work in the fields (Ex 1 41, 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 Chr 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 a "service," in Nu 8 15; 15 23; Jer 22 13. (3) Serádth means "stitching," i.e. piercing with a needle; it occurs only 4 t, and in each case in AV instead of "service" is used "filly wrought garments" (Ex 31 10; 35 19; 59 1). (4) Sharáth means primarily "to attend" as a servant or worshipping, and to contribute to or render service, wait on, and thence service; occurs only 3 t (Ex 35 19; 39 1.1 AV) and in ARV is rendered "for ministering." (5) Cíbbáh 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 30.33-39.43; 8 24).

(6) Yádh, means "hold," an "offering," for direction, power, and so ministry as in 1 Chr 6 31, where David appoints certain ones to have direction of the music, t (1 Chr 29 5, RV not service, but "himself.") (7) 'Abbadháh means "business," "labor," "service."(8) Ear 6 19 is the only place where it is found. (8) Pólín, from root meaning "to worship," "minister to," and so in Ez 7 19 vessels given for service.

The following are the uses in the NT: (1) Dia-

konía, from root meaning "to run on errands," and so attendance, aid as a servant, min-

2. In the 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) Douolía, lit. "to be a slave," in bondage, service (Gal 4 8, "bondage"); Eph 6 7, "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"); Rev 12 1, "service"); Rom 12 1 ("spiritual service"); He 9 10 ("service"); 1 Cor 9 12, "service").

(4) Léitourgia, 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.

WILLIAM EDWARD RAFFEY
Thus (a) To attack: Jer 9 33, AV “and set upon the city.” (b) To imprint: Gen 4 15, AV “The Lord set a mark upon Cain.” (c) To trust: 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: Ezek 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 inquiries before thee.” Ps 143 3, “Set a watch, O Jehovah, before my mouth.” (h) To go down: of the setting of the sun (Mic 3 2), Lk 4 11, “To be proud.” Mal 3 15, AV “They that work wickedness are set up.” (j) To fill in: Ezek 36 9, “stones to be set, for the ephod.” (k) To plant: Mic 12 1, “set a hedge about it.” (l) To mock: Lk 23 11, “The Lord 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. Dobker

SETH, seth. SHETH, sheth (שֶׁת, shèth, סֵתָה, Sèth):

(1) The son born to Adam and Eve after the death of Abel (Gen 4 25; 5 3 ff; 1 Ch 1 1; Sir 49 16; Lk 3 38). In Gen 4 25 the derivation of the name is given as Eve’s “called him Seth,” for she said, God hath appointed that he shall seed instead of Abel.” In 1 Ch 1 1 AV, the form is “Sheth”; elsewhere in AV and in RV throughout the form is “Seth.”

(2) AV “the children of Sheth,” RV “the sons of nhamuk.” According to AV rendering, the name of an unknown race mentioned in Balaam’s parable (Nu 24 17).

S. F. Hunter

SETHER, se’ther (סְתֶר), Sethur; Sadoe, Sa-toiur; An Asherite spy (Nu 13 13 [14]).

SETTING, set’ing (מָקָם, makhôm, 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 it in its settings of stones, vis. four rows of precious stones. The same word is rendered “inclosings in ver 20, and in 39 13 AV.

Settle, set’l (סְתַל, ‘shèth). For this word in Ezek 43 14.17.20; 45 19, ARV and ERV substitute more correctly ‘ledge.’ See Temple.

Settle: The Heb language has 8 words which are thus tr*: yashabh, nabhath, anaath, sshabat, tlhaba, râ‘abâm, mâmôn, bôthâh’. Now the meaning is to settle down, to cause to occur (Ezek 36 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 65 10). In the NT the words ἐπαφέω, ἐπαφέως, ὕπαρξην, they employ, and ἔγείμω, ἀπασχολέω, have been tr* “settle.” RV in 1 Pet 5 10 has tr* “establish,” and the context unquestionably points to the idea of a fixed establishment in the faith. In Lk 21 14 the word the tr* “settle” evidences points to a fixed determination.

Henry E. Dobker

SEVEN, sev’n (שֶׁבֶן, shebôn; πέντε, heptô). See Number.

SEVEN CHURCHES. See Churches, Seven.

SEVEN STARS. See Astronomy.
SEVENEH, sē-wen'ē, se-wē'ne (סבִּינֵנָה), sṭāwēnē). For AV "the tower of Syene," in Ezk 29 10; 30 6, RV reads, "the tower of Seveneh," with note m, "or, from Migdol to Syene." Seveneh is the town at the First Cataract of the Nile as 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, PAPYRUS, SANCTUARY, 4, etc.

SEVENTH, sev'-nth. DAY. See SABBATH.

SEVENY, sev'-ni, sev'-ni (שבעים, shêbîm; בשבעים, hebdômêkonta). 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 to determine which is the correct reading; and internal evidence does not help us in this case. There is nothing in the function or circumstances to indicate any reason for the specific number.

Commentators have sought parallels in the seventy elders chosen to assist Moses (Nu 11) and suppose that Jesus was intending for His disciples, 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 (see Gen 10), and some have supposed Jesus to be thus indicating that His Church, which makes no distinction between Jews and Gentiles, is to extend the kingdom of God to all nations. But it is more probable that the seventy were not so far 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 the kingdom was a parabolic recognition that as the Jews were officially rejecting Him, so He was replacing them as agents for the work of the kingdom. It is impossible to speak with any certainty as to any of these suggestions.

Inasmuch as no further mention is made of these seventy, it is to be understood that they were appointed for a temporary ministry. Tradition maintains that the number was reduced to twenty in the latter part of the first century. The disciples active after Pentecost. While it is probable that some of these were witnesses later, the tradition is worthless in details. The mission of these and the reason assigned for their appointment are essentially the same as in the case of the Twelve. Jesus is now completing His last popular campaign in preaching and introducing the kingdom of heaven. The employing of these in this service is in line with the permanent ideal of Christiandom. In Eph 4:11-16 distinction is made 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 (Acts 1:8) and would find a hundred and twenty such after His ascension (Acts 1:15). WILLIAM OWEN CARVER

SEVEN YEARS: The "seventy weeks" of the prophecy in Dnl 9 24–27 have been a subject of controversy in the critical schools. The conflicting views may be seen very fully in Dr. Driver's Dnl, 91 ff, 145 ff, and Dr. Pusey's Daniel the Prophet, lects 11, 111, IV. On both sides it is agreed that the "weeks of years," as in the 70 weeks represent 490 years. This period, commencing with "the going forth of the commandments to restore and build Jerusalem" (ver 25), is divided into three parts, 7 weeks (49 years), 62 weeks (484 years), and one and 39 weeks (28 years). The third part to the appearance of "an anointed one [Heb "Messiah"], the prince" (ver 25), who, after the 62 weeks, shall be "cut off" (ver 26), apparently in the "midst" of the 70th week (ver 27). On the traditional view (see Pusey), the 69 weeks (483 years) mark the interval from the decree to rebuild Jerusalem till the appearance of Christ; and if, with Pusey, the decree in question be taken to be that of the 7th year of Artaxerxes (457–56 BC; the mission of Ezra; cf Ezr 7 8 ff), confirmed and extended in the 20th year of the same king (mission of Nehemiah; cf Neh 2 1 ff), the 483 years run out about 27–28 AD, when Our Lord's public ministry began. On the other hand, the view which supposes that the Book of Dnl belongs wholly to the Maccabean age, and does not here contain genuine prediction, is under the necessity of making the 490 years terminate with the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (171–164 BC), and this, it is admitted, cannot be done. To give time the violent expediency is adopted of dating the commencement of the 70th week from the prophecy of Jeremiah of the 70 years' captivity, or from the rebuilding of Jerusalem (606 or 587 BC), i.e. before the captivity had begun. Even this, as Dr. Driver admits (p. 146), leaves us in 171 BC, a period 87 years short of the duration 490 years, and a huge blunder of the writer of Dnl has to be assumed. The divergent reckonings are legion, and are mutually contradictory (see table in Pusey, p. 217). To invalidate the older view Dr. Driver supposes (p. 145) that the 69 weeks extend to ver 25 and 27 in ERV. It is to be noted, however, that ARV does not follow ERV in these changes. Thus, whereas ERV reads in ver 25, "Unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks: and three-score and two weeks, it shall be cut again; and accordingly takes "the anointed one" of ver 26 to be a distinct person, ARV (as also ERVn) reads, as in AV, "shall be seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks." Again, where ERV reads in ver 27 "For the half of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease," ARV (and ERVn) has as formerly, "In the midst of the week he shall cause" etc (conversely, in ver 25 ARVn gives the ERV rendering). The question cannot be dismissed here. It is well recognized that the interpretation may yet claim acceptance from those who do not accept the postulates of the newer critical writers. See DANIEL; JUBILEES, BOOK OF.

JAMES OER

SEVETH YEAR: 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; Ezr 1 1; Dnl 9 2). If the period be reckoned from the date of the first deportation in the 4th year of Jehoiakim (Ver Dnl 36 6 ff), Dnl 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'-er: The three Heb words badhal, pâldh and pâraḏh are thus tr1. 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 ἀφορίζω, aphorizō (Mt 24 32) stands for final judicial segregation.

SEVERAL, sev'-er-al, SEVERALLY, sev'-er-a-ly: The Heb and Gr words ἀρματικῶς, armatikōs and ἀρματικῶς, armatikōs in both cases tr4 "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 σήμερον, ἀδιός, is "several," "severely." In both cases it points to the individuality of the recipients of the gift bestowed.

SHAALABBIN, ša-a-šal-bā'īn (שֹׁלַבְבִין, sha'allabbin; B, Ṣalābīn, Ṣalābat, A, Ṣalābīn, Ṣalaleim): A town in the Dan territory of Benjamin (Jos 19:42). It seems to be identical with SHAALABIM.

SHAALABIM, ša-a-šal-bīm (שֹׁלַבִים, sha'allabim; B, Ṣalābīm, Béthalame, A, Ṣalābīn, Salaleim, in Josh B.A, Ṣalābīn, Thalabim): When the Amorites had forced the children of Dan into the mountain they came and dwelt in Mt. Heres, Aijalon and Shaalabim, where, it appears, they were made tributary to the house of Joseph (Jgs 1:35). In the time of Solomon it was included in the administrative district presided over by Ben-hoker, along with Makaz, Beth-shehem and Elon-ban-hanan (1 K 4:9). Beth-shehem is the same as Ir-shechem (Jos 19:42). Shaalabim is probably only another name of Shaalabbin. One of David's mighty men is called "Shalabba" in 2 Sam 23:23; 1 Ch 11:33, which again is probably identical with Shaalabim. Onom identifies it with Salala, a large village in the district of Sebastae (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 48:15 speaks of the towers of Aijalon and Selebi and Emmaus. Conder would identify Selebi with Selâbî, 3 miles N.W. of Aijalon (Yâdî), and 8 miles N. of Beth-shehem. This would suit for Shaalabim, as far as position is concerned; but it is difficult to account for the heavy f. name, if derived from Shaalabim.

E. W. WING

SHAALBONITE, ša-a-lâl-bô-nît, ša-a-bô-nît (שֹׁלַבֹּן, ha-shallbonîn; A Samlûnîn, ho Salâbînetis [2 S 23:32]; B, U Q, ho Hemûl, A, Šalâbîn, Šalâbîn): Eliezer, one of David's heroes, a native of Shaalbon. See SHAALABIM.

SHAALIM, ša-a-lîm, LAND OF (שֹׁלַל, אַלִים, erosh shoalâm; B, Ṣyôf ha-Šalûmû, Ṣyôf Eassàûmû, A, Ṣyôf ha-Šalûnû, Ṣyôf Šcâlûmû; AV Shalôm): Saul attains the research of his father's ass passed through Mt. Ephraim and the land of Shalishah, then through the land of Shaalim and the land of y'renî. This last name EV renders "Benjamin" (1 S 9:4). The whole passage is so obscure that no certain conclusions can be reached. The search party may have proceeded northward from Gibeah, through the uplands of Ephraim, turning then westward, then southward, and finally eastward. We should thus look for the land of Shalishah and the land of Shaalim on the right side of the mountain range; and the latter may have been on the slopes to the E. of Lydda. Possibly we ought here to read "Shalbim," instead of "Shaalim." W. Ewing

SHAAP, ša-a-f (שָׁאָב, sha'ab): (1) A son of Jablai (1 Ch 2:47). (2) The son of Maschah, a concubine of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel. Shaaph is called the "father," or founder, of the city Madmannah (1 Ch 2:45).f

SHARAIM, ša-a-rânîm (שֹׁאָרִים, sha'aronim), "two gates"; Ṣeṣaḏuḏ, Ṣorâkeim; AV Sharamaim): (1) A city in the Shephelah or "lowland" of Judah mentioned (Jos 15:36) in close association with Sooch and Azekah; the vanquished army of the Philis 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 themselves. Shaaraim has been identified with Tell Zakariyya (see however Azekah) and with Kh. Sa'trekh (PEF, 111, 124, Sh XVII), an old site W. of Beth 'Atib. Both proposals are hazardous.

(2) One of the towns of Simeon (1 Ch 4:31), called (Josh 19:6) "Saraheben" and, as one of the uttermost cities of Judah, called (Josh 19:6) "Shilhîm." This town was in Southwestern Pal and is very probably identical with the fortress Sharhana, a place of some importance on the road from Cjara to Egypt. Asmuss (XVIIIth Dynasty) besieged and captured this city in the 5th year of his reign in his pursuit of the flying Hykaos (Petræ, Hist, II, 22, 35), and a century later Tahutmes III, in the 23rd year of his reign, took the city of Sharhuben on his way to the siege and capture of Megiido (Petræ, Hist, II, 104). On philological grounds Tell esh-Sherî'â, 12 miles N.W. of Beersheba, a large ruin, has been proposed, but it does not suit at all the Egypt data (PEF, III, 399, Sh XXIV).

E. W. WING

SHAASHEGAZ, ša-a-sh'gaz (שֹׁשַגְぞ, sha'ashgaz), LXX reads Gs'a, Gai, the same name it gives to the official referred to in Est 2:15, the name may go back to the Old Acanan word Sâshakhant, "one anxious to learn" [Schatz]; 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, shah-b't-hî (שֶׁבֶתָהִי, sha'bthahy), "one born on the Sabbath"; B, Ṣāḇaṭâh, Šabatâh, A, Ḫâḇaṭâχ, Kabbathah = "Sabbatean" of 1 Es 9:14): A Levite who opposed (?) Ezra's suggestion that the men who had married foreign wives put them aside (Ezr 10:15). Kuenen, however, renders the phrase P̄N̄ s̄w̄, a vbhhol 'al zîth, of which Asahel and Jahaziah are the subjects, to mean "stand against," "oppose" (Gemamme 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 Kuenen's interpretation of the 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 chief s of the Levites who had the oversight of "the outward business of the house of God" ( Neh 11:16).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHACHIA, ša-ki'a, šak'î-urnished (שָׁכִי, sâkîyd, so Baer, Ginsberg; some edd read N̄s̄w̄, sakîyd, or N̄s̄w̄, sakâryā; also 1546, shakîyd, and 1546, shakhâryâh, and 1546, shakhâryâh): This last reading is favored by the Syrian and the LXX [B, Ṣâḇâs, Ṣâḇâ, Ṣâḇâ, Ṣâḇâ, Ṣâḇâ, but Luke, 1546, Shc̄aḥ], the forms in kh (2) instead of bh (2) have the support of the Vulg, Sechía, "Yahweh has forgotten"?: A name in a genealogy of Benjamin (1 Ch 8:10).

SHADDAI, šad'dâ-î, shad'dât. See GOD, NAMES OF, 11, 8.

SHADE, šâd, SHADOW, shadâh, SHADOVING, shad-dâh-ing (ΣΤ, σίδ; σκιά, skiah): A shadow is any obscuration of the light and heat with the form
of the intervening object, obscurely 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 21 5), of a great rock (Isa 35 20), of a roof (Gen 5 15), of the shadow on the dial (2 K 20 9, etc.), of Jonah's gourd (Jon 4 5 f.). 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; cf Col 2 17); (4) of darkness, gloom; see SHADOW OF DEATH. In Jas 1 17, we have in AV, "the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (apokolksma), 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 rising and setting of the sun" 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 "shadowy trees" RV has "lotus-trees."

W. L. Walker

SHADOW OF DEATH (םגמלות, qalmaweth): The Heb word trv "shadow of death" is used poetically for thick darkness (Job 3 5), as descriptive of Sheol (Job 3 21; 12 22; 38 17); figuratively of deep distress (Job 12 22; 16 16; 24 17 bis; 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; Isa 9 2; Jer 2 6; 13 10; Am 5 8; Mt 4 16; Lk 1 79, 80, 89. When Heb words are translated by English words meaning of gê, "shadow," and ma'aheth, "death," and the idea of "the valley of the shadow of death" was most probably derived from the deep ravines, darkened by over-hanging briars, etc., through which the shepherd had sometimes to lead or drive his sheep to new and better pastures.

W. L. Walker

SHADRACH, sha'drakh: The Bab name of one of the so-called Heb children. Shadrach is probably the Syrian form of the Bab Kadramu-Aki, "servant of Sin." It has been suggested by Meinhold that we should read Merodach instead of Shadrach. Since there were no vowels in the original Heb or Aram., and since sh and m as well as r and d are much alike in the old alphabet in which Dn 1 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 3rd year of Jehoiakim (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 requirements, 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 respect from the king, he told the 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, sha'di, TREES (Job 40 21 f.). See LOTUS TREES.

SHAFAR, shaf't: Isa 49 2 for 77b, הָג, "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 777, יָרֶק, "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, Arm.

Shaghe, shâ'gê (נִשָּׁג, shagheh'; KJV, Shaghe); B, Solâ, Solá, A, Sâ'gå, Sâ'gât; AV Shage: The father of Jonathan, one of David's heroes (1 Ch 11 34).

Shaharaim, shâ-âr-â-im (שוֹבָרָיִם), shobăr-ayim; B, Sâ'orôl, Sareaîl, A, Sâ'orô, Sareaîm: A Benjamite name (1 Ch 8 8). The passage is corrupt beyond any of the most tentative emendation. "Sharahim" has no connection with the foregoing text. One of the suggested readings is: "And Shaharaim 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-zô-ô-ma, sha-hâzô'ô-ma (שָׁהַצּוּמָה, shahâçumâh; B, Sâ'âlîm nâ-tâ êdâsâsûn, Sâ'âlîm hâ-tâ êdâsâsûn, A, Sâ'âlîmâh, Sâ'âlîmâh; AV Shazrah, shahâ'zimâh): 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, šâ'le'm, šâlām; el šâ'lêm, el šâlêm (סַלֵם, šâlôm): The word as a place-name occurs only in Gen 33 18. With Luther, following LXX, Pesch and Vulg, AV reads "And Jacob came to Shalem, a city of Shechem," RV with the Tgs Onqos and (pseudo-Jonathan) and the S. and the Ash, "and read, "came in peace to the city of Shechem." 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 (Shekho), there is a village bearing the name šâlôm. If AV is right, this must represent the city referred to; and E. of šâlôm 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. Šonöm gets over the difficulty by identifying Shalem with Shechem. W. Ewing

Shalm, šâ'îm. See Shaalim.

Shalishah, šâ-li'sha, šâ-li'ehš, LAND OF (סַלִישָה, šâlîsâh; KJV, 'ever shalishah; B, ḫ ṭ šâlîsâh, Ḫ ṭ šâlîsâh; A, ḫ ṭ ṭālîsâa, Ḫ ṭ ṭālîsâa; E, ḫ ṭ ūlîsâs): If the general indication of the route followed by Soul, given under Salmash, is correct, the land of Shalishah (1 S 9 4) will lie to the N.E. of Lydda 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 Kefer Thilith, about 10 miles N.E. of Jaffa, it meets well enough the general indication given above. Šonöm knows the name, but gives no guidance as to where the district is.
Baal-shalishah it places in the Thammite region, 15 miles N. of Diospolis (Lydda). No boundaries can be laid down, but probability points to this neighborhood. W. Ewing

SHALLECHETH, shal'k-keth, sha-lék-keth, THE GATE (םשֶׁלֶכֶת, šəlākeḵeth, i.e. as m, "Casting forth"): A gate of the temple "at the causeway that goeth up" (1 Ch 26 16)—probably an ascent from the Tyropoan Valley to the W. of the temple. It has been supposed on account of the meaning of the name that the temple and gate of the temple were cast forth there, but this is very unlikely—they were thrown into the Kidron valley to the E. or S.E. The LXX has παστορφορίον, pastophorion, which seems to point to a building with chambers; in consonance with this Cheyne reads in the Heb רַּבְּשֶׁת, rashkoth, "[of] the chambers." E. W. G. Masterman

SHALLUM, shal'um (שַׁלֹּם, shāllum, šalām; shalām; various forms in LXX): This is the name of not less than 12 Heb persons:

1. The youngest son of Naphtali (1 Ch 7 13). He is also called "Shilem" in Gen 46 24; Nu 26 49.
2. A descendant of Simeon, the son of Shaal and the father of Mibsam (1 Ch 4 25). He lived in 1618 BC.
3. The son of Sismai "son" of Sheerah of the tribe of Judah (1 Ch 2 40 41). He lived in 1300 BC.
4. A son of Kore, a porter of the sanctuary during the reign of David (1 Ch 9 17 19 31; Ezr 2 42; Neh 7 45). The name is also written "Me-shalum" in Neh 12 25, "Salum" in 1 Esd 6 28, "Meshelemiah" in 1 Ch 26 1 2 9, and "Shelemiah" in 1 Ch 26 14. He lived about 1050 BC.
5. A son of Zadok and father of Hilikiah, a high priest and ancestor of Ezra the scribe (1 Ch 6 12; Ezr 7 2). In the works of Jos he is called "Salmus"; in 1 Esd 8 1, "Salem," and in 2 Esd 1 1, "Salemes.
6. The 13th king of Israel. See following article.
7. A son of Bani, a priest who had taken a heathen wife and was compelled by Ezra the scribe to put her away (Ezr 10 42; omitted in 1 Esd 9 34).
8. The father of Jehizkiah, an Ephraimite in the time of Ahaz king of Israel (2 Ch 22 5).
9. The husband of the prophetess Huldah (2 K 22 14; 2 Ch 34 22). He was the keeper of the sacred wardrobe and was probably the uncle of Jeremiah the prophet (Jer 32 7; cf Jer 35 4).
10. King of Judah and son of Josiah (Jer 22 11; 1 Ch 3 15), better known by the name Jehohaz II. This name he received when he ascended the throne of Judah (2 Ch 36 1).
11. A Levite who was a porter at the time of Ezra (Ezr 10 24; "Salmus" in 1 Esd 9 25).
12. A ruler over a part of Judah and a son of Halkesh. He with his daughters aided in building the walls of Jerusalem in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 3 12).

S. L. UMBACH

SHALUM (שָלֹם, shalām, šalām, "the required one" [2 K 15 10 15]): The 15th king of Israel, and successor of Zechariah, whom he publicly assassinated in the 7th month of his reign. Nothing more is known of Shallum than that he was a son of Jabesh, which may indicate that he was a Gileadite from beyond Jordan. He is said to have made a "conspiracy" against Zechariah, so was not alone in his crime. The conspirators, however, had but a short-lived success, as, when Shallum had "reigned for the space of a month in Samaria," 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 Assyria to Israel (see JEROBOAM II), as when next we meet with that kingdom, it is under its own king and in alliance with Samaria (2 K 16 5).

The 10 years of rule given to Menahem (2 K 16 17) may be taken to indicate 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 later).

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHALLUN, shal'um, shalūm, not in LXX: Another form of Shallum, the son of Col-hozea. He was the ruler of the district of Mizpah. He assisted Nehemiah in building the wall of Jerusalem and in repairing the gate by the Pool of Siloah at the King's Gardens (Neh 3 16).

SHALMAI, shal'māy, shal'māy: AV form in Ezr 2 46 for "Shamlai"; Neh 7 48 "Salmai" (q.v.).

SHALMAN, shal'man (שַׁלֹּמָן, shālman): A name of uncertain meaning, found only once in the OT (Hos 10 14), in connection with a place-name, equally obscure, "as Shalman destroyed Beth-arbel." Shalman is most commonly interpreted as a contracted form of Shalmaneser, the name of several Assyrs kings. If this explanation is correct, the king referred to cannot be identified. Some have thought of Shalmaneser IV, who is said to have undertaken expeditions against the West in 775 and in 773 772. Others have proposed Shalmaneser V, who attacked Jerusalem in 723. This, however, is improbable, because the activity of Hosea ceased before Shalmaneser V became king. Shalman has also been identified with Salamanu, a king of Moab in the days of Hosea, who paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser V of Assyria; and with Shalma, a North Arabian tribe that invaded the Negeb. The identification of Beth-arbel (q.v.) is equally uncertain. From the reference it would seem that the event in question was well known and, therefore, probably one of recent and considerable importance, but our present historical knowledge does not enable us to connect any of the persons named with the destruction of any of the localities suggested for Beth-arbel. The ancient text offer no solution; they too seem to have been in the dark.

F. C. Eiselen

SHALMANESER, shal'-ma-něs'er (שַׁלֹּמָן-אֵשֶּר, shalmanešer): LXX Σαλμάναρ, Sammanešer, Σαλμάναρας, Salmanasor, Salmandaros): The name of several Assyrs kings. See ASYRIA; ASSYRIAN CAPTIVITY. It is Shalmaneser IV who is mentioned in the Bib. history (2 K 17 3; 18 9). He succeeded Tiglath-pileser on the throne in 772 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 unpaid resources, the result being that he was taken prisoner outside Samaria and most likely carried away to Nineveh. The Bib. 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 contraction for Shalmaneser, but the identity of Shalman and of Beth-archel named in the same passage is not sufficiently made out.

LITERATURE.—Schneider, "COT. I. 258 ff; McCurdy, "H.P.M. I. 587 ff; "

T. NICOL

SHAMA, shā'mā (תַּשָּׁם, shā'mā): One of David's heroes (1 Ch 11 44).

SHAMAI, shăm'ā'i. See Salm.

SHAMARIAH, shăm-a-ri'a, sha-mā'r'yā. See Shemariah.

SHAMBLES, shăm'blz (μαστόλον, makeldon): A slaughter-house; then a butcher's stall, meat-market. The word is once used in the NT in 1 Cor 10 25.

SHAME, shâm (עָזֹא, bēshk, "to be ashamed," רֵזָה, rēzah, "shame," בֶּשֶׁת, "shame," קַלָּן; ašūr, ašūr, "shame; "ignominious," אַתְמָה, atimā, "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 m; Hos 9 10 m; see Isu—horrētēth). 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, "vainness") (1 Cor 11 16; 14 35 AV; Eph 5 12), and "them 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, מ "Gr. 'shames'"). Manifestly, then, shame is a comcomitant of the Divine judgment upon sin; the very worst that a Hebrew could wish for an enemy was that he might be covered with shame (Ps 149 5; Mic 1 11), and 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 19 10). But also, and impartially, shame is the portion of faithless Israelites who deny Jeh and follow after strange gods (Ezk 17 18; Mic 7 10; Hos 10 6, and often). But shame, too, comes upon those who exalt themselves against God, who trust in earthly power and the show of material strength (2 Ch 35 21; Isa 30 3); and upon those who make a Mock of righteousness (Jeb 6 23; Ps 56 20; 133 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 place (Hos 4 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 Dnl (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

SHAMEFACELESSNESS, shăm-fā'se-nēs, shám-fā'sed-nēs. See Shamefastness.

SHAMEFASTNESS, shăm'fāst-nēs, shăm-fā'sed-nēs: The original AV tảsbs, täsbs, in Sir 41 18 and 1 Tim 2 9 (Perhaps half a century later the Hebrew "shamefacelessness" supplanted the better form, and continues in the ordinary editions of the King James Version. RV, however, rightly restores "shamefastness."

SHAMER, shâm'mër. See Shemer.

SHAMGAR, shâm'gär (שמגאר, shampagar): One of the judges, son of Anath (מָנָת, "Anath"), in whose days, which preceded the time of Deborah, it is stated (Jgs 5 6 7) and followed those of Ac Hola of old, Israel's subjugation was so complete that "the highways were unoccupied, and the travelers walked through byways." The government had become thoroughly dishonored, and apparently not a day of Deborah, the people were entirely unprepared for war. Shamgar's improvised weapon with which he helped to "save Israel" is spoken of as an oxgoad. With this he smote the Philis 600 men. This is the first mention of the Philis asTrouble-some neighbors of the Israelites (Jgs 3 31). According to a tradition represented in Jos (Am, V. 4, 3), Shamgar 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 "Shamgar" 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 Shamshah, son of Age (2 S 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 Shamgar a foreign oppressor and not a judge, and among the fathers of the Philis. 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}
SHAMHUTH, sham'huth. See Shammua, IV.

SHAMIR, šāmîr (שָׁמִיר, šāmîr; שָׁמוֹם, 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. be 20; So 21. 2,000 ft. above sea-level, a site with ancient walls, caves, cisterns, and tombs not far W. of Debir (edh Dhatheyc) and 2 miles N. of Anab (Anab) (PEF, III, 262, 286, Sh XX).
2) In the hill country of Ephraim (Jgs 10 1) from which came “Tola, the son of Puah, a man of Issachar,” who judged Israel 23 years; he died and was buried in the place with the semi-fortified and strongly-located town of San 2 on the road from Nablus to Jenin. A local chieftain in the early part of the last century fortified San 2 and thus dominated the whole district. That San 2 could hardly have been within the bounds of Issachar is an objection, but not necessarily a fatal one. It is noticeable that LXX A has ἀνάβεια, Ἀραμεία, for Shamir (PEF, II, Sh XI).

SHAMIR (שָׁמִיר, šāmîr; שָׁמוֹם, Sameir): A Kohathite, son of Miech (1 Ch 24 24).

SHAMLAI, sham'la'i, sham'lli. See Salmai.

SHAMMA, sham'a (שָׁמָה, sham'ma): B, שָׁמוֹת, Same, A, שָׁמָא, Samma): An Asherite (1 Ch 7 37).

SHAMMAH, sham'a (שָׁמָה, sham'ma):
1) The son of Reuel, the son of Esau, a tribal chief of Edom (Gen 36 13 17; 1 Ch 1 37, Ṣượ, Same, 2) The third son of 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 S 17 13 ff). One reductor states that he and his two brothers, who were also sons of Jesse, were joint recipients of the armor of David by Samuel (1 S 16 1–13). He was the father of Jonadab, the friend of Amnon (2 S 13 3 ff), and that Jonathan whose victory over the Philistines is narrated in 2 S 21 20 ff was also his son. His name is rendered as “Shammah” (1 S 16 9; 17 13), “Shimeah” (2 S 13 32), “Shmei” (2 S 21 21), and “Shimea” (1 Ch 2 13; 20 7).

2) The son of Agee, a Hararite, one of the “three mighty men” of David (2 S 23 11, LXX Σαμαθ, Samada), who held the field against the Philistines. The passage (1 Ch 11 10 ff) ascribes this deed to Eleazar, the son of Dodo. The succeeding incident (2 S 23 13 ff), viz. the famous act of three of David’s heroes who risked their lives to bring their leader water from the well of Bethlem, has frequently been credited to Shammah and two other members of “the three”; but the three warriors are plainly said (ver 13) to belong to “the thirty”; ver 33 should read “Jonathan, son of Shammah, the Hararite.” Jonathan, one of David’s “three,” was a son of Shammah; the word “son” has been accidentally omitted (Driver, Buidé, Kittel, etc.). The passage (1 Ch 11 34) has “son of Shache,” which is probably a misreading for “son of Agee.” Lucian’s version, “son of Shammah,” is most plausible. “Shimei the son of Ela” (1 K 4 18) should also appear in this passage if Lucian’s reading of “Ela” for “Agee” (2 S 23 11) be correct.

4) A Harodite (2 S 23 25 33), i.e. probably a native of ‘Ain-barad (‘Ain Jalud, 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 “Shammuth the Izrahite” (1 Ch 27 8).

SHAMMAH, sham’a, shamm’ah (שָׁמָה, sham’mah):
1) A Reubenite spy (Nu 13 4, Ṣאום, Samoul, and other forms).
2) One of David’s sons (2 S 5 14; 1 Ch 14 4, Ṣאום, Samma). In 1 Ch 3 5 he is called “Shimea.”
3) A Levite (Neh 11 17): he is called “She- maiah” in 1 Ch 9 16.
4) The head of a priestly family (Neh 12 18); a contemporary of Joakim.

SHAMSHERAII, shams-šer-ı, sham-she-ra’i (שָׁמְשֶר-י, shamšeray): A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 26).

SHAPE, shap: In AV the tr of elōth, elod, “form,” “appearance” (Lk 3 22; Jn 6 37), and of ḥayyōn, homîlôtâ, “likeness,” “resemblance” (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 thing or a person. This is the case in the phrase “the word is joined with the sâd, sâwarâd, sâmāhah, ‘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 mater- ial 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 homîlôtâ, has tr “form” for ḥayyōn, which also serves to render several other Gr synonyms, such as μορφή, μορφής (Mk 16 12; Phil 2 6 f), μορφών, μορφοσία (Rom 2 20; 2 Tim 3 5), τόπος, τόποι, RVm "pattern," “pattern,” Rom 6 17, and στοιχεῖα, στοιχεοπαίδες (RV “pattern,” “pattern,” 2 Tim 1 13). In AV Wisd 18 1 “shape” translates μορφή, RV “form.”

H. L. E. LUKERING

SHAPHAP, shâfâm (שָׁפָם, shâphâm; סַפָּם, Sapîm, Sapâr, Sabâd): 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 Hagrites (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.

SHAPHAM, shafan (שָׁפָן, shaphâm, “rock-badger,” EV “ceney”); “Saphan, Saphephon”: An old totem clan name (so W. R. Smith; cf. however, art. TOTEMISM: Gray, HPN, 103 ff, and Jacob’s Studies in Bib. Archaeology, 84 ff).

(1) Son of Azaliah and scribe of King Josiah. He received from Hilkiah the Book of the Law
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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 20 34; Jer 26 24), who befriended and protected the prophet Jeremiah. Another son, Eliasah, was one of the two men intrusted by Jeremiah with his letter to the captives in Babylon (Jer 29 3). A third son, Gemariah, vied (of Judah) to prevent 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 Jazaniah, one of the 70 men whom Ezekiel saw in his vision of the Temple, sacrificing to idols (Ez 8 11).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHAPHAT, sha’fat (שָׂפָט), shaphatḥ (שָפָט): (1) The Simeonite spy (Nu 13 5; Zeph, Sapahṭ).
(2) The father of the prophet Elisha (1 K 19 16; 2 K 4 1; LXX Sapahṭ).
(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 herdersmen (1 Ch 27 29).

SHAPHER, sha’fer. See SHEPHER.

SHAPHIR, sha’fer (שַׁפִּר, shaphir), “glittering”; kalṣōṣ, kalōz; AV Saphir: One of a group of towns mentioned in Mic 1 10–15. From the association with Gath, Azor (of Judah) and Mare(shah, it would seem that the places mentioned were in Southwestern Pal. According to Onom, there was a Zaphir, Sapheir, “in the hill country” (from a confusion with Shamir [Josh 15 48], where LXX A han Sapheir) between Eautrophos and Ascalon. The name probably survives in that of three villages called es-Safir, in the plain, some 34 miles S.E. of Ashdod (PER, 11, 413, 5b XV). Cheyne (EB, col. 4582) suggests the white “glittering” hill Tell es-Safir, at the entrance to the Wady es-Sant, which is known to the Crusaders as Blan-garde, but this site seems a more probable one for Gath (q.v.).

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SHARAI, sha-raj, sha’ri (שָׁרָי, šārəy): One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 40).

SHARAIM, sha-raj-im. See SHAARAIM.

SHARAR, sha-raj. See SCHAR.

SHARE, sha’ar. See FLOW.

SHAREZER, sha-re-zèr (שָׁרֶצֶר, sar’ezer, ‘ṣ; Shareer): (1) Connotes to the Assyri Shar-ugur, “protect the king”; found otherwise, not as a complete name, but as elements in personal names, e.g. Bel-šar-ugur, “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 with Adrammelech and Tachcun was slain by his father (2 K 19 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, 1941 ff), following Ahydenius, as quoted by

Eusebius, completed the name of Sennacherib’s son, so as to read Nergal-sharezer = Nergal-šar-ugur (Jer 39 3.13), and this is accepted by many modern scholars. Johns thinks that Sharezer (šar’ezer or sar’ezer) may be a corruption from Sharr’-etir-Asur, 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 fertility observance. Perhaps Sharr’-etir has a connection with Sharezer, and is possibly related 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-šar-ugur = Belshazzar. The present text, no matter how it reads, presents difficulties. See REGEM-MELECH.

F. C. EISELEI

SHARON, sha’rôn (שָׁרוֹן, ha-sharon), with the del. art. possibly meaning “the plain”; ṭo n라도, ṭo pedion, ṭo drumos, ṭo drumo, ṭo 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. Where 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. Nahr el-A‘ujeh enters the sea to the N. of Jaffa; Nahr Iskanderînâ 7 miles, and Nahr el-Mefîr fully 2 miles S. of Caesarea; and Nahr ez-Zerkâ, the “Crocodile River,” 2½ miles N. of Caesarea. Nahr el-Valîk runs its short course about 12 miles N. of Nahor el-A‘ujeh, 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 drumos. Jos (Ant., XIV, xiii, 3) speaks of “the woods” (hoi drumol) and Strabo (xiv) 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 breaths are given up to the pasturing of cattle. Over David’s herds that fed in Sharon was Shime a in the Sharonite (1 Ch 27 29). In the day of Israel’s sin “Quail 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 in the present day. The Ger. colony to the N. of Jaffa, preserving in its name, Sarôna, the old Gr. name of the plain, and several Jewish colonies are proving the wonderful productivity of the soil. The orange groves of Jaffa and Caesarea indicate that the land is still the same.

“The rose of Sharon” (Cant 2 1) is a mistranslation: hâbâqâceleth is not a “rose,” but the white narcissus, which in season abounds in the plain.
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 mtsbar 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, sha've, VALE OF ("^", 'emek shâ'el). See King's Vale.

SHAVEH-KIRIATHAIM, shâ've-kir-ya-thâ'îm ("^", shâ'ew kir'ya-thâ'îm; en Saôthâ'ti-pol). Here Chedorlaomer is said to have defeated the Emim (Gen 14 5). RV reads "the plain of Kiriathaim." If this rendering is right, we must look for the place in the neighborhood of Kiriathaim of Moab (Jer 48 1, etc), which is probably represented today by el-Kâreiyât, about 7 miles to the N. of Dibon.

SHARONITE, shâr'ûn-ît ("^", ho-shâró'tî; ε Σαρωνιτής, ho Sarōnîtîs): Applied in Scripture only to Shitrai (1 Ch 27 20). See SHARON.

SHARUHEN, sha-ro'hen ("^", shâ'râh'en; οι ἀγολ αὐτῶν, ho agol autôn): One of the cities in the territory of Judah assigned to Simeon (Josh 19 6). In 15 32 it is called "Shilhim," and in 1 Ch 4 31, "Shaaraim" (q.v.).

SHASHAI, sha'shâ'î ("^", shâ'shâ'y; Σασσεί, Sesset): One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 40) = "Sessis" in 1 Esd 9 34.

SHASHAK, shâ'shâk ("^", shâshâh'; Ἀσσαχ): Eponym of a Benjamite family (1 Ch 8 14 25).

SAUL, shâ'ul, SHALULITES, shâ'ûl-ît's ("^", shâ'îl; Σαοῦ, Saûol):
(1) A king of Edom (Gen 36 37 ff = 1 Ch 1 48 f).
(2) A son of Simon (Gen 46 10; Ex 6 15; Nu 26 13; 1 Ch 4 24). The clan was of notoriously impure stock, and, therefore, Shaul 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, gâ'az, usually gâ'â, gâ'âh; in Acts 21 24, ἔποτα, xurââ): 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). Nazirites 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 Hahn, 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 13 4).

Shaving "with a razor that is hired" is Issiah's graphic figure to denote the complete devastation of Judah by the Assyry army (Isa 7 20).

JAMES ORR

SHAVSHA, shav'sha ("^", shav'shâ'; in 2 S 20 25, K'tibhâ, N'tâ, shav'â; K'tê, N'tê, shô'â; EV "Sheva," are refuted by LXX; in 2 S 8 15-18,
in other respects identical with Ch, “Seraiah” is found. LXX. David's personages in all passages; it is the general consensus that Shavsha 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 18:11-17), in 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. Shavsha's two sons, Eliehoeph and Ahijah, were secretaries of state under Solomon; they are called "sons of Shisha" (1 K 4:3), "Shisha" probably a variant of "Shavsha."

**Horace J. Wolf**

**SHAWL, sōl:** RV substitutes "shawls" for AV "wimples" in Isa 3:22. See DRESS.

**SHEAF,** shēf; **SHEAVES,** shāv (םש), "'almāḥ, ʿōmer, ṭemār, ṭemēr): When the grain is reaped, it is laid in handfuls back of the reaper to be gathered by children or those who cannot stand the harder work of reaping (Ps 129:7). The handfuls are bound into large sheaves, two of which are laden at a time to a donkey (cf Neh 5:15). 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 handfu.l. 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 kemshi, kemshi (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 2:7-8).

**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 34:10). 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, sēl (שֵׁל, sēlād, "request"):** One of the Israelisites of the sons of Bani who had taken foreign wives (Ezr 10:34; LXX: Solowai, LXX Luc., Assālī; 1 Esd 9:30, "Janassul").

**SHEALTIEL, sēl-ōltī-ēl (שֵׁלתֵי-ל, sēlēltēl, but in Hag 1:12, 14; 2:1; LXX: Saulitēl; LXX and the NT always Saulēthiā, Saulēthiēl, hence "Sala- thiel") of 1 Esd 5:48.56; 6:2; AV of Mt 1:12; Lk 3:27: Father of Zerbabel (Ex 3:2:5; 5:2; Mt 1:12,13; Lk 3:27,14; Luke 3:27,14; fact, coupled with the statement of the first in Hag 1:17, Shealtiel was the oldest son of King Jeconiah; in ver 19 the MT makes Pedaiah, a brother of Shealtiel, the father of Zerbabel (cf Curtis, ICC)."}

**SHEAR, šēr.** See SHEEP; SHEEP TENDING.

**SHEARAH, shē-ā-ri'a, shē-ăr'ya (שְׁרָיָה, šārāyah; Šarād, Sarād):** A descendant of Saul (1 Ch 8:38; 9:44).

**SHEARING, shēr'ing, HOUSE:** **SHEAR, shēr (שֵׁר, šēr):** "house of binding of the shepherds"; B, Bāsdākā (א. בָּשָׁדָקָה) for nāqāmōn, nāqātēthākā (Bathkkādā, tvā nāqāmānān): 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 between Lod and Ramah in the plain. This seems to point to identification with Beit Kād, about 3 miles E. of Jenin.

**SHEAR-JASHUB, shē-ār-jāshūb or jāshūb (שֵׁיהוּב, shē'ār yāshāhb, "a remnant shall return"):** LXX ko katalerphtheis lusoubl: 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," "Mathershalash-baz," "Lo-ruhamah," etc) is symbolic of mercy in which the prophet wishes to emphatize. Thus Isaiah uses the very words shē'ār yāshāhb to express his oft-repeated statement that a remnant of Israel will return to Jeh (Isa 10:21).

**SHEATH, sēth.** See SWORD.

**SHEBA, šē̄ba (שֶׁבָּה, šēbāh; Šephā, Sābī):** (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 is 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 Southean tribe (Gen 10:29), and his own name and that of some of his brothers (e.g. Hazarmaveth = Hadhrumaut) 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-rangers (Job 1:15; 6:19; cf CTS 84:3).

By the Arab genealogists Saba is represented as great-grandson of Kąhtán (=Joktan) and ancestor of all the South-Arabian tribes. He is the father of Himyar and Kahřán. He is said to have been named Saba because he was the first to take prisoners (shābālah) in war. He founded the capital of Saba and built its citadel Marīb (Marib), 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 inscription.

1. **History:** 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 Eudoxus, which was later made known to European scholars. One of the Sabaeans kings is known from 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
Sabaean state came to an end, being most numerous about the commencement of the Sabean and the name of the nation of which Marib was the usual capital. The Sabaeans at first shared the sovereignty of South Arabia with Himyar and one or two other nations, but gradually absorbed the territories of these some time after the Christian era. The form of government seems to have been that of a republic or oligarchy, the chief magistracy going by a kind of rotation, and more than one "king" holding office simultaneously (similarly Dt 4:47 and often in the OT). The people seem to have been divided into patricians and plebeians, the former of whom had the right to build castles and to share in the government.

A number of deities are mentioned on the inscriptions, two chief being Baal-Makki and Ta'lab. Others are Athtar (masc. form of the Bib. 'dathr'), Hammon (the Bib. 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 sacrifice, 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 charge of his worshipper's castle, wells, 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 raising and trade. The chief products of their country are enumerated in Is 60:16, 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 Sabaean means "per-fume" (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 shared the same religious and even military functions. Polygamy does not seem to have been practised. The Sabaeans inscriptions do not go back far enough to throw any light upon the queen who was contemporary with Solomon, and the Arab, Khalif. It was information of her who is merely due to the latter being the only Sabaean queen known to them. Bilkiš must have lived several centuries later than the Heb monarch.

(3) The alphabet used in the Sabean inscriptions is considered by most scholars to be the original Sem alphabet, from which the others are derived. In other respects Sabean art seems to be dependent upon that of Assyria, Persia and Greece. The coins are Gr and Rom style, while the system of weights employed is Persia. See further SABAENS.

LITERATURE.—Rödiger and Oslander in ZDMG, vols XX and XXI; Halfey in Journal Asiatique, 1886, vol VI; CTS, ed. by J. and R. Schürer; Hamdani, ed by D. H. Müller, 1891; Mordtmann, Himyari sche Inschriften, 1893; Hommel, Südasiatische Chronologie, 1895; Schürer, Achéen, 1895; D. H. Müller, Südasiatische Alterthümer, 1899; Derenbourg, Les monumens en sabéens, 1899; On the coins Schümberger, Le trésor de San'a, 1880; Mordtmann in Wiener numismatische Zeitschrift, 1880.

SHEBA, sheb'h (שֵׁבָה; shehba'ha; Zêber, Sêber, or Sâmê, Sâmâ); The name of one of the towns allotted to Simeon (Josh 19:12). AV mentions it as an independent town, but as it is not mentioned at all in the parallel list (1 Ch 4:28), and is omitted in Josh 19:2 in some MSS, it is probable that RV is correct in its tr "Ieer-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 (q.v.).

SHEBA, QUEEN OF. See QUEEN OF SHEBA.

SHEBAH, sheb'hasha. See SHEBAH.

SHEBAM, sheb'hash. See SHEBAH.

SHEBAH, sheb'ha'shána. See SHEBAH.

SHEBAHANIAH, sheb-a'nhâ, sheb-bân'ya (שְׂבַּה חַנָּא; sheb'hanyâh), in 1 Ch 16:24, sh'b'hanyâhâh): (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 SHECAHIAH.

(3) Another Levite who sealed the covenant (Neh 10:12).

(4) A priest in the time of David (1 Ch 15:24).

SHEBARIAM, sheb'ârim, sheb'hâ'rim (שֶׁבַּרְיָה; sh'bharyâh; ka-shb'hârîm; sôrâ'pâ'rim, sôd'ârâ'rim): After the repulse of the first attack on their city the men of Ai chased the Israelites "even unto Shebariam" (Josh 7:5). RV reads "the quarter"; so Keil, Steuernagel, etc. LXX reads "until they were broken," translating "the quarter" as "leaders." 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, sheb'at' (שֵׁבַת; shb'hāṭ): The 11th month of the Jewish year (See 1:7), corresponding to February. See CALENDAR.

SHEBER, sheb'her (שֶׁבֶר; shehber'; B, Zêbêp, Sêber, A, Zêbêp, Sêber): A son of Caleb by his concubine Maacah (1 Ch 2:48).

SHEBNA, sheb'nâ (שֵׁבֵן; shebh'na; Zômâos, Sâmâos; but רבנָה, shebh'nâh, in 2 K 18:10, 18:18:26:37 and 19:2 = Isa 36:11:22 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 the 3rd "steward of the house" in RV of Gen 43:16:19; 44:1, 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 15:2; 18:11, 3:15: 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, "Joatham, the king's son, was over the household, judging all the people of the land." Again Isa 22:15 speaks of "this sôkhên," 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 15:13; 22:2; 34:9. The fem. participle is employed of Ahishag in 1 K 2:24, where AV translates "cherisher;" BDB renders it "servitor" or "steward" in Isa 22:15. It occurs also as a Can. gloss in the Am Tab. (Winckler no. 2579:9). The sôkhên was a high officer: Shebna had splendid chariots (v. 18), but what the office 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,"
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Shebna
Shechem

i.e. governor of the palace, probably, or major-domo. The word ἱκέν 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 σήφερ, "scribe" or "secretary," a minister 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 (Shebhnî) twice in the prophecies of Isaiah and Hosea: (2 K 18 18) and a Joah (ben Jozahz) having the very same position under Josiah a century later (2 Ch 34 8). But such a coincidence is rare. Had there been two high officials 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, "Isc.," 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"] and is over the house," or is over the palace, are properly the title of the 15 ff. section, 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 (RV'm) 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? Behold, Jeh of hosts, 

Box (Isa) would further transpose some parts of vs 17 f. Shebna is to be looked as a ball into "a land wide of sides," i.e. a broad extensive land. He is addressed as a disigrant to the house of his royal master. The prophecy is not a personal inveighing, 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-Assyrian (Sadd 5 5-9a). 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 Iisianic, only later in date than vs 15 f, 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 such official life 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).

Note the question to be preceded.

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 Isa 22 15-18 is to be dated previous 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 (2) 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 1917, LX, 337 ff., that Isa 22 15-18 is a later history, perhaps as late as the year 621-42. Fullerton sets vs 24 f as not due to Isaiah, and maintains that Isa 22 15-18 was spoken by the prophet early in the reign of Manasseh, i.e. later than 2 K 18 f. "not so much as a prophecy, a sample pronouncement, as an attempt to save the palace office..." It must be admitted that Isaiah probably did not succeed. The reactionary party seems to have remained in council during the reign of Manasseh. Unfortunately, the moral significance of Isaiah does not depend on the fulfillment of this or that specific prediction. We are dealing not with a walking oracle, but with a great character and a noble life (p. 639). He does, however, feel from the end of the house," that a conspiracy had been formed against him by the prophetic party which proposed to place Eliaim on the throne" (p. 560). Isaiah thinks he 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 further than their great leader would approve. This view assumes too much, (a) that the terms in vs 20-23 refer toingly power; (b) that Eliakim was of Davidic descent, unless we have a man of non-Davidic origin aspiring to 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, sh'e-búl'd, sheb'úl'd (םשבוייל, Shebhi'el; Σωβαύλ, Soubail): (1) A son of Gershom and grandson of Moses (1 Ch 23 16). He was "ruler over the treasures" (26 24). In 24 20 he is called "Shubael," which is probably the original form of the name (see Gray, HIN, 310).

(2) A son of Heman (1 Ch 25 4), called in ver 20 "Shubael" (LXX as in ver 4).

SHECANIAH, SHECHANIAH, shek-an'-í-a, shek'án-ya (שְׁכַנִּית, Shekhannya) [in 1 Ch 24 11; 2 Ch 31 15, Shekhannah; B. Ἰσχάνα, Iischanâ, Σέχανα, Sekhâni]: (1) A descendant of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3 21 22). This is the same Shecaniah mentioned in Ezra 8 8.

(2) "The sons of Shecaniah," so the MT of Ezra 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 Jahaziel" (of 1 Esd 8 32, "of the sons of Zattoshe, Schenias the son of Jezzebel").

(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 Shechaniah, "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.

**Shechem, shē'kem (Σχῆμα; șekhem, "shoulder"); Συχέμ, Suchém, ἡ Σίκιμα, ἡ Σικίμα, τὰ Σίκιμα, τὰ Σικίμα, etc; AV gives "Shechem" in 1. Histori- Gen 12:6; and "Sycem" in Acts 7:16): 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 12:6f). It was doubtless by this oak that Jacob, on his return from Paddan-aram, buried "the strange [ARV "foreign"] gods" (36:4). Hither he had come after his meeting with Esau (33:18). Onom here identifies Shechem with Shalem; but see SHLEM. 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 seek his brethren (37:2). It is mentioned as lying to the W. of Michmethath (el-Mothneh) 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 20). 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." Joshua's parable was spoken from the cliff of Gerizim overlooking the town (vs 7f). 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
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 ben Nethaniah (Jer 41:5ff). It became the central city of the Samaritans, whose shrine was built on Mt. Gerizim (Sir 60:26; Ass, XI, viii, 6; XII, i, 1; XIII, iii, 4). Shechem was captured by John Hyrcanus I B.C. (Ass, XIII, ix, 1; BJ, i, 6). It appears in the NT only in the speech of Stephen (Acts 7:16, AV "Sychem"). Some (e.g., Smith, DB, s.v.) would identify it with Sychar of Jn 4:5; but see SheCh. Under the Romans it became Phila. Neapolis. It bore the name of 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 Mt. Ephraim, Ebal and Gerizim.

2. Location guarding it on the N. and S. respectively, and Physically. Along this line runs the great biblical road which from time immemorial has formed the easiest and the quickest means of communication between the E. of 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 Müller, Asien u. Europa, 394), "Mountain of Sahams" probably referring to Phila. (i.e., Gerizim). The ancient city may have lain 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 directly on the S. side of the valley, 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 Makmeh. To the E. of the city, in a reccia at the base of Gerizim, is the sanctuary known as the Elijah of Mount, i.e., "men of the column" or "pillars," 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 called Ballat or Ballat, the name which may be connected with ballat, "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 el-Azor, see Sychar. To the S. of the vale is the traditional Well of Jacob; see Jacob's Well. To the S.W. of the city is a small mosque on the spot where Jacob is said to have moured over the blood-stained coat of Joseph. In the neighboring mararet is a stone whereon the Ten Commandments are engraved in Samaritan characters. The main center of the town in 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.

3. Modern Shechem

The 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 olives growing in the vicinity, and leather goods are also 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.

SHCHEMITEs, she-kem-its (וֹשֵׁךְ, ha-shekhitm, סְכֵּמִי, Suchemeli); The descendants of Shechem the son of Gilead, a clan of Eastern Manasseh (Nu 26:31; Josh 17:3).

SHED, SHEL'ING, The three Heb words, naphar, sâm or süm and shaphak, tr'd "shed" in many OT passages, always mean a "pouring out," and in nearly every case the point to the effusion of blood (Gen 37:26; 44:9; Josh 21:22; 1 Ch 22:8; Prov 16, etc.). The Gr words ἔκχω, ἐκχέω, and ἐκχώρηω, have precisely the same specific meaning (Mt 23:35; 26:28; Mk 14:24; Lk 11:50; He 9:22, Rev 16:6). Sometimes they are tropically used in reference to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2 33 AV; Tit 3:6), and to the outpouring of the love of God in the believer's heart (Rom 5:5).

Henry E. Dusker

SHED'EUR, shed'-er, shëd-ä'r, "daybreak"; Sh'dbör, She'doër, She'doir, She'dōir, "lightning"; She'döir, "shock"; (Num 15:1; 34:5, AV, B.B.); She'dbir, "third" (Num 15:1; 34:5; B.B.; Gr. Ipsi, "third"; Acts 7:43). Fr. Delitzsch correctly conceives the name as an Assyrian compound, šará udir, "daybreak." Cf., however, Gray, HPN, 169, 107, who emends the text to read Shaddâ'dūr, "Shaddai is flame.

SHEEP, shipt. The usual Heb word is נָקָה, cō'n, which is often tr'd "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). AV and ERV have "milk of sheep." Cf Arab. ʼā'd, ʼān. The Gr word is ἐκπλασθέω, probatón. 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 Rasmaskan species. One species, the wild aoudad, Ovis aries, is found in Europe. The Barbary sheep, Ovis tragelaphus, also known as the black or ariel, or its races, the AOU or the black Barbary sheep, Ovis aries, is found in Europe. The wild sheep of Europe is known as the Armenian wild sheep, Ovis aries, or the "black sheep" of Asia Minor and Persia. The wild sheep are in the same genus as the domestic sheep, and all are characterized by the possession of an enormous fat tail which weighs many pounds and is known in Arab. as ʼālūyāt, "fat tail" (AV "rumpp") (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
brought down to the coast in easy stages. Among the Moslems every well-to-do family sacrifices a sheep at the feast of al-‘udha’, the 10th day of the month dhul-hijjat, 40 days after the end of azadad, the month of fasting. In Lebanon every peasant family during the summer fattens a young ram, which is

literally cramped 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. Every afternoon she washes it at the village fountain. When slaughtered in the fall it is called , , , , , , , 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 , , , 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 through 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 Gilad 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 sheering 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 “very soft” (2 S 13:23-29). The character of the occasion is evident also from the indignation of David at Nabáal when the latter refused to provide entertainment at his sheep-shearing for David’s young men who had previously protected the sheep of Nabáal (1 S 25:2-15). 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 unto the Lord upon the altar nineteen thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep” (2 Ch 7:11); “And three sacrifices unto the Lord in that day in the reign of Asa ... seven hundred oxen and seven thousand sheep” (2 Ch 15:11); at the cleansing of the temple by Zerubbabel (the consecrated things comprising two hundred and one hundred oxen and three thousand sheep. But the priests were too few, so that they could not carry all the burnt offerings: wherefore their brethren the Levites did help them” (2 Ch 29:33); and “Hoshea king of Judah did give 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 21:1). A king of Moab is called a “sheep-master,” and we read that “he rendered unto the king of Israel the wool of a hundred thousand rams, 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; Ezk 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; Ezk 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; Ezk 34:6; Lk 15:3ff). 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 12:4). 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 good 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

SHEEP COT, shēp‘kot, shēp’kōt, SHEEPFOLD, shēp’fəld (תְּבֶל, gēḇēresh, תְּבֶל, mikhālah, תְּבֶל, mishyphthayim, תְּבֶל, nāvōch; ‘adīk, ‘ađel): 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; Lk 13:31; Zeph 2:6). One of these sheepfolds is heaped thorny brushwood 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 keep the flocks (Gen 30:28; 2 S 5:2). In the winter time caves are sought after (1 S 34:3; 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 (סֵפֶר), sha'or ha-gōn (Neh 3 132; 12 39): One of the gates of Jerusalem, probably near the northeast corner. See Jerusalem. For the "sheep gate" of Jn 5 2, see Bethesda; Sheep Market.

SHEEP MARKET (Jn 5 2, RV "sheep gate"): The Gr (παρατήριον, hê probable) means something simply that pertains to sheep. See Bethesda; Sheep Gate.


SHEEP-SHEARING, shēp’she-ring: The shearing is done in the springtime, either by the owner (Gen 31 19; 35 13; Dt 15 19; 1 S 25 24) or by regular "shearers" (תֹּפֶר, gōzāw) (1 S 25 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 3 4, Mesha, the chief or shepherd of Moab, was a sheep-master, lit. "a sheep spotter." JAMES A. PATCH

SHEEPSKIN, shēp'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 doubtless 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 plateau 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, shē'ra (םֶ֖שֶרַ), shē'rah'; A, Šaşād, Sārār, B omission): A daughter of Ephraim, who, according to the MT of 1 Ch 7 24 (AV "Sherah"), 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 Bēt Sīrā, a village 2 miles S.W. of the Lower Beth-horon (Mem 3 10).

SHEET, shēt. See Dress; cf Acts 10 11, "as it were a great sheet" (ἐνθέον, olothēn).

SHEHARIAH, shē-ha-ri’a (שֵּׁשֶׁהַרִי), shēharyāh): A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 26).

SHEKEL, shēk’l, shēk’el, shēk’el, shēk’ul (שַֽיֵּךְ), shēkel): A weight and a coin. The Heb 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 232 grains. In value it was about equal to £2 1s. 6d., or $10. See Money; Weights and Measures. In RV of Mt 17 27 "shekel" replaces "piece of money" of AV, the tr of σταρίον, sta'ter. See STATER.

H. PORTER

SHEKEL OF THE KING'S WEIGHT, or ROYAL SHEKEL (תֹּפֶ֖ר גֹּתַּמ, 'ebhen ha-melekî), "stone i.e. weight of the king"): The shekel by which Absalom's hair was weighed (2 S 14 26), probably the light shekel of 130 grams. See Weights and Measures.

SHEKEL OF THE SANCTUARY, or SACRED SHEKEL (תֹּפֶ֖ר חֵיֵם, shekel ha-kodshēh [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, shē-kī'nah (שֵּׁקִינָה), shekînâh, "that which dwells," from the vb. ṣhâkān, ṣhākân, or ṣhākhan, "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.

SHELAH, shē'la (שֶּלַח), shēlāh; Zānā, Sālah): (1) The youngest son of Judah and the daughter of Shua the Canaanite (Gen 36 5 11 14 26; 46 12; Nu 26 20 [16]; 1 Ch 2 3 4 21). He gave his name to the family of the Shelanites (Nu 26 20 [16]). Probably "the Shelanites" should be substituted for "the Shelemites" of Neh 11 5; 1 Ch 9 5.

(2) (תֹּפֶ֖ר, shēlēh): The son of the LXX grandson of Arpachshad and father of Eber (Gen 10 24; 11 13 [12]; 14 15; 1 Ch 1 18 24; Lk 3 35).

(3) Neh 3 15 = Shilohah" of Isa 8 6. See SİLOAH.


SHELEMIAH, shēl-ēm’i-ah, shēl-ēm’yā (שֶׁלֶמְיָהוּ), shelemīyāh; B, Sâlām, Selemid, A, Sâlāmās, Selēmās): (1) One of the sons of Bani who married foreign wives in the time of Ezra (Ezr 10 39), called "Selemias" in 1 Esd 9 34.

(2) Father of Hananiah who restored part of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 3 30) (B, Tēśwād, Tēlēmīd, N, Tēmūdās, Tēlēmīdās).

(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 2; 38 1; in the second passage the name is Telyahānāh).

(5) The father of Irijah, the captain of the ward, who arrested Jeremiah as a deserter to the Chaldaea (Jer 37 13).

(6) 1 Ch 26 14. See MESHHELPHIAH.

(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—Sharai, Azarel, and Shelemiah—is almost identical with the names in Jer 36 26, viz. Seriah, Azriel, Shelomith.

(8) Ancestor of Jehudi (Jer 36 14).

(9) (LXX omits.) Son of Abdeel, 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). See MESHEMIAH.

HORACE J. WOLP
SHELEPH, šé'lef (שֶּלֶף, šâlēf, in pause; LXX Ἀδεφ, Ἀδελφός): Son of Joktan (Gen 10:26; 1 Ch 1:20). Sheleph is the name of a Yemenite tribe or district, named on Saubian inscriptions and also by Arabians, located in Southern Arabia.

SHELESH, šé'leš (שֶּלֶשׁ, šâlešh; B, סֶלֶשׁ, Sâmēh, A, סָלֶשׁ, Salmēth, Lc, סילום, Sâlem): An Asherite, son of Helam (1 Ch 7:35).

SHELOMITH, šé'loməth (שֶּלֹמִית, šâlōmîṯ; in Ezra 8:10, ולום, šâlōmîṯ): (1) The mother of the man who was stoned for blasphemy (Lev 24:11) (B, סָלָומִית, Šalômîṯ, Lc, סַלְמִית, Šalmîṯ).

(2) Daughter of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3:19) (B, סָלָומִית, Šalômîṯ, A, סָלָמִית, Šalômîṯ, Lc, סלָמִית, Šalmîṯ).

(3) One of the "sons of Izhar" (1 Ch 22:18) (B, סָלָומִית, Šalômîṯ, A, סָלָמִית, Šalômîṯ, Lc, סולומית, Šalômîṯ), called "Shealomith" in 24:22.

(4) The name of a family whose representatives returned with Ezra (Ezra 8:10) (B, סָלָומִית, Šalômîṯ, A, סָלָמִית, Šalômîṯ). 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 Josephasah."

HORACE J. WOLF

SHELOMOTH, šé'lō-moth, šé'lo-moth, -moth (שֶּלֹה-מִית, šâlōh-mîṯ): (1) An Izharite (1 Ch 24:22, B, סָלָומִית, Šalômîṯ, Lc, סַלְמִית, Šalmîṯ = "Shealomith") of 23:18).

(2) A Levite descended from Elizer ben Moses (1 Ch 26:25, "סָלָמִית", šâlômîṯ; 26:28).

(3) A Gershomite (1 Ch 23:9, "סָלָמִית", šâlômîṯ; B, סָלְמִית, Šalmîṯ, A, סָלָמִית, Šalômîṯ). No context is provided at this point. 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 Gray, HPN, 200). The meaning of the present form, if it be correct, is "at peace with God." [Hommed, AMHT, 200, ‘my friend is God’]. LXX reads סלומיה (Salomêth), 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 Shlemiel, called there "Salmelid."

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEM, shem (שֵׁם, šām; סֵם, Sām; Stm): The eldest son of Noah, from whom the Jews, as well as the Semitic ("Semitic") nations in general 1. Position have descended. When giving the names of Noah’s three sons, Shem is always mentioned first (Gen 9:18; 10:21); it is interesting to note that Shem may be the usual Heb word for "name" (šām), given him because he was the firstborn—a parallel to the Assy-Bab usage, in which "son," "name" (šām) are synonyms (W. A. Inserations, V. pl. 23, II. 20—23a).

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 married at the time of the Flood, Shem had no children. Alied by Japheth, he covered the nakedness of their father, from whom the youngest brother, had revealed to them; but unlike the last, Shem and Japheth, in their filial piety, approached their father walking backward, in order not to look him. Two years after the Flood Shem being 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 pious blessing, on awakening from his wine, may be regarded as having been fulfilled in his descendants, who occupied Syria (Aram), Pal (Canaan), Chalada (Arpachshad), Assiya (Assheer), part of Persia (Elam), and Arabia (Joktan). In the first three of these, as well as in Elam, Canaanites had settled (not in the other districts mentioned), but Semites 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 Semites (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; JAPETH; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. PINCHES

SHEMA, šē'ma (שֵׁמָא, šēmā; סָמא, Ša'māt, Šamād): A city of Judah in the Negeb (Josh 15:26). If, as some think, identical with SHEBA (q.v.) of Josh 19:2, then the latter must have been inserted here from Josh 15:26. It is noticeable that the root letters (םש) were those from which Simeon is derived, and Shema is probably identical with Jesha (Neh 11:26). The place was clearly far S., and it may be Kh. Sa’swā, a ruin upon a prominent hilltop between Kh. ’Aϊṭir and Kh. el-Milh. There is a wall around the ruins, of large blocks of conglomerate flint (PEF, III, 409, Sh XXXV).

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SHEMA (שֵׁם, šēm):

(1) A Reubenite (1 Ch 5:8, 8, B, סָמא, Šāma, Lc, סם, Šām, Shemamed). See SHEBA.

(2) One of the heads of "fathers’ houses" in I Ajalon, who put to flight the inhabitants of Gath (1 Ch 13:8, 8, B, סמא, Šāma, Lc, סם, Šām, Shemamed); in ver 21 he is called "Shemei." 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, 4, Nema’s, Šimnāt). He is called "Shammus" in 1 Esd 9:43.

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMAH, šē'mā (שֵׁמַא, šēmā; ko-šēmād; B, זאמ, Amud, A, סמא, Šāmā, Lc, "אمؤ, Šma’), A Benjaminite, who was the father, according to the MT, of Ahiezer and Joash; but according to the LXX vio, hūsios = ἃ (ben) instead of τοῦ (bēn) of Joash alone (1 Ch 12:3). The original text may have read Σαμᾶ ο, ben γνήσιον, hōsiam' (of Šēmeter, hōsiam', of Ἀσία, 13); then a dittography of the following μ (h) caused the error (Curtis, ICC).

SHEM'AH, šē'ma’ya (שֵׁמה’יא, šēma’ya; šē’ma’yaḥ in 2 Ch 11 2; 17 8; 31 15; 35 9; Jer 26 20; 29 24; 36 12, še’ma’yaḥ), "Jaheb hears":

Sheep Gate
Shemaiah
The name is most frequently borne by priests, Levites and prophets.

(1) B. Samias, Sammaias, A, Zaqais, Samoias (2 Ch 13 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 Shemaijah at the gathering at Shechem where both Jeroboam and Rehoboam were present; it narrates that on this occasion Shemaijah (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.) Shemaijah 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 Judah 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, Zaqais, Samaid), a descendant of Zerubbabel. This is also the name of one of the men who helped to repair the wall (Neh 3 29, Zaqais, Semelai [N] [cf Com., ICC, in vv 7-24 of 1 Ch 3]).

(3) A Simeonite (1 Ch 4 37, B, Zaqais, Semelai, A, Zaqais, Samoiias), identical, perhaps, with the Shemel of 1 Ch 4 26:27.

(4) A Reubenite (1 Ch 5 4, B, Zaqais, Semelai, A, Zaqais, Semleim), called Shema in ver 8.

(5) A Merarite Levite (1 Ch 6 14; Neh 11 15, Zaqais, Samoias, B, Zaqais, Samoiias) of those who dwelt in Jerusalem.

(6) A Levite of the family of Jeduthun, father of Obadiah or Abda (1 Ch 9 16, B, Zaqais, Semeid, A, Zaqais, Samoias, called "Shammua" in Neh 11 17).

(7) Head of the Levitical Kohathite clan of Elisaphan in the time of David (1 Ch 15 8, B, Zaqais, Samoias, A, Zaqais, Samoiias, B, Zaqais, Samoias; ver 11, B, Zaqais, Samoias, A, Zaqais, Samoiias, Semelai, B, Zaqais, Samai).

He may be the same person as (8).

(8) The scribe (1 Ch 24 6), the son of Nethanel, who registered the names of the priestly courses.


(10) A Levite (2 Ch 17 5, B, Zaqais, Samoias, A, Zaqais, Samoiias), one of the commission appointed by Jehoshaphat to teach the book of the Law in Judah. The names of the commission members as a whole belong to a period later than the 9th cent. (Gray, HPN, 231).

(11) One of the men "over the free-will offerings of God" (2 Ch 31 15, Zaqais, Semelai).

(12) A Levite of the family of Jeduthun in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Ch 29 14), one of those who assisted in the purification of the Temple.

(13) A chief of the Levites (2 Ch 35 9), called "Samaish" in LXX and 1 Esd 1 9.

(14) A "chief man" under Ezra (Ezr 8 16), called "Massmas" and "Samaish" in 1 Esd 8 43.

(15) A member of the family of Adonikam (Ezr 8 13, B, Zaqais, Samoias, A, Zaqais, Samoiias, "Samaish" in 1 Esd 8 39).

(16) A priest of the family of Harim who married a foreign wife (Ezr 10 21), called "Samoeus" in 1 Esd 9 21.

(17) A layman of the family of Harim who married a foreign wife (Ezr 10 31), called "Sahbees" in 1 Esd 9 32.

(18) A prophet (Neh 6 10-14, B, Zaqais, Semelai, A, Zaqais, Semelai), employed by Sanballat and Tobiah to frighten Nehemiah and hinder the rebuilding of the wall.

(19) One of the 24 courts of priests, 16th under Zerubbabel (Neh 13 6-8, A, Zaqais, Semelaias), 15th under Joiakim (Neh 12 18, B, Zaqais, Semelaias), and 21st under Nehemiah (Neh 10 8, Zaqais, Samoiias), mentioned in connection with the dedication of the wall.

(20) A priest, descendant of Asaph (Neh 12 35).

(21) A singer (or clan) participating in the dedication of the wall (Neh 12 36).

(22) Father of the prophet Urijah (Jer 26 20, B, Zaqais, Samoias, A, Maacai, Maakot).

(23) A false prophet who was upbraided by Jeremiah (29 24-32) for attempting to hinder his work. He is styled "the Nehedamite" and was among those carried into captivity with Jehoiachin. In opposition to Jeremiah, he predicted a speedy ending to the captivity. Jeremiah foretold the complete destruction of Shemaijah's family.

(24) Father of Delahai, who was a prince in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer 36 12).

(25) "The great," kinsman of Tobias (Tob 5 13).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMARIAH, shem-ar'-i-ah, shem-ar'-i-ah, shem-ar'-i-ah, "whom Jahveh guards":


(2) A son of Rehoboam (2 Ch 11 19).

(3) One of the sons of Harim who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 32, B, Zaqais, Samareid, A, Zaqais, Samareid, A, Zaqais, Samareid, A, Zaqais, Samareid, A, Zaqais, Samareid).

(4) One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 41, A, Zaqais, Samareis, A, Zaqais, Samareis, A, Zaqais, Samareis).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMEBER, shem'-e-bair, shem'-e-bair, "shem'-e-bair": The king of Zeboim (Gen 14 2). See SHIMAIH.

SHEMED, shem'-ed. See SHEMER, (4).

SHEMER, shem'-er (שֵׁמֶר), shem'er; Σαμηρ, Sémér, Luc., Σαμηρ, Sémér, "shepherd";

(1) The owner of the hill which Omri bought and which became the site of Samaria (1 K 16 24, שֵׁמֶרִים, shomerim). Shemer may be an ancient clan name. The fact, however, that the mountain was called Shomeron when Omri bought it makes one doubt that the city of Samaria was named after Shemer; the passage is questionable. The real etymology of Samaria roots it in "watch mountain" (see Stade, Zeitschrift, 165 f).

(2) A Merarite (1 Ch 6 46 [31], Σαμηρίς, Sémér). Shemer.

(3) An Asherite (1 Ch 7 34, A and Luc., Σαμηρίς, Sémér), called "Shomer" in ver 32.

(4) A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 20, B, Σαμηρίς, Sémér, A, Σαμηρίς, Sémér, Luc., Σαμηρίς, Sémér, RV "Shemed." AV "Shamed.")

The Heb MSS differ; some read "Shemer," others "Shemed." HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMIDA, SHEMIDAH, shem'-id'-a, SHEMIDAIITES, shem'-i-da'-i'tes (שֵׁמִידָה, shemedē), A Gileadite clan belonging to Manasseh (Nu 26 32; Josh 17 2; B, Σαμηρίς, Sémér, A, Σαμηρίς, Sémér, Σαμηρίς, Σαμηρίς, Σαμηρίς, Σαμηρίς, Σαμηρίς, Σαμηρίς, Σαμηρίς).

SHEMINITH, shem'-nith. See MUSIC; PSALMS.
SHEMAROTH, šē-mı́r’a-moth, šē-mı́r’ra-mōth, šem-rā’moth (שֵׁם רָמָה, שֶׁמֶרָמְתוֹת) in 2 Ch 17:8, Kôthîb שֵׁם רָמָה; Ḡîqqaḥ שֵׁמֶרָמְתוֹת; Samaritans, Semenamoth): The name of a Levitical family. In 1 Ch 15:16-17, 18:16-17, 19:15 it is listed among the names of David’s choir. 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 Assyr Summar- mat; the latter seems to be a wrong name on the monuments, more esp. on the statues of Nobe from Nimrod. Another suggestion is that Shemiramoth was originally a place-name meaning “image of Shemiram” (=name of Ram or “the Exalted One”).

HORACE J. WOLF

HEMITES, šēmî’tēs. See SEMITES.

SHEMUEL, šē-mu’ēl, šem-ā’ēl (שֵׁם עֵמֶל, שֶׁמֶל), “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 שֵׁם עֵמֶל, šem-ēmel, to correspond with the form found in 1 6; 2 12; 7 36;41, 10 19. LXX has uniformly Σαλαμίτης, Salamitēs. (2) Graddon of Issachar (1 Ch 7:2) (B, Іσαבο- φ, Іσαβωφ, Σαμωφ, Σαμουφ), and Luc, Σαλαμιτη, Samoith). SHEN, šēn (שֵׁן), ha-shēn, “the tooth” or “peak”; τὶς παλαῖας, the palaias): 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 yāšān, “old.” Probably we should here read yēshān, as in 2 Ch 13:19 (OHL, s.v.). Then it may be represented by ‘Ăin Sinia, to the N. of Beitha.

SHENAZAR, šē-nā’zār: AV = RV Shenazzar (q.v.).

SHENAZAR, šē-nāz’ăr (שֶׁנָּצָר, shen‘azer): A son of Jeconiah (Jehoachin) and uncle of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3:18, B, Σαμαρόν, Samaaron, Luc, Σαμαράν, Samaaron, Vulg Sennaser, Senneser). It is highly probable that Sheshbazzar (Exr 1:8.11), “the prince of Judah,” and Shenazzar are identical (so Meyer, Rotherstein, etc). The name is difficult; some suggest corruption of בְּשֶׁנְבָּלֶקְוֹר, beshen‘belqor, and as equivalent to Sin-usur, “Sin [the moon-god] protected.”

SHENIR, šēnîr (שֶׁנְיֵר, šen‘îr, šen‘îr, šen‘îr): Only found in Cant 4:8 (MT). See SENIR.

SHEOL, šē’ōl (שְׁאֹל, she‘ol): 1. The Name 2. The Abode of the Dead (1) Not a State of Unconsciousness (2) Not Removed from God’s Jurisdiction (3) Relation to Immortality 3. Post-canonical Period This word is often tr̄ in AV “grave” (e.g. Gen 37:35; 1 S 2:6; Job 7:9; 14:13; Ps 6:5; 49:14; Is 14:11, etc) or “hell” (e.g. Dt 32:22; Ps 9:17; 18:5; Is 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 Ἅιδες, by which word it is tr̄ 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 Is 14:14. Cf their “Preface. The American Revisers more properly use “Sheol” throughout the etymologically equivalent vulg Raphah, a derivation is from šādāl, “to ask” (cf Prov 1:12; 27:20; 30:15.16; Is 5:14; Hab 2:5); others prefer the ḥ šādāl, “to be hollow.” The Babylonians are said to have a similar word Sinuš, 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 (to go to one’s father’s; etc) (Gen 15:17; 25:8.17; 49:33; 50:21; Ps 23:4; 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 83:1; 30:3; Prov 1:12; Is 36:18, etc), Anaddon (q.v.) or Destruction (Job 26:6; 28:22; Prov 15:11), the place of “silence” (Ps 94:17; 116:17), “the land of darkness and the shadow of death” (Job 10:21 f). It is, as the antithesis of the living condition, the synonym for everything that is gloomy, insubstantial (the abode of phosphorescent shades, Job 26:5; Prov 18:15; 21:16; Is 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; 116:13, etc). In its still more abysmal 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 enfeebled, weary and tired, it may present the aspect of a welcome rest or sleep (Job 3:17-22; 14:12 f). 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 f). The state is rather that of slumberous and semi-consciousness (the abode of ἐνυπνάσθαι, the insensible, 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” (26:6). “If I make my bed in Sheol,” says the Psalmist, “beloved thou art there” (Ps 139:8). The wrath of Jehovah 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).

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 ESCATOLOGY OF THE NT; also DEATH; HADES; HELL, etc. JAMES ORR

SHEPHAM, šēbḵam (שֶׁבֶחּם, šepḥam; Zephīmā, Sephīmār): A place, probably a hill town, on the ideal eastern boundary of Israel, named in Nu 34:10, but omitted in Ezk 47 15–18. It lay between Hazar-esan and Harbel (MT "Harbillah"), which must have been in the territory of Issachar. It belongs to the tribe of Zebulun. The word means a "naked" place, and doubtless indicates one of the barier midway ridges of Anti-Lebanon. It was probably the native place of Zabdi the Shphamite, who was David's chief vine-gardener (1 Ch 27:27).

SHEPHAHAT, šēf-āt-ṯā, šē-faṭ-ṯā (שֶׁפֶחַת, šeph̄atā): "Jeh has judged":
1. A son of David, by Abital (2 S 8 3; 1 Ch 3:9).
2. A Benjamite, father of Mesbullah, of Jerus (1 Ch 9 8).
3. A Benjamite, who joined David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12 5).
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; Neh 7 59 ff); "Saphat" in 1 Esd 5 9 and "Saphatas" 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, šēf-əlā (שֶׁפֶלֶל, ha-shēphēlāh; ṣephēlā, sōphēlā, sōphālā, sōphēlā): The word denotes "lowland," and is variously
1. Name rendered in AV. It is "vale" in Dt and Refer- 1 7; Josh 10 40; 1 K 10 27; 2 Ch ences 1 15; Jer 33 13; "valley" in Josh 11 11; 12 20; 12 15; 15 35; Jgs 1 9; Jer 32 44; "low plain" in 1 Ch 27 28; 2 Ch 9 27; "plain" in Jer 17 26; Ob 19; 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" (HGL, 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 Southern Judaea. The early days of 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, I, 211).

(1) The sites of many ancient cities named in the Shephelah have been identified. They all lie within the strip of hill country that runs along the western base of the mountains of Judah, terminating in the X. 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 district of the N. and that of the S. of Ajalon (HGL, 203 f). "North of Ajalon the low hills which run over to Sharon are flanked by high mountains behind them. You ascend to the latter from Sharon either by long sloping ridges, such as that which today carries the main road of Hermon. Sharon means a "naked" place, and doubtless indicates one of the barier midway ridges of Anti-Lebanon. It was probably the native place of Zabdi the Shphamite, who was David's chief vine-gardener (1 Ch 27:27).

(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 is proverbial, and it testifies 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 hewncombed into caves.

The western boundary is not so definite as that
on the E. Some have held that it included the Phili plain. This contention draws support from the mention of the Phili cities immediately after those of Judah, which are said to be in the Shephelah (Gosh 15 45 ft.; these verses can hardly be ruled out as of a later date). On the other hand the Phili 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 Talmi (Jerus Sbhelāh 2 2) distinguishes the "northern Shephelah," the Shephelah, and the Plain. See, however, discussion in Buhl (GAP, 104, n.); and G. A. Smith, Expos, 1896, 404 ff.

The Shephelah is crossed by five wide valleys which furnish easy passes from the plain. These are of importance chiefly because from each

3. The Five of them a way, crossing the "foss," Valleys 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 Aja-
lon. It winds its way first in a north-easterly 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 Jerus. This is the eastern end of all the avenues leading from the plain to the heights, and it is the one along which the tide 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) Wady es-Surâr, 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 Jerus. This is the line followed by the Jaffa-Jerus Railway.

(3) Wady es-Sunt runs eastward from the N. of Tell es-Sûfâh (Gatli) up the Vale of Elah to its confluence with Wady es-Surâr which comes in from the S. near Kâribat Shaveleh (Souch); and from that point, as Wady el-Jindéy, pursues its way S. of Timnah to the uplands W. of Bethlehem.

(4) Wady el-'Afrânj crosses the plain from Ashdod (Esjud), passes Beth Jibrin (Eleutheropolis), and winds up through the mountains toward Hebron.

(5) Wady el-'Afrânj, from the sea about 7 miles N. of Ga'aac, 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 Jerus 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 debatable land between Israel and the Philis. The ark for a time sojourned in this region (1 S 5.6 f.). 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 Wady es-Sunt, between Sooch and Azækah (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

SHEEPHE, she'fér (שֵׁפֶר, shepher, "beauty"): A mount near which the Israelites encamped (Nu 33.23 f.). See Wanderings of Israel.

SHEPHERD, shep'erd (שֶׁפֶר, רְדֶח, רְדִּי, רוֹדִי; ποιμήν, ποιμέν, "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 hireling (1 S 17.20) the flocks may be neglected or abused (Isa 55.10.11; Ezek 34.8.10; Zec 11.15.17; 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-
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 'aba or coat is worn (Job 30:15; Ezra 8:18; LXX omits), and had charge, along with eleven others, the silver and gold and vessels for the Temple (ver 24, BA, Σαμαθα, Σαραθα, Luc., Σαραθας, Σαραθα, Σαραθας). 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 Σαραθας, Σαραθα, Luc., Σαραθας, Σαραθας. In I Esd 8:47 the name appears as "Asebebius;" RV "Asebebius;" in ver 54, "Esebias," RV "Esebias;" and in Esd 48, "Sarabia." Many of the companion-names on the lists are plainly ethnic (Cheyne).

Horace J. Wolf

SHERER, she'resh (שֶרֶשׁ, šə'resh; B, Σόφος, Σώφος, Σώφος, Luc., Σόφος, Σφηρός, Σφηρός; A, Σόφος, Σφηρός, Luc., Σφηρός, Σφηρός | Gen 36:23): A Machirite name in a genealogy of Manasseh (1 Ch 7:16).

SHEREZER, she-řez'ér (Zec 7:2 AV). See SHAREZER.

SHERGHT, še'reg't, še'reg't, ASHUR, or ASSUR: The name of the first capital city of Assyria is known by the Arabs as Kal'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 upon 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 Babylon. In time, as the city acquired a political significance, the power of the priesthood declined; allegiance to Babylonia ceased, and the Assyrian 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 609 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 Orient-gesellschaft, 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 Bab 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 appear 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 monoliths, from 4 to 8 ft. high, were found still 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 Sammuramat or Semiramis, the once supposed mythical queen of Nineveh. Its tr reads: “The column of Sa-am-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. שֶׁרֶף, šārēf, “militia,” “lawbreaker,” “a sheriff” [Dnl 3:29]); Probably a “lawyer” or “jurist” whose business it was to decide points of law. At best, however, the tr “sheriff” is but a conjecture.

SHESHACH, šēshak (שׂשְׁחָק, šēshākh), as if “humiliation”; cf נָשְׁחָה, nēshākah, “to crouch”: The general explanation is that this is “a cypher-form of ‘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 (תבש), 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, שׁשָּח is substituted for בָּבִיל, bāḇīl. This theory has not failed of opposition. Delitzsch

Monuments in Assur Discovered by the Germans.
holds that "Sheshach" represents Ṣīl-kā-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 Heb: Hebraizm of Ṣīkā, a Bab district. Winckler and Sayce read Ṣiw-saqqa. 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.

HORACE J. WOLF

SHESHBAZZAR, shesh-ba'zar (שֶׁשֶם, shēsh-baça), or "שָׁשֶׁבַּזַּב, shāshēbazzāḇ): Sheshbazzar is the Heb or Aram. form of the Bab Shamsam-ah-usr, or Shamash-bana-usur: "Oh Shamash, protect the father." It is possible that the full name was Shamash-bana-siri-Babili-usur; "Oh Shamash, protect the father [builder] of the seed of Babylon." (See Zerubbabel, and compare the Bab names Ashar-bana-usur, Ban-siri, Nebi-bana-siri, Shamash-ban-apli, Shamash-apil-usur, Shamash-ban-ahī, and others in Tallequist's Neubabylonisches Namenbuch, and the Aram. names on nos. 35, 44, 36, and 45 of Clay's Aramäische Dokumente.) If this were the case, there would be little doubt that Sheshbazzar may have been the same person as Zerubbabel, since the former is called in Ezr 5 14 the governor of Judah, and the latter is called by the same title in Hag 1 1. The name is very probable, however, because Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel were different persons, and that Sheshbazzar was governor of Judah in the time of Cyrus and Zerubbabel in that of Darius. It is possible that Sheshbazzar 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 Ezr 2 65; 4 2; Hag 1 14).

According to Ezr 1 8 Sheshbazzar was the prince (Hammam) 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 Sheshbazzar brought these vessels with them of the captivity which he brought up from Babylon to Jerusalem. In Ezr 5 14 it is said that these vessels had been delivered by Cyrus unto one whose name was Sheshbazzar, whom he had made governor (pēhēd), and that Sheshbazzar came and laid the foundations of the house of God which was in Jerusalem. See SANABASSAR.

R. DICK WILSON

SHESHAI, šésh'ē (שֶׁשֶּה, šēshē): One of the sons of Anak, perhaps an old Hebronite clan name. (Sayce combines the name with Šāqū, יִשְׂרָאֵל, the Egypt 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, Ɔsādē, Ṣassēl, A, Ɔsēd, Șemen; Jos 15 14, B, Ɔsēdō, Șonatē, A, Ɔsēd, Șonat; Jgs 1 10, B, Ɔsēdē, Ṣassēl, A, Șēdē, Șonatē).

SHESHAN, šésh'ēn (שֶׁשֶּה, šēshēn; Ṣōvā', Šōvān; Șōvān): A Jerahmeelite whose daughter married his servant Jarha (1 Ch 2 31.34.35). The genealogical list which follows embraces some very early names (cf Curtis, ICC, ud loc.)

SHETH. See SETH.

SHETHAR, shēth'ār (שֶׁתֶר, šēṭēr; B and Luc., Șādrābōn, Sōdrān, Șādrān, Sōdrān, Șādrān, Sādrābōn): 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 רֵשֶׁר, with which the Pers šēkāta, "joy," is to be compared.) The word has never really been satisfactorily explained; it is presumably Pers.

SHETHAR-BOZNAI, šēth'th-ōr-ōz'ēn, shēth'th-ōr-ōz'ēn: Among the conjectures as to the meaning and derivation of the name, the following may be mentioned: (1) Shethar-boznai may be a corruption of רֵשֶׁר-בּוֹצָנָא, *methaphasa*, *Mithrabozana*, Old Pers *Mithraubazana*—i.e. "Mithra is deliverer." (2) It is identical with the Old Pers *Sēsē* ("seed," "brilliance"); the names have been confounded in the Aramaic. (3) It may be a title, but shēthar, must then be read for shēthar. (4) It is equivalent to the Old Pers *Sétirubazana*, "empire-delivering"; cf *B*, Art., "Shētharubazana," and 2 Dn 2 30.

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEVA, šēv'ā (שְׁוָא, še'vā); B, Șoā, Șoāt, Șoāt, Șoād, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl; (A, Șādā, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl, Șoāl): (1) A son of Caleb by his concubine Maacah (1 Ch 2 49).

(2) See SHAVSHAI.

SHEW, SHOW, shō: "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 "see.

In AV "shew" 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 [or person] to be seen" (Dt 4 35; Jgs 12 22, etc.). "Seeing," naturally, can be taken as intellectual or moral (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 "shew" can be used as a general tr for the most various phrases, as be "shewed" for γίνεσθαι, γινομαι, "come to pass" (Acts 4 22, RV "see wrought"); "shew forth themselves" for εἰρήνω, εἰρήνη, "be active" (Mt 14 2, RV "work"); "shew" for τοιεύω, τοιεύω, "do" (Acts 7 36, RV "having wrought"); for δοκίμασαι, δοκιμαζομαι, "beolate" (Lk 8 39, RV "declare"); for ὑπακούω, ὑπακούομαι, "make clean" (2 Pet 1 14, RV "signify"), etc. In Cant 2 9 AV (ERV) "shewing himself" and ERV (ERVm) "glimpse" both miss the poetry of the original: His eyes shine in through the lattice (יָרַע, "blosso," "sparkle").

AV's uses of the noun "shew" usually connote appearance in contrast to reality. So Lk 20 47, "for a show" (ῥητορικός, ῥητορική, "false, pretense"); Col 2 23, "shew of wisdom" (so RV, λόγος, λόγος, "words, "words of authority"); Gal 6 12, "make a fair shew" (so RV, εὑρομένος, εὑρομένος, "have a fair face"); Ps 39 6, "vain shew" (so ARV וַעַנֵּא, gelem, "image," RVm "shadow"). However, in Sir 43 1 (דַּשֵּׁא, הַרְּוָא, "spectacle" [so RV]) and in Col 2 15 (דֹּקָה, דֹּקָה, "to display") "shew" = "spectacle."
SHEWBREAD, shi'brad, THE (דְּשֶׁבֶּרֶד), lehem ha-µa'om, “bread of the presence”; שֵׁבֶרֶד (Ex 25:30); ARV “showbread.”

1. The Term
See SHEWBREAD. The marginal reading of Ex 25:30; 37:15, 16, RV “Presence-bread,” exactly gives the meaning of the Heb. In 2 Ch 2:7 it is spoken of as the “continual showbread,” 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

2. Mosaic many minute regulations as to the Regulations placing of the loaves, the covering of them with frankincense, and other ritualistic values for the continuance of the Mosaic legislation. All that the 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 24:3–9). 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—thely 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 “flagons” would contain wine, and the bowls (made with spoons, “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 (hoi ártov òts prosthésen), as told in 1 S 21:6–6 (Mt 12:4; 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 the 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, 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 refresh 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 continued and unbroken dependence upon God. Even during the travels of the table of shewbread with the tabernacle, the “continual bread” 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. In many cases (of Nu 7:14 ff.). 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 and adoration 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 SHREW- TABLE, OF.

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF (דְּשֶׁבֶּרֶד, shulhan-bréd), [Ex 25:25–30, etc.]; הֶּרֶם תַּנֹּתְנָה, he próthetais lón ártov (He 9:2)); For construction, see TABERNACLE; Temple. A rude representation of the table is given on the Arch of Titus in Rome. The base-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 Spoons” in PEPS, 1906, 306 ff.

The table of shewbread is to be distinguished from the altar of incense. It has become the fashion of the newer critics 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 SHEW-BREAD.

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHIBAH, shībä (דִּישָּׁב) seven; אֶפֶס, hórkos; Swete reads Φιλας ἄρτος, Phēkeb hórikos, lit. “well of cattle”; AV Shebah: The name of the original seat of Beer-sheba according to Gen 26:33. See BIB.-SHEBA.

SHIBBOLETH, shibbô-leth (דִּישָּׁבֵל, shibboleth): A 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 gībbolīth, their dialectic variety of speech betrayed them (Jgs 12:6). The word probably has the sense of “stream” or “flood” (cf Ps 69:2).

SHIBMAH, shīb'ma (דִּישָּׁבָה, shibmah). See Sû- MAH.

SHICRON, shik'ron (דִּישָּׁכוֹן, shikron). See SHIKKERON.

SHIELD, shi'ild. See ARMOR, IV, 1.

SHIGGAION, shī-g'yoùn, shi-gô'un (שִּחְּגַיִון, shigga'yôn): Occurs in the title of Ps 7, and, in the pi., in the verse introducing Habakkuk’s prayer (Hab 3:1). Derived from a vb. meaning “to wander,” it is generally taken to mean a dishebramt, or rhapsody.
This is not supported by the Gr VSS, but they are evidently quite at a loss. See Psalms, Book of.

**SHIHON**, shif'hôn (םיִיְחֹן, shihôn). See SHILOH.

**SHIHOR**, shîhôr (שִׁיוֹר), shîhôr, also written without "i" in Heb and incorrectly "Sihôr" in Eng.: A stream of water mentioned in connection with Egypt. Joshua (13:3) speaks of the "Sihôr, which is before Egypt," a stream which commentators have thought to be "the brook of Egypt," the stream which separated Egypt from Pal, now called Wady el-'Arish. Jeremiah (2:18 AV) says, "When the Lord brought thee out of the land of Egypt," to drink the waters of Sihôr." Commentators have thought Shihor in this case to be a name for the Nile. Both interpretations cannot be correct. Whatever the name Sh 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 the interpretation of the name is strictly correct, and has made clear the Bib. references to S. In the northeasternmost province of ancient Egypt, Khentah ("Fronting on the East"), was a canal, a fresh-water stream drawn off from the Nile, called in ancient times, "the Holy 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 lost altogether; but there is a tradition of a branch of the 4th or 5th Orders to 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 Pal 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 border of the desert. The two other references to S. (I Ch 13:5; Is 23:3) are perfectly satisfied by this identification. The "seed of S." (Isa 23:3 AV) would be grain from Egypt by way of the Sihor.

**SHIHOR-LIBNATH**, shîhôr-libnath (שִׁיוֹר לִיבְנָתָה). 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 Onam 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 (Tantarah), so the river may be sought S. of that town. Crocodiles are said still to be found in the Khion; but this river runs N. of Carmel. The Crocodilodon of Potamia (V. xxv.5; xvi.2) and Pinny (v.19), which latter makes the southern boundary of Phoenicia, may possibly be Naher ez-Zerka, which enters the sea about 5 miles S. of Tantarah. Here also it is said the crocodile is sometimes seen. Perhaps therefore we may identify this stream with Shihor-libnath.

**SHIKKERON**, shîk'ker-on (שִׁיקֶרֶון, shîkkrôn; AV Shicron): A place mentioned in Josh 15:11 as being on the northern border of Judah, between Ekron and Baalath, Jabneel being beyond, toward the sea. The site is unknown, but Rev. C. Hauer (PEFS, 1907, 289) suggests Tell es-Sellakeh, N.W. of Akir, remarking that if this were the site the boundary would follow a natural course over the mountain to Jabneel.

**SHILHIL**, shîlhi (שִׁילְי, shîlî): Father of Jehoshaphat's mother (1 K 22:42 = 2 Ch 20:31). BA in 2 Ch, Zekel, Solei, B in 1 K, Zekel, Semei, A in 1 K, Zelah, Solei. Luc. in both, Zekel, Semei. Comment (EB, art. "Shihil") ventures the supposition that "Shihil" 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**, shîlhim (שִׁילְיִם, shîlîm) [Josh 15:32]: See SHARRAM, (2). Possibly Azubah the mother of Jehoshaphat, who is called "the daughter of Shilhî" (1 K 22:42 = 2 Ch 20:31), was a native of Shilhîm.

**SHILLEM**, shîl'lem, SHILEMITEs, shîl'lem-its (שִׁילֶם, shîl'lem, שִׁילֶםִים, ha-shilemîm): Shillem is found in Gen 46:24, a son of Naphtali; Shilemites, his descendants, are mentioned in Nu 26:48; Shallum (q.v.) is found in 1 Ch 7:13.

**SHILLOAH**, shîl-lô'ah, shîl-lô'a (Isa 8:6). See SLOAH.

**SHILLOH**, shîl'lo (שִׁילָה), shîlôh: The prophecy in Gen 49:10, "The sceptre 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" (cf 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 appear earlier than the Septuagint version of Seb. Münster in the 16th cent. (1534).

(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 3d rendering, which regards Shiloh as representing the Heb shilîh (שִׁילְיָה) = shilshôl for תִּשְׁלָךְ, "asher lô, "whose [it is]," has in its favor the fact that this is evidently the reading presupposed in the LXX, the Pesh, and the Jewish Tg, and seems to be alluded to in Ezk 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 discussions in E. H. Thompson's Christology, 1.54 ff., ET, the comms. of Delitzsch, Driver, and Skinner in Gen (esp. Excursus II in Driver), and the arts. in the various Bible dicts.; see also PROPHECY.

James Orr

**SHILLOH** (the most usual form is שִׁילָה, shilôh, but it appears  שִׁלָּה, shilô, and שִׁלּוֹ, shullo, etc)
Shilon, Shilshah, Shimeathites

Shilonite, shîlô-nîth (םילוניט), shîlônî [2 Chr 9:29], shîlônî [10:15; Neh 11:5], shîlônî [13:16]; Shîlônî, Shîlôneh, Shîlônîth [תשלונית]: This denotes an inhabitant of Shiloh, and applies (1) to Ahijah the prophet (1 K 14:19, etc.); and (2) to a family of the children of Judah, who, after the exile, made their home in Jerusalem (1 Chr 9:5; Neh 11:5, AV "Shiloni").

Shilshah, shîlshâh (םילשח, shîlshâh): See Shammua and Shammah.
(1) Brother of David (see Shammah).
(2) Son of David (1 Chr 3:5, B, Ṣimʿâr, Sôman; but in 2 S 5:14, 1 Chr 14:4, "Shammua").
(3) A Merarite Levite (1 Chr 6:30, B, Ûômâ, Šîmônâ, A, Ṣûdâ, Šûmâd, Luc, Ṣâdûd, Samad).
(4) A Gershonite Levite (1 Chr 6:30[24], Šîmâd, Šûmâd).

Shimeathites, shîmʾâth-îsî (םיימאתים, shîmʾâthîm; BA, Ṣâdûthîm, Samathîm, Luc, Ṣûdûthîm, Samathîm): A subdivision of the tribe of Caleb (1 Chr 2:55). In the three families mentioned in this passage Jerome saw three distinct classes of religious functionaries: Vulg concones atque resonantes et in tabernaculis commorantes. The Tg has a similar explanation, except that the "Sacaithites are those covered" with a spirit of prophecy. Bähr (Handbuch zum AT) accepts Jerome's explanation, except that he regards the first class as gate-keepers (Aram. תירא, 'irâ; Heb תירא, shaʾar) and the second as the "men of the Forty." These are also the "men of Shimeath" (cf Torrey, Ezra Studies, 215).

Horace J. Wolf

Shimeath, shîmʾâth (םיימא, shîmʾâth, or שיםא, shîmʾâth; LXX in 2 K, 'Ismoûth, Yismôth, B in 2 Chr, Šûdâ, Šûmâd, A, Ṣûdâ, Šûmâd, Luc, Ṣâdûd, Samad): Father of Jozacar (2 K 2:21), one of the murderers of Joash, king of Judah. According to 2 Chr 24 26 Shimeath is an Ammonites and the mother, not the father, of Jozacar. Many textual emendations have been suggested (af HDD, 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 practice of intercourse with non-Israelites. In this particular story, the two conspirators are given as "Jozakar the son of [shîmʾâth], and Jehozabad the son of [shîmʾâth]." The two names are both masc.; but the final of the former looked to the Chronicler like the fem. ending and offered him his opportunity. In his account, the two of the murderers (dastardly villains, even though the king had merited death) was the "son of [shîmʾâth], the Ammonite," and the other was "the son of [חָוִית], the Moabite" (cf Torrey, Ezra Studies, 212).

Shimeathites, shîmʾâth-îsî (םיימאתים, shîmʾâthîm; BA, Ṣâdûthîm, Samathîm, Luc, Ṣûdûthîm, Samathîm): A subdivision of the tribe of Caleb (1 Chr 2:55). In the three families mentioned in this passage Jerome saw three distinct classes of religious functionaries: Vulg concones atque resonantes et in tabernaculis commorantes. The Tg has a similar explanation, except that the "Sacaithites are those covered" with a spirit of prophecy. Bähr (Handbuch zum AT) accepts Jerome's explanation, except that he regards the first class as gate-keepers (Aram. תירא, 'irâ; Heb תירא, shaʾar). Wellhausen (DGJ, 30 f) finds underlying the three names תירא, תירא, the technical term for sacred music-making, תירא, תירא, the Halacha or sacred tradition. Buhl (HWB 248) de-
rives Shimeathites and Sukethites from unknown places. Keil interprets as descendants from the unknown Shenei (cf. Curtis, ICC). The passage is hopelessly obscure. Horace J. Wolf

SHIMEI, shim'i (םימה, shimm', possibly "hear me [El]" or "Jah"); Shem'e, Semei, Seme, Seme'ah. A frequent occurrence throughout the OT records, sometimes varying slightly in form. AV has "Shimi" in Ex 6 17; "Shimhi" in 1 Ch 8 21; "Shimeah" in 2 S 21 21. RV has "Shim'ites" in Zec 12 13, where AV has "Shomites". Shime'ah in 1 Ch 18 21 has "Shema" in 1 Ch 18 21 21 m 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 Gershom 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 Shimeis. Evidently that of 23 is nearer for one of its four sons (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 S. (cf. 23 10) being by a copyist's error transposed so as to be the father of S. (c) A descendant 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 27 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 36), 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 Jordan led through a narrow ravine, on one side of which stood Shimei, on the ridge above, stood Shimei 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 burst 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 could not make the ravine to make quick work of S., the noble king forbade him with these 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 bidden 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 18 16 23).

The king spared his life; but shortly before his death charged his son Solomon to see that due punishment should come to Shimei for his sins: "Foul shalt bring his儿子 sons upon me in time to come; (1 K 2 9). When he came to the throne Solomon summoned Shimeai and made him his chief house in Jerusalem, which he shared with 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 Jerusalem to recapture some escaped slaves (vs 39 41), and in consequence he was promptly dispatched by that gruesome avenger of blood, the royal executioner. "Benjamin fell upon him," as he had upon Adonijah and Joab, "so that he died" (ver 46).

(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 1 5 8). 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 21), whose home was in Ahijah, where he was a "head of fathers' houses" (ver 13); but his descendants lived in Jerusalem (ver 28). In AV he is called "Shimi"; in ver 13 he is called "Shema.

(5) Another Benjamin, an ancestor of Mordecai (Est 2 5), "Seme'as" in Est 11 2.


(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 20 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 (ver 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 father 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 "Semei" (9 35) and "Seme'et" (9 34).

(12) A brother of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3 19).

The Shimeites were descendants of Shimei, grandson of Levi; cf (1) (a) above (Nu 3 21; Zec 12 13).

Edward Mack

SHIMEON, shimön (שֵׁם, shem'; elsewhere "Simeon"): One of the sons of Harmi who had married foreign wives (Est 10 31; BA, Zevan, Semein, Luc., Zevane, Simean = 1 Esd 9 32, "Simon Chosemann").

SHIMHI, shim'hi. See SHIMEI.

SHIMI, shim'i, sh'nt, SHIMITES, shim'mas. See SHIMEI.

SHIMMA, shim'ma. See SHAMMAR.

SHIMON, shimón (שֵׁם, shem'; B, Simeon, Simeon, Simeon, Luc., Sapi, Samit): A name in the Judahite genealogy (1 Ch 4 20).

SHIRUmRATH, shirumrath (שִׁרְמָרָת, Shirumarath; Sama- rath, Samarath): The last of nine sons of Shimei of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 21).

SHIMRI, shim'ri (שֶׁם, sherm; various forms in LXX): There are four Hebrews mentioned in the Bible who bear this name:

(1) A Simeonite, a son of Shemiah and father of Jedediah, a chief of his tribe (1 Ch 4 37).

(2) The father of Jedediah, 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).

Edward Mack

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia 2770
(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

SHIRMITH, shim' rith (שִׁмяרִית, 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) Jehezabad is described as the son of Shomer (q.v.), the same name without the fem. ending.

SHIRMON, shim' ron (שִׁמְרֹן, shimron; B, שְׁמֹרֹן; Summon, A, שָׁמֹרֶנָה, Sameron; 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 Zebulon (15:15). No sure identification of the site is given. Uder Etn and Talm both omit the r from the name; and Neubauer would identify it with Simonia (Vita, 24), the Simonia of the Talum, which is now represented by Semânîyê, a village about 5 miles W. of Nazareth, on the edge of the plain (Assur, du Talum). Beil Laḥm, named by Jos along with it, is a short distance to the N.W. Es-Semirîyê, about 3 miles N. of Acre, has also been suggested; but it is perhaps too far to the W.

W. EWING

SHIRMON-MERON, shim' ron-mê' ron (שִׁמְרֹן מֶרִון, shimron merôn; Summon . . . Meror; Summon . . . Marrom, A, Σαμαρεία . . . Μαροῦν, Samron . . . Phasdi . . . Maron): A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (12:20). Here the name is followed by that of Adashiphon, which also follows the name of Shirmon in 11:1. This suggests that the two are in reality one, and that Shirmon-meron may only be the full name. A royal Can. city, Samsimuruna, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Samascharr, Esar-haddon and Assur-bani-pal, which were found by Julius Schrader (KAT, 163) would identify with this, and thinks it may now be represented by es-Semirîyê. See Shirmon.

W. EWING

SHIMSHAI, shim'shāi, shim'shā' (שִׁמְשָי, shimshay; B, Σάμαρα, Samasdr, Samal, Shamshâ, Samasdr, Samasar, Sames, Σαμαρεία, Samas, Σαμαρ, Luc., Σαμάθα, Samatos, throughout; in 1 Ead 2:17 he is called "Semellius," RV "Samellius"); there are two explanations of this name; he has been generally favored. One conjecture traces it to an Old Persian compound șimash, in the sense of "servant" (cf. BDB, s.v. The name looks as though it were derived from șimash, "shemesh," "the sun"): A state secretary who, with Rehum (q.v.) and others, wrote to Artaxerxes to persuade him to prohibish the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 4:8, 9.17.23).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHIN, shin, SIN, sēn (שֵׁנ), șen: The 21st letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as š, ș. It came also to be used for the number 300. For name, etc, see ALPHABET.

SHINAB, shin' āb (שִׁנָּב, shināb', Sum, ſhînôh, shinār; Šinādār, Šennadr): King of Admah (q.v.). He is mentioned with Shemever, king of Zeboiin; 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 Sinib, an Ammonite king in the time of Tgath-pileser III (so Fr. Delitzsch, Wo lag der Paradies? 294); or the name may be equated by the Assyry scholars (cf. "Shenaaz"); and Semer with the Assyry Semus-abi (Sacey, Expose 7, VIII, 463). Jewish exegesis gives a sinister explanation of all four names (ver 2). The Mihir (Br. Bab. 42) explains Shinab as șināb bāšab, "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 the same letters as that of 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.

HORACE J. WOLF

SHINAR, shin' nār (שִׁנָּר), shin' ar; Šinnār, Šen̄nādār, Šennadār):

1. Identification
2. Possible Babylonian Form of the Name
3. Sumerian Name, and Corresponding Semitic Name
4. The Syriac Šen' ar
5. The Primitive Tongue of Shinar
6. Comparison with the Semitic Idiom
7. The Testimony of the Sculptures, etc., to the Race
8. The Sumerian Probable in Shinar before the Semites
9. The States of Shinar
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 Babel, or the land of Babel (בַּבֵּל, bavel, 'ereq bavel). In Gen 10:10

1. Identity—It is the district wherein lay Babel, the ancient name, of Erech, Accad, and Calneh, cities which were the "beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom. In 11:2 Shinar is described as the land of the plain where migrants from the E. settled, and founded Babel, the city, and its great tower. Though sometimes identified with the Bab Šomer, the connection of Shinar with that name is doubtful.

The principal difficulty lies in
2. Possible Babylonian Form (סִינָר)

3. Sumerian and Other Equivalent Forms (which would alone furnish a satisfactory basis of comparison, names not found, and would, if existent, only 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 Šen(n)ār shows that, at the time the LXX tr was made, there was no tradition that the ʾqinā was guttural, as the supposed Bab forms would lead us to expect. As the Bib. form Šinar indicates the whole of Babylonia, it corresponds with the native (Sumerian) Kingi-Ura, rendered "Sumer and Akkad," from which, by changing K into Š (found in Sumerian), Shinar may have been derived, but this explanation is not free from difficulties.

This twofold designation, Kingi-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.

Latin Equivalents on the corresponding term seems to have been "Kos" ("the territory of the Koskam") to all appearance a term introduced by the Kasite 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
country. Often, however, the equivalent term for Babylonia is Ee', probably an abbreviation of Erûdu, 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 édînu, or "plain" (see Édînu).

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 Sýr for the country around Baghdad, and accordingly included may be supposed (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 Babylonia.

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, Turkish as its Chinese affinity. áyalk, "to be," Turkish ol-mak; ana (ana), "mother," Turkish ana; abba, "old man," Turkish Baba, "father"; ë; ë, "house," Turkish ev, etc. The Chinese affinities seem close lest, but the following may be quoted: ë(y)u, "father." Chinese ye (Amoy ë); ge, "night." Chinese ye; gu, "to speak," Chinese yâ; shu, "hand," Chinese shuë; kin, "business," Chinese kung, "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 hêkal, "temple," Sem 'hêgal, "great house") entered the other Sem languages.

Halfey's contention, that Sumerian is simply "an allography" 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) oppositional suffixes instead of prepositions; (2) verbs with long strings of prefixes and infixes to express the person and regiments, instead of a prefix and a suffix; (3) compound words, both nouns and verbs, are common instead of 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 Turanians. The inscriptions and bas-reliefs show, they have been sited in any case, their warriors, in the better bas-reliefs, as well as the figures of the god Nin-Girsu (formerly known as "the god with the firestick"), and the engraved cylinders, have this type. Moreover, the sculptures and cylinder-seals show that certain classical objects or the like—were common shaven, in marked contrast to Sem usage elsewhere.

Deities, however, always had hair and beard, implying that they came from a different, though possibly related, stock. These deities were very numerous, and it is not unlikely that, though those with Sumerian names may be counted by hundreds, those with Sem names are only to be reckoned by tens.

Though there is no certain indication which race entered Shinar first, it is to be noted that Nimrod, presumably Shinar's first king and the founder of its great cities, was a son of Cush (Gen 10:8), and the name of Shinar seems to have existed before the foundation of Babel (Babylon) and its tower (Gen 11:2). In the native sculptures, moreover, the name Sen'ar was prominently pre-eminent, and in the inscriptions the non-Sem idiom precedes that of the Sem tr. Everything points, therefore, to the Semarians having been in Babylonia before the Sem inhabitants.

At the earliest period to which our records refer the Semarians of Shinar were divided into a number of small states, of which the following may be regarded as the principal:

6. of Shinar (1) Sippar or Sippar-Arusu (Ye-ruru), possibly including Accad (Gen 10:1), some distance S.W. of Baghdad. It is the modern 'Abu-rabbah, "father of grain." Though it seems to have fallen early under the dominion of the Semites, it was at first Semarian, as its native name, Zimhir, and the ideographic writing thereof show. According to Berosus, who calls it Pontapiblion, one of its earliest kings was Amelon or Amillaros, who reigned 13 sari, or 45,800 years. Later on comes Eredesh, the name Enne-duran-ki, renowned as a priest favored by the gods.

(2) About 18 miles N. of Babylon lay Kâš, now Kishina—found as Babylon the capital of Shinar. Its early name, Asag-shau, is said to have been the name of a place, or 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 Aloros, "the shepherd of the people," as having reigned for 10 sari, or 30,000 years. The state of Babylon probably included Cuthah (Tel Ibraheim), 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 Bira, or the Bira Nimrud, 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 10:10. It was the place of considerable importance under the Assyrians, and 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 Bismanyag, the city of Mah, the goddess of reproduction. One of the earliest rulers of Adab was probably known as Linga-lol, 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 Šurippak, now Fara. This was the birthplace of the Bab Noah, Ut-napishtim, son of Oparsa (Umbara-Tulu), a Chaldaean of Erech. The coming of the Flood was revealed to Ut-napishtim here.

(7) Practically E. of Fara lay Unma or Gišá or Gišá or Gišá, now Jochâ. This city was apparently of considerable importance, and the traditional type of Lulli.

(8) S. of Fara lay Unuqa, Sem Urak, the Bib. Ereck (q.v.), now Warka. Its most celebrated king, after Gilgamesh, was Lugal-zaggi-Ši, one of the opponents of the rulers of Lagash.

(9) Some distance E. of Warka was the territory of Lagash, now Tel-hah—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 Uru-kagina and viceroy Guda, to whom many erections in the city were due. (See Guda's remarkable statue in the Louvre.)

(10) Some time after the S.E. of Warka lay Larsa, the “Elassar” of Gen 14 1 (q.v.). This center of learning maintained its independence even after the other states had been absorbed by Hammurabi and his dynasty into the Babylon empire.

(11) To the S.E. of Warka and Senqara lies the site of the ancient Ur of the Chaldees (q.v.). This city was given to Abraham, and much of its plan is preserved by the ruins of modern Mesopotamia, which were once the seat of the ancient city.

(12) Of the Ur lay Erédin, or, in full, GURDUGA, “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 generally of the tree of life. The later kings of Babylon sometimes bear the title “king of Erédin,” 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 Ammenak, who reigned 12 sari, or 43,200 years, and in whose time the Musurus Oannes, or Annedotus, arose out of the Pers Gulf. In references referred to in the legends which Berossus refers to, he was half-man and half-fish. It is thought that these incidents, though evidently mythical, point to the introduction of civilization into Babylonia, from this point. See also Jonaiah, The Book of

(14) N. of the Ur lay Isin, or Karrar, seat of the worship of Nin-Karrara, was also an important state governed by its own kings.

(15) Upé 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 Kassite.

(16) Other well-known cities, possibly state-capitals, were Larak, Gr Laranche; Amarda, one of the centers of the worship of Nergal; Allmanu, a province E. of the present Bagdad; Dilmu, now Nuru, Ennigu, and Kabara, seeming centers of the worship of Hadad; Tilman, at the head of the Pers Gulf, and including the island of Bahrein; the province of Sabu; Sebes or Bagdadu, possibly the modern Bagdad, and several others.

Whether the country was in the same seemingly uncared-for state as at present is unknown; but one cannot help admiring the courtesy of the original immigrants into such a district, for example, as that of Lagas. This, which belongs to Lagas, is without an equal among the neighboring peoples. The watercourses and marshes are like the whole of Shinar in general, it is more or less dried up in summer, and unhealthy for Europeans. The alternations in the waterways, owing to changes in the irrigation-dikes, 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 state of Shinar possessed no mean 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 uncouth, but this is probably due to the sculptures 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 superior work 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 users, of the writing-cum-Language. According to the study of the system which they introduced, the whole of the present Near East was divided into cuneiform script, and ideographic for the roots. To show this the following transcribed example will probably suffice:

Énu-DU URU nu-DIM, A house was not built, a city was not constructed; URU nu-DIM ADAM nu-mun-GAR, This city was not constructed, a community nation was not founded;

ABZU nu-DU GURDUGA nu-DIM, The abyss was not built, Erédin was not constructed;

ÉAZAGA DINGIR-Ene KI-DURA-bi nu-DIM, The holy house of the gods, its seat was not constructed;

SU-nu-NIGA KURKUR-AGA ABDADAD, 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 are in smaller letters, with a couple of lengthening suffixes and few pronunciations 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 Aratu, but also show how short and concise, as a language, was the speech of Shinar, before Sem supremacy.

T. G. Pinches

SHINE, shin: The Heb words 'elah, 'or, hadal, zahr, zarah, žabba', žaphah, 'öshath and karon are all tr. "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 dazzles in any sense (Ex 34 29 f.35; Is 60 1; Ezk 43 2; Dn 12 3). God as the sun of righteousness is thus depicted in Ps 50 2. The NT words astrapé, astrapá, ãmpá, phainó and phainó are tr. "shine." Thus literally it is said of the lightning that it shines (Mt 24 27; Lk 17 24). The term is also applied to the life of faith or to men prominent in the kingdom of God (Mt 5 16; Jn 5 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).

Henry E. Dusker
SHION, shi'ôn (שִׁיאָן); B; Ἰσαάκ, Σίσιν, Α, Ἦσαίας, Σίσιν): A town in the territory of Issachar, called with Shunem, Haparah and Anaharath (Josh 19:20). It is possibly identical with Khirbet Shâ'ân, near 'Ai in Bashan, 4 miles N.W. of Mt. Tabor.

SHIPHI, shi'î (שִׁיִּח); B; Ἰςάφαδ, Ἰσραήλ, Α, Ἰσαήλ, Ἰσραν: A Simeonite prince (1 Ch 4:37 [360]).

SHIPMITE, shîp'mît. See SHEPHAN; SHIP-MOTH.

SHIPIRAH, shîp'rá (שֵׂיפֶרָה, shiphrâ), "fairness," "beauty": LXX Σεφήρα, Septuagint, the rendering also of ספֶרָה, siphrâ, in Ex 2:21); The name of one of the Hebrew midwives (Ex 1:15). See also Ziph-Forah.

SHIPHTAN, shîf'tân (שִׁפְחֵת, shiphâth); B; Ἰασαβαθ, Ἰασαβάθ, Ἰασαβάθ, F, Ἰασαβάθ, Ἰασαβάθ, L; Ἰασάβαθ: An Ephraimitic prince (Nu 34:24).

SHIPMASTER, shîp'mas-ter. See SHIPS AND BOATS; PHOENIX.

SHIPMEN, ship'men. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3); III, 2.

SHIPS AND BOATS:

I. THE HEBREWS AND THE SEA.

II. SHIPS IN THE OT AND APOC.

1. Among the Hebrews

(1) In Early Times

(2) During the Monarchy

(3) In Later Times

2. Among neighboring Nations

(1) Egypt

(2) Assyria and Babylonia

(3) Phoenicia

3. General References

III. SHIPS IN THE NT

1. In the Gospels

2. In the Acts of the Apostles

3. In Other Books

LITERATURE

In the OT the following words are found:

(1) The word most commonly used in Heb.) "a ship, a vessel, a boat, a ship's crew" (Prov 28:39; 1 Jon 4:34), of which the pl. ספָרֵים is found most frequently (Jgs 5:17; 1 K 22:48 ft, and many other places).

The collective term for "a army of ships" is שְׂפָרִים (1 K 20:26 f; 10:22; "unto Tarshish," a "navy [of ships] of Tarshish," 1 K 10:22; "shipped a "collared with rope.")

(2) ספֶרָה, siphrâ (Nu 24:24; Exk 39:9; Isa 33:21; 11:12; "gallant ship"); Dan 11:30; "cümm Kitim, "ships of Kitim.

(3) ספֶרָה, siphrâ, "innermost parts of the ship; RV, "sides of the ship" AV (Jon 1:5, the only place where the word is found).

In Acts 20:7; 21:24, plôoan, is the usual word (Wisd 14:1; Eccles 33:2, etc), τρ' "vessel" in Wisd 14:1, but "ship" elsewhere. For "ship" Wisd 5:10 has מָלַל, מַלֶל, "a boat in 2 Macc 18:3.6 is for ἱππάν, ἱππάν, and "navy" in 1 Macc 1:17; 2 Macc 13:9; 14:1 for ἱππάν, ἱππάν, in Wisd 14:6 Noah's ark is called a σκύλος, σκύλος, σκύλος, a "clumsy ship" (the literal tr 'raft" in RV is impossible). In the NT there are four words in use: (1) πλῶν (Acts 27:41, the only place where it occurs, designating the large sa-ca-going vessel in which St. Paul sailed to Crete) (2) πλοῖον, πλοίον, πλοῖον, "a little boat" (Mt 4:21, 22 and all other places where the ship carrying St. Paul is mentioned, except Acts 27 above). In Jas 3:8; Rev 19:17, πλοῖον is rendered "ship." (1) σκύλος, σκύλος, σκύλος, "boat" (Acts 27:16-30, 32, where it means the small boat that carried St. Paul) (3) πλοῖον, πλοῖον, "a boat")


I. 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 seaborde along the Mediterranean, but the character of their coast gave little encouragement to navigation. The capture 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, I H G L, 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 Herod's and more Gr and Rom than Jewish. It was mostly inhabited by Greeks (Jos. BJ, III, 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 them 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 5:18, "shîphrâth, "islands"; and even that is not perfectly clear (RV "convo," 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 Heb lit., "shipped a "sailed with anchors".

II. During the monarchy.—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 S 5:11); the friendly cooperation was continued by Solomon, who availed himself of a fleet of cedar and the grip 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, 12, 27, dóbbróth, AV 'floats'; 2 Ch 2:16, 'flotes'); raphddoth, 'flotes' 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 navy 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 wool and spices which 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 Baetic, the modern Andalucia. It was the farthest limit of the western world as known to the Hebrews. It was no doubt a strong enterprise where they had held their commerce, but Tarsus is much nearer to it than Tarragona (Hab 2.14). In the days of Ahaz (2 K 16:6) it was seized by the Syrians in the days of Ahaz (2 K 16:6).

From Solomon's time onward the kings of Judah retained their hold upon Eloth (1 K 22:46; 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. Again, 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 1:17). He found a ship bound for Tarshish as far toward the W. as Nineweh to the E. The fare (qaddar) for such a voyage was a passenger of the ship in which he stowed himself away (qaddihan), the crew (malkhim), the captain or shipmaster (rabh ha-babkh), 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 likeable 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 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 15:8).

1. Egypt.—The Egyptians, like other nations of antiquity, had a great horror of the open sea, although they were expert enough in the management of their commerce and the building of Neighboring Pharaoh-necho built up a powerful navy to serve him both in commerce and in war. See PHARAOH-NECHO.

Of explicit references to Egyptian 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) which "hurried" 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 "courageous Egyptians." (30:9). When Jeh compares his days to "the swift ships" (c. the ships of reed "RVm), the allusion is most likely to Egypt's, these being skiffs with a wooden keel and the rest of buirissons, 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 scopes for navigation. The Assyrian monuments contain representations of naval engagements and operations on the Euphrates. When Isaiah pictures Jeh as a better defender of Judah than the rivers and streams of his country, he speaks of water coming up to the doors of his city (1:7). Day by day the wondrous narratives come to us which Ezekiel tells (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, oars 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 Elahiah (possibly Sidon). She is described as *oarsmen* of Sidon and Arvad, pilots of the wise men of Tyre, *callers* from Gebal to stop up the cracks and seams in their timbers, *mariners* and men of war from other lands who enhanced her beauty by hanging up the shield and hem of their flag in her. She is furnished 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 Grecia, and Tubal, which is Spain, in the W.

One or two of the particulars of this description may be commented upon. (a) As regards rigging, the Phoen ships of the time of Ezekiel, as seen in Assyri representations, had one mast with one yard and carried a square sail. 

Egypt 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 maysur was employed as well as flax in the manufacture of sail-cloth. The sail had also to serve "for an ensign" (Ex. EK 27 7). "The flag proper," says Davidson (ad loc.), "seems not to have been used in ancient navigation": its purpose was found to have been served as for example in the battle of Actium the ship of Antony was distinguished by its purple sail."

As regards the crew, in the two-hanked Phoen ships the rowers of the first bank work their oars over the top of the mast, while those of the second portage lower down, so that each may have free play for his oar. The callers were those who filled up seams or cracks in the hulls with pitch, and covered them with pitch and wax, after the manner of the instruction given to Noah regarding the Ark. Thou shalt set pitch it within and without with pitch" (Gen 6 14).

(c) As regards cargo, it is to be noted that "the person 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 is an exemplary 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 (ps 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 billowy water, whereof, when it is gone by, there is no trace to be found, neither pathway of its keel in the billows" (5 10). The same book notes it as a striking example of the case of a divine and benevolent 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 Ecclesiastical 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 fish-catching industry. Bethsaida at the northern end of the Lake and Tiberias at the southern end were great centers of the trade. The boats were probably of a size and build 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 22), 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 proskephalaion, "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 reference 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 Ramsay puts it, had the true Apostles' Gr 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 a prisoner in Rome and was proceeding to Rome in charge of Julius, the centurion, along with other prisoners, a ship of Adramytium, a coastering vessel, carried the party from Caesarea along the Syrian coast, northward of Cypria, 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 Jesus the emperor Titus returned to Italy in such a vessel, touching at Rhugium 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
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(Acts 28:11), "the sign" (παράσημον, parásemmon) is given, and she is called "The Twin Brothers." This expression shows that it was in painting or relief; a figurehead, with the Twin Brothers represented, would be given by ἐκταμαξιν, ektamaxin. The cargo (φορτίον, phortion, Acts 27:10, AV and RV "lading") in this case was wheat (27:28), but another word is used, γόες, γόμης, by St. Luke of a ship's load of wheat (Acts 21:3; cf. Rev 18:11 ff.). Of those engaged in handling the ship we find (ver 11) the master (κυβερνήτης, kubernētēs), the owner (καλλικῶν, kallikōn, although this expression seems not quite consistent with the ownership of a ship, in its legal sense, by a local service, and Ramsay's distinction between the words, making the former "sailing-master" and the latter "captain," may be better), the sailors (ver 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 masts and rigging and everything else that may be of help, and adopting the expediency, only resorted to in extremities, of passing cables under the keel of the ship to keep the hull together, and to preserve the timbers from starting), (3) the lowering of the gear (ver 17, reducing sail, taking down the mainsail and the main yard), (4) throwing freight, overboard and later casting out the tackle of the ship (ver 19), (5) taking soundings (ver 28), (6) 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).

The parts of the ship's equipment there are mentioned as "the sounding lead" (βούλι, and, though it is the vb. which is here used), "the anchors" (ἀλάνεσσα, ἀλάνεια, 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" (ππᾶδλα, pīdalia, of which every ship had two or 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" (στρογγυλέως, στρογγυλή, not the mainsail, 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" (πάροδος, skēphē, which had been in tow in the wake of the vessel, according to custom still prevalent in those coasting-vessels being sometimes blemished, when the crew cut 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 obscuration 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 ver Projected constructed raft. It may be a reminiscence of the sea when St. Paul in the very earliest of his Epp. (1 Thess 4:16), speaking of the coming of the Lord, says "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout! (ἐκκολοκοῦν, on kolokoun), and with a great voice, to the sign" (ναύκλειον, kaleusai, giving the time to the rowers on board a ship. Although ἡμετέρα, hypēdēris, was "an underrover" and ἄρημος, ἄρσης, "the crew of a ship," as contrasted with κυβερνήτης, kubernētēs, "the sailing-master," the derived meaning of "servant" or "officer" has lost in the NT all trace of its origin (Mt 5:25; Lk 1:2 and many passages; of σῶλον, σῶλον, and σῶλον, σῶλον, where the idea of "furling" or "shifting a sail" is entirely lost: 1 Cor 7:29; 2 Cor 8:20).

Figurative: In He the hope of the gospel 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, ad loc.), St. James, showing the one thing that adds to the ships, large though they be, and driven by fierce winds, turned about by a very small "rudder," ἀντωτριδα, πίσθινον, as "the small steersman will" (Isa 3:4). In Rev there is a representation of the fall of Babylon in the image reminiscence of 27), in which lamentations arise from the merchants of the earth who can no more buy her varied merchandise (τον γόα, τὸν γόμη, "cargo" RV) and shipmasters and passengers and seafaring people look in terror and shout upon the smoke of her burning (Rev 18:12-16).

LITERATURE. — The usual books on Gr and Rom antiquities furnish descriptions and illustrations. Works on the monuments like Layard, Nineveh and its Remains, 1853; Maspero, Ancient Egypt and Assyria; Ball, Light from the East, and Reissner, Cairo Museum Catalogue, "Models of Ships and Boats," 1913, 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, shish'a (Σίσια, shishā): One of Solomon's officers of state (1 K 4:3).

SHISHAK, shish'ak (Σίσιχα, shishā [1 K 14:25]; Σουσσακιφ, Sussakhe): Sheshonk or Sheshonq I, who is called on the stele of the 1. Shishak, founder of the XXIId Dynasty, was 963-930 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 Pasekhkhanu II, the last of the kings of the XXIst Dynasty, 932 BC, Shishak ascended the throne, with an efficient army and a well-filled 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 who had been left far behind had escaped 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 returning 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 Pal, when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter and received with her Gezer as a dowry, seems not to be clearly established.
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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 Judah 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

4. Shishak's Record at Karnak

Figure of the God Amon Holding Captive the Cities of Judah for Shishak. One of the Heads of the Cities, Jud-ha-malek (Jehud of the King, Josh 19:45). Which is the Third behind the Knee of the God Amon.

Shemaiah, Rehoboam and his people repented, 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 12:3–9). From the 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 engraved there. A number of tovets mentioned in the Book of Josh have been identified, and among the names of the list are Rahabah, Taanach, 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 seems probable, had invited him to come to his aid. Among the names in the list was "Jud-ha-malek"—Yahmalak on the monuments—which was at first believed to reflect the king of Judah with a fictitious name which passed for Rehoboam. Being, however, a place-name, it is now recognized to be the town Yehudah, belonging to the tribe of Judah. On the death of Shishak, his successor assumed a nominal suzerainty over the land of Canaan.

LITERATURE.—P!nders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 227 ff; Maspero, Struggle of the Two Peoples, 773 ff; Nicol, Recent Archaeology and the Bible, 223–25.

T. NICOL

SHITRAI, shîtrî, shît-Îâ'î, shîtray'; A Sharonite, David's chief shepherd (1 Ch 27:29).

SHITTAH, shî'tâ, TREE (תֶשֶׁת), shittah; LXX φόλον ἄγαστον, xulon ἄστρον; RV ACACIA TREE [ Isa 41:19 ]; SHITTIM WOOD (תַּשְׁתִּית וּמָכָן), a 1.6; people—it is called expedition Ch Maspero, a 1.6; people; list is number Shishak's name, which is "the precious treasures of Shishak's campaign, away from the city, which, with the exception of the tree, is a remnant of the ancient city of Thebes.

The tree yielded a hard, close-grained timber, not readily attacked by insects.

E. W. G. Masterman

SHITTIM, shî'tîm (תַּשְׁתִּים), ha-shittim, "the acacias"; סַתֵּרְיָה, Sattê; (1) This marked the last camping-ground of Israel before they crossed the Jordan to begin the conquest of Western Pal. Here it was that the people fell into the snare set for them by the satanic counsel of Balaam, who thus brought upon them greater evil than all his prohibited curses could have done (Nu 25:1 ff; 31:16). In Nu 33:49 it is called Abel-shittim. It was from Shittim that Joshua sent the spies to view out the land and Jericho (Josh 2:1); and from this point the host moved forward to the river (3:1). The place is mentioned by Micah in a passage of some difficulty (6:5); after "what Balaam the son of Bun answered," perhaps, some such phrase as "remember what I did" has fallen out. This would then be a reference to the display of Divine power in arresting the flight of Jordan until the host had safely crossed. Those places the camp "near Jordan where the city Abila now stands, a place full of palm trees" (Ant, IV, viii. 1). Onom says Shittim was near to Mt. Peor (Fogor). It may possibly be identical with Kherbet el-Refrain, about 6 miles S. of the Jordan, on the lip of Wady Seubdan, where there are many acacias. (2) In Joel 3:18 we read of the valley of Shittim which is to be watered by a fountain coming forth of the house of the Lord. It must therefore be sought on the W. of the Jordan. The waters from the Jerus district are carried to the Dead Sea down the Wady which continues the Brook Kidron: Wady en-Náár. The acacia is found plentifully in the lower reaches of this valley, which may possibly be intended by the prophet.

W. Ewing

SHIZA, shî'za (שִׁזָּה), shiz'ah; סַזְדָּה, Sazê; A Reubenite, one of David's leading warriors (1 Ch 11:42).

SHOA, shô'ā (שֹׁאָה), šô'; סַוַּע, Sow'; A people named in Ezk 23:23 in association with Babylonians, Chaldeans and Assyrians. Schrader iden-
SHOBAB, shō'bah (םובב, shōlbāḥ; Σουβάβ, Sōbeb): (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 (םובב, shōhabkh; Σουβάκ, Sōbak): Captain of the Syrian host (2 S 10 16.18); but "Shophach" (םופב, shōphakh) in 1 Ch 19 16.18.

SHOBAL, shō'bal, shō-há'l, shō-há'-l (םובל, shōlbāl; B, אבשל, A, Luke, Sūbāt, Sōbat): The head of one of the families which returned from the Bab captivity (Ezr 2 42; Neh 7 45).

SHOBAL, shō'bal (םובל, shōlbāl; Arabic, "overflowing"); Σουβάλ, Sōbal, with variants: (1) An Edomite name mentioned in connection with Lotan, Zibeon and Anah, as that of a "son" of Seir (Gen 36 20), the father of a clan (ver 23), and a Horite "dike" (ע.setBounds(9, 26), Hebrew) (ver 29; 1 Ch 1 38. 40). (2) Calebite, the father (possibly of the inhabitants) of Kiriat-jearim (1 Ch 2 50-52). (3) A Judahite, perhaps to be identified with (2) above (1 Ch 4 11).

SHOBEK, shō'bek (םובק, shōlbēk; Arabic, Sōbek, Sōbbāk): One of those who sealed the covenant under Nehemiah after the Bab captivity (Neh 10 24).

SHOBI, shō'bi (םובי, shōbē; Onešı̂b, Ouesbè): One of those who remained faithful to David during the rebellion of Absalom (2 S 17 27).

SHOCHOH, shō'kō (םочек, shōchō; B, Sonqāw, Sokhebāh, A, 'Oeqē, Okehō): This in 1 S 17 1 AV is a variant of Socoh (q.v.).

SHOE, shō, SHOE-LATCHET, shōo'lach-et (שֹׁעֶל, nā'al, lit. "that which is fastened," with derivative vb. לָשֵׁט, "to provide with shoes") [2 Ch 28 15; Ezk 16 10]; ὑπόδημα, hupó démā [Sir 46 19; Mt 3 11, etc.], from the vb. ὑπήδησεν, hupódēsen [Mt 6 9; Eph 6 15], "to bind under," σαμαδύω, samadýō, "sandals" [Jth 10 4; 16 9; Mk 6 9; Acts 12 8]; AV, RVm also have "shoe" for נָעָל, minâ'él, "bar" [as RV text] in Dt 33 25; the "latchet" is either נָעָל, nā'al, "twisted thing" [Gen 14 23; Isa 5 27], or יִֽדְּס, yīdâs, "leather thong" [Mt 1 7; Lk 3 16; Jn 1 27]; The nā'el was a simple piece of leather tied on the foot with the strâkh, 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 28 13; Isa 20 2). Women, however, might have ornamental sandals (Cant 7 1; Jth 16 9), and Ezekiel names "sealskin" (16 10) as a particularly luxurious material, but the omission of sandals from the list of Isa 3 18–25 shows that they were not customarily made articles of great expense. The hupódēma was likewise properly a sandal, but the word was also used to denote a shoe that covered the foot. The contrast between hupódēma in Mt 10 10 and sandalion 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 1's, 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 [']s) by slaves. When one entered a house they were removed; all the more, naturally, on entering the sanctuary (Ex 3 5; Josh 15 15; 19 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 was often without a pair of sandals (2 S 19 5, 18), and the preservation of the "latchet of their shoes" from being broken (Isa 5 27) would require almost miraculous help.

Ruth 4 7ff 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 9ff the custom appears in a different light. If a man refused to perform his duty to his deceased brother's wife, the priest of the city were to remove his shoe and disgrace 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 remanement 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 89 8 108 9, "Upon [m "unto"] Edom will I cast my shoe," is uncertain. נָעָל, "shoe," may mean either "upon" or "unto." If the former, some (otherwise unsubstantiated) custom of asserting ownership of the shoes of another may be meant. If the latter, the meaning is "Edom I will treat as a slave," to whom the shoes are cast on entering a house.

Burtton Scott Easton

SHOHAM, shō'ham (םיהם, shōhum, "onyx"); B, 'Iṣorām, Iṣadīm, A, 'Iṣorām, Iṣadīm): One of the sons of Merari (1 Ch 24 27).

SHOMER, shō'mer (םומר, 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 the tribe of Asher (1 Ch 7 32). See SHEMER.

SHOPACH, shō'fak. See Sborah.

SHOPHAN, shō'фан (שופן, shōphān). See APROTH-SHOPHAN.

SHORE, shōr: (1) שָׁר, hoph, always of the Mediterranean, variously transl. "haven," "beach," "shore," "seashore," "coast," "sea coast" (Gen 39 13; Dt 1 7; Josh 9 1; Jgs 5 17; Jer 47 7; Ezk 26 15). (2) מָרִים, marīm, lit. "lips," of Arab. مَّرَّ, mar, "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 'Abab.
by Ezion-geber (1 K 9 26; 2 Ch 8 17); the brink of the River Nile (Gen 41 3 17); the edge (AV "brink") of the valley of Arnon (Dt 2 36). (3) koph, koph, lit. "end," "extremity," the uttermost part (AV "shore") of the Salt Sea (Josh 15 2); "end of the earth" (Ps 46 9; cf. Arab. ʾašqā-l-ʿard, "the uttermost parts of the earth." (4) ʾašqāl, ʾašqal, lit. "high," was the ancient name by the sea shore (He 11 12). (5) ayyāyās, ayyāsōl, 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) āṣōn pareshēm tōn Kūriōn, āson parēléghōn tēn Krētēn, double reading, "sailed along Crete, close in shore" (AV "sailed from one port to another") (Acts 27 13). See COAST; HAVEN; SAND. ALFRED ELY DAY

SHORTEN, šōr't:n: The Heb word ʾāšar and the Gr kóllōlōi lit. indicate abbreviation of time or space (Ps 59 45; Prov 10 27; Ezek 43 5); figuratively they point to limitation of power or of suffering (Nuz 11 23; Isa 50 2; 59 1; Mt 24 22; Mk 13 20).

SHOShANNIM EDUTH, šō'-shan-im ʾed'-uth. See Song; Psalms.

SHOULDER, shōld'ér (ʾēḇāḵ, ʾēḇḵēm, ʾēḇḵ, kāthēp, ʾēḇk, ʾēḇḵō, ʾēḇḵōr, ʾēḇḵōl, ʾēḇḵōlā, ʾēḇḵōlāh; ʾēḇḵōs, ʾēḇḵōs, ʾēḇḵōsaph, ʾēḇḵōsaphā; brachion, Sir 7 31 only): The meanings of the Heb words are rather varied. The first (ʾēḇḵēm) has perhaps the widest application and is used for the part of the body 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 personalitv 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, "The government shall be upon his shoulders" (Isa 9 6) and "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 f.).

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. Like the Heb ʾēḇḵēm, 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 Heb speaker in the psalm of personal lament (Ezk 12 19). 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 (ōmos, fairly common in Apoc.), it corresponds most closely with this use (Mt 28 4; Lk 15 5). Of the shoulders of animals the word ʾēḇḵēm is used in Ezek 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" (Zech 7 11), where the meaning of the word is "the gage or "turned up 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 Ephraim (Gen 49 19), "Benjamin 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 Jerus, 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 zōōṯ, zōōṭ, which is used of the "balled shoulder of the ram" which was a wave offering at the consecration of a Nazirite (Nu 6 19) and of one of the priestly portions of the sacrifice (Dt 15 21). In Sir 7 31 this portion is called brachion, properly "arm," but both AV and RV translate "shoulder." The sheep and heave offerings see SACRIFICE. AV frequently translates Heb ḥēḵāh, lit. "leg," "shin" (q. v.) by "shoulder," which RV occasionally retains (e.g. Ezk 42 16; Nu 6 20).

H. L. E. LURING

SHOULDER-BLADE, shōld'èr-blad (ʾēḇḵōšēph, shōkēnāh): Then let my shoulder (kāthēp) fall from the shoulder-blade (shōkēnāh), and mine arm (zōōṯ) be broken from the bone (kānēḵ)" (Job 31 22). The Heb word is the fem. of šēkēm (see SHOULDER). It is found only in this passage.

SHOULDER-PIECE, shōld'èr-pēs (ʾēḇḵōsōp, kāthēp): 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). These shoulder-pieces were fastened the plated or waved 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 35; 39 4 18 20) how we are 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. Anessi, 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 Egypt garments have no shoulder strap, or at most one.

H. L. E. LURING

SHOVEL, šùv̄l: (1) ʾēḇḵōṯ, raboth, is a wooden shovel used on the threshing floor for winnowing the grain (Isa 30 24). (2) ʾōḇōṯ, ʾōḇāth, 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 42; 2 K 26 14; 2 Ch 4 11 16; Jer 62 18). It was very likely a small shovel of those used in connection with modern fireplaces for cleaning away the ashes of (Heb ʾēḇāth, "to sweep away") or for carrying live coals to start a new fire. (3) ʾēḇḵōṯāh, yāḏēhāth (Dt 13 16 RVm). JAMES A. PATCH

SHOW, šō. See SIRAW.
SHOWBREAD, shō'bred. See Shewbread.

SHOWBREAD, TABLE OF. See Shewbread, Table of.

SHOWER, shō'âr. (1) שְׁפֵר, 'ĕshî'hām, a pl. form apparently denoting gentle rain, usually used figuratively, as in Dt 32 2; Ps 72 6; Mic 5 7. (2) שפּר, 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” (Exk 34 20); of destruction: “There shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hailstones in wrath to consume it” (Ezk 13 13). (3) שפור, zerem, usually storm or tempest (cf Isa 4 6; 28 2): “They are wet with the showers of the mountain” (Job 24 8). (4) שפּופ, ṭabros (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 (va'd, mado). In Acts 19 24 small models of temples for Diana.

SHROUD, shroud (תָּשׁוֹר, hōres, “bough”): Winding-sheets for the dead. See BURIAL. Used in AV, ERV Exk 31 3 in the rare old sense of “shelter,” “covering.” ARV has “a forest-like shade” (תָּשׁוֹר, hōres, “wood,” “wooded height”) (Isa 17 9, etc). Cf Milton, Comus, 147.

SHRUB, shrub (תָּשׁוֹר, nîr) [Gen 21 15]. See BUSH, (2).

SHUA, SHUAH, shō'â: (1) (תָּשׁוֹר, šhîrā, “prosperity”): A Canaanite whose daughter Judah took to wife (Gen 38 2.12; 1 Ch 2 3; see BATH-shua). (2) (תָּשׁוֹר, šhîrâ, “prosperity”): Daughter of Heber, an Asherite (1 Ch 7 32). (3) (תָּשׁוֹר, šhîrâ, “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 SHUHAL.

SHUAL, shō'âl (תָּשׁוֹר, šhādāl): An Asherite (1 Ch 7 36).

SHUAL, LAND OF (תָּשׁוֹר, תָּשׁוֹר, אֶרֶץ שׁוֹדָל; ה שְּמָוָל, hē Sōgāl): From their encampment at Michmash the Philistines 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 f). Ophrah is probably identical with et-Tamieh, a village which lies some 5 miles E. of Bešîtn (Bethel). It is in this district therefore that the land of Shual must be sought, but no definite identification is possible. W. EWING

SHUBABAEL, shōbôhâl, shōbôhâl (תָּשׁוֹר, shābahâlēl): (1) A Levite, son of Anram (1 Ch 24 20); one of the leaders of song in the temple (1 Ch 25 20). See SHEBEUEL; Men, H.P.N., 130. (2) A son of Hemam (1 Ch 26 4). See SHEBEUEL.

SHUHAH, shōbôhâ (תָּשׁוֹר, shābah, “depression”): A brother of Caleb (1 Ch 4 11).

SHUHAM, shōbôham (תָּשׁוֹר, šabôhàm): Son of Dan, ancestor of the Shubamites (Nu 26 42 f). In Gen 46 23 called “Hushim.”

SHUHITE, shōhoht (תָּשׁוֹר, šhôhât): 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'ôlâh-îm (תָּשׁוֹר, Shulamîth): One of the families of Kiriath-jearim (1 Ch 2 53).

SHUNEM, shō'ônêm (תָּשׁוֹר, šhûnîn; B, Ṣ̄ôvăv, Ṣônâ, A, Šôvâvâ, Šûnânîs): 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 3 13; 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 Shuhamite (Cant 6 13). In this name there is the exchange of l for n which is common. W. EWING

SHUNEM, shō'ônêm (תָּשׁוֹר, šhûnîn; B, Ṣ̄ôvăv, Šûnâdân, A, Šôvâvâ, Šûnâdôn): A town in the territory of Issachar named with Jezreel and Chisloth (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 Rom miles S. of Mt. Tabor. This points to the modern Sālam, a village surrounded by cactus hedges and orchards on the lower southwestern 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 into 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 Akraibatta; or perhaps with Sâlem, usually 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.” The materials do not exist on which any certain conclusion can rest. Both Sālam and Sâlem are on the edge of the splendid grain fields of Esdraelon (2 K 4 18). W. EWING
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SHUNI, šo[b]nî, SHUNITES, šo[b]nîts (šuN, ša努î): One of the sons of Gad and his descendants (Gen 46 16; Nu 26 15).

SHUPHAM, šo[b]'am, SHUPHAMITES, šo[b]'-fam-îts. See SHEEPUPHAM.

SHUPPM, shup'ım (šuP, shuppm): (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 MUPPM; SHEEPUPHAM.

SHUR, shûr, šâbîr (šwîr, šâr; Šisô, Šorî): 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 (Ain Kadsî) (see ver 14) is said to have been "in the way to Shur." Abraham also lived "between Kadad and Shur" (Gen 20 1). The position of Shur is defined (Gen 25 18) as being "opposite Egypt on the road from Beer-sheba to Asman." 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 15 7) as being opposite Egypt, and (2 S 6) as near Egypt. The term thus no doubt covers a large area on the E. of the Red Sea, and the S. of the Bitter Lakes.

Brusenge, however, proposed to regard Shur ("the wall") as equivalent to the Egyptian ḥaša ("wall"), the name of a fortification of some kind apparently near Asman (2 S 6), probably near the entrance to Egypt on the road from Pelusium to Zan. The extent of this "wall" is unknown, but Brusenge connects it with the wall mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (14) who wrote about 8 BC, and who attributed it to Seleucus I who defended "the E. coast of Egypt against the incursions of the Syrians and Arabians, by a wall drawn from Pelusium through the deserts as far as to Heliopolis, for a space of 1,500 furlongs." 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 the Nile. The wall which Diodorus speaks of as being built by Alexander the Great, 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; Brusenge, Egypt under the Pharaohs, abridged edition, 320.

C. R. Conder

SHUSHAN, šo[b]šan (šwšan, Sůshûn; Šiswâr, Šušân, Šora, Šušân): This city, the Šuš or Šaban of the Babylonians, and the native 1. Position, (Elamite) Šabûn, is the modern Shushter Erytology and ETYMOLOGY (Sus) in Southwestern Persia, a series and forms of ruin-mounds on the banks of the of its Name river Karkhe. The ancient etymology gives ("city of lilies" or "of horses") are probably worthless, as an etymology in the language of the place would rather be expected. Sayce therefore connects the name with ṣâšin, meaning "forerunner," and pointing to some such meeting place. It is frequently mentioned in the BAB inscriptions of the 3rd millennium BC, and is expressed by the characters for the goddess Ishtar and for "oeder," implying that it was regarded as the place of the "divine grove" (see S, below). In later days, the Assyrians substituted for the second character, that having the value of (Š), possibly indicating its pronunciation. Radu (Early BAB History, 235) identifies Shushan (Susa) with the Šâša of the Bab king Kudur-nahar (11th cent. BC, if the first of the name), who dedicates to the Bab goddess Ninlil an inscription of a certain Sushan, who had, at an earlier date, dedicated it to Ishtar for the life of the Bab king Dungi (c 2500 BC).

The surface still covered with ruins is about 2,000 hectares (2,940 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 Apadana-mound (W.), the Archaemenian 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 palaces 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, &c. (4) The district on the right bank, similarly inhabited. This area extended into all the lower plain, between the Shour and the Karkhe. 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 Persian period. In the northern part of the Royal City, the palace of Apadana, the only great monument of which remains were found on the level. (1) The principal portion of the hall of columns, known as the throne-room or Apadana, with inscriptions of Darius and his successors on the walls. The Apadana was destroyed by fire in the time of Artaxerxes II.

3. The "Royal Citadel." and the Ruins

Shushan, built by Darius, is a massive palace of which a few later structures were erected. The name is probably derived from the Sabean name Shushah, which was adopted as a place-name, and came to mean the "city of the sun," or "sun rising." The palace was probably built by Susa, and extended to the S., and the E. The palace began to be an important center in the Persian period. The Achaemenian palace of Susa was destroyed by fire in the time of Artaxerxes II, and was thereafter rebuilt by Xerxes. The palace was later destroyed by fire, and the site was subsequently occupied by small towers and fortifications, which continued to be inhabited until the time of Alexander the Great.

The number of important antiquities found on the site is considerable. Among the finds may be mentioned the triumphal stele of Naram-Sin, king of Agade (3d-4th millennium BC); the statues of the Bab king Dungi (c 2600 BC); the inscriptions of the Elamite king Be(?)-Sa-Shinak (c 2400 BC); the obelisk inscribed with the laws of Hammurabi of Babylon; the bronze bas-relief of the Elamite king Shutruk-Nahhunte (c 1120 BC), who carried off from Babylon the stela of Naram-Sin and Hammurabi above mentioned, together with numerous other inscriptions and monuments, of which the stele of Adda-hamiti-In-Sushak, of a much later date, together with numerous other objects of art and inscriptions—a 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 Assur-bani-apli about 640 BC. According to Assur-bani-apli's account, the ziqqurat or temple-tower of Susa was built of enameled bricks inlaid with lapis-lazuli, and was adorned with pinnacles of bright bronze. The god of the city was Shusnakh, who dwelt in a secret place, and none ever saw the form of his divinity. Lagalamu (Laomer) and five other of the city's deities were adored by kings, and their images, with those of 12 more (worshipped by the people), were carved off as spoil to Assyria. Winged bulls and genii adorned Susa's temples, and figures of wild bulls protected the entrances to the shrines. Other noteworthy things were the sacred groves into which no stranger might 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; 13:9; 11ff; Dan 8:2; Ad Est 11:3).

LITERATURE—See Porot et Chlpiçe, Histoire de l’art dans l’Antiquité, vol V, Perse, 1800; no Morgan, Delitation en Perse (Mémoires), 1900, etc: Histoire et traves de la délocalisation en Perse, 1905; art. “Elamite” in Hastings’ ERB; art. Elam in this work.

T. G. PINCHES

SHUSHAN EDTH, sho’šhan Ed’uth. See Song; Psalms.

SHUSHANCHITES, sho’šhan’ki’tis (ם"שחנ”), shāḥān’khāy’ [Aram.]; B, שושניאת, Shosan- chaito; AV Susanchites): Colonists in Samaria whose original home was in Shushan (Ezr 4:9).

SHUThALHITES, šōô-thal’hits, šōô-thal’hits. See Shuthelah.

SHUThELAH, šōô-thē’lān, šōô-thē’lān, SHUThELAHITES, šōô-thē’lān-šōô-thē’lān, šōô-thāl’hits (ם"שחנ”), šubṭal’ḥay): A son of Ephraim (Nu 26:35.36; cf 1 Ch 7:20.21), and his descendants.

See Genealogy.

SHUTTEL, shut’l. See Weaving.

SIA, s’a, SIAHA, s’a-ha (ם"שח, s’t’): One of the remnant which returned from captivity (Neh 7:47; Ezr 2:44).

SIBBECAI, SIBBECAI, sib’ē-ki, sib’ē-ki (ם"שח, sibḥkḥay): One of the valiant men in David’s army (2 S 21:18; 1 Ch 11:20; 20:4; 27:11).

SIBBOLETH, sib’ō-leth (ם"שבהל), sibbéloth). See Shibboleth.

SIBMAH, sib’mah. See Sheam.

SIBRAIM, sib-r’im, sib’ra-im (ם"שבר”, sibbrayin; B, שברע, Sebrūd, A, שבריא, Sephrād): 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 have been represented by the modern Khirbet Sanbariyeh on the west bank of Nahr el-Hasbān, about 3 miles S.E. of ‘Abil.

SIBYLINE ORACLES, sib’ī-l’n, leī or’-a’-k’l. See Apocalyptic Literature, B. V.

SICARI, sī-ka’ri. See Assassins.


SICK, sik, SICKNESS, sik’nes (ם"שק), bālāh [Gen 48:1, etc; ד”שת, ḥǎhšt [Dt 28:61, etc; מ"שך, ṭāḥad’a [Dt 29:21, etc; מ"שקה, nāḥālah [Ex 23:25, etc; מ"שקר, ḏāzech [Lev 16:33, etc; מ"שץ, ṭāmash [2 S 12:15, etc; מ"שעט, asthenē [Mt 10:8, etc; cf 2 Macc 9:22], מ"שעוק, kōlos ḥōn [Lev 7:2], מ"שעון, ḥōn’nas, ḥōn’nas [Lev 21:14, etc; מ"שעטמה, orkhēstēna [Sir 10:10, etc; with various cognates, ק”ש, ק”מ, ק”מ], ק”נך, ק”נך [Jas 5:15]; Lat 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 tr 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 ṭānash, not improbably trismus nascantum, a common condition in Palestinian infants. In Paul 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), Jairus’ daughter (Mt 9:18), and the young man’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 (Ahasiah, 2 K 2:2), wounds (Joram, 2 K 8:29), from the violence of passion (Amnon, 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). דוקח or periodic sickness is referred to (Lev 15:15, 20:18), and an extreme case is that of Lk 8:43.

In some examples the nature of the disease is specified, as Asa’s disease in his feet (1 K 15:23), for which he sought the aid of physicians in vain (2 Ch 15:12). Hezekiah and Job suffered from sore boils, but were delivered from these by God’s healing hand (2 Ch 29:21), 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 19:23 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, leprosy is spoken of as 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 2:17) has come down to us in several forms in apocryphal and rabbinical writings (Babda Kalama ed 26:13; Šanhedar 176), but is nowhere so terse as in the form in which He expresses it. The Lord performed His healing of the sick to demonstrate His word or to utter 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 incorporated in some of the rabbinical tracts. “He that visits the sick lengthens his life, he who refrains shortens it,” says Rabbi Ishanan in Nāḥārim 29.

In Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De‘arah there is a chapter devoted to this duty, which is regarded as incumbent on the Jew, even though the sick person be a Gentile (Gil’ena 61a). The church’s duty to the sick, so long neglected, has now been recognized in the mission field, and has proved, in heathen lands, to be the most important of all pioneer agressive 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'le (σικέλη, ἵρμντις [Dt 16 9; 23 25], ῥοζόβα, magäll), c.f Arab. m'injil [Jer 50 16; Joel 3 13]; ἤπερανοῦ, ἰδρέανον [Mk 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 Egyptian sculptures. The earliest sickle was probably of wood, shaped like the modern scythe, although much smaller, with the cutting edge made of sharp flints set into the wood. Sickle-bits 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. PARCH

SICYON, sish'-ion (Σικυών, Σικύων, Σικύων, Σικύων, Σικύων), (Σικύων, Σικύων): Mentioned in 1 Mac 16 2 23 in the list of countries and cities to which Lucas the Roman envoy, probably Lucius Junius Bocchus Lucianus (Burnouf LXX 130 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 (cfr Sib C 14 2 and Plato).

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 Hellenistic 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'Im, VALE OF (σιδώμ, σίδωμ, 'emek ha-siddim; LXX ἡ φάραγγι [or κολάδα] ἡ ἄνω, ἢ φάραγγι [κολάδα] ἡ ἐλαφότειν): The place mentioned in Gen 14 3–8 as being the scene of encounter between Chedorlamen and his allies with the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim and Zoar. In verse 3 it is identified with the Salt Sea, and in verse 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 again in the account of Moses' vision from Pisgah (Dt 34 3).

In the account of Abram and Lot, it is said that from Bethel towards the Plain of the Delta of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before Jeh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. The word here is "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 Achor. But it seems to go beyond the text to assume that the Vale of Siddim was within that circle of the 4th cent. In Gen 14 3:10 it says that Lot dwelt "in the cities of the Plain, and moved his tent as far as Sodom." In the vision of Moses, likewise, we have a very general and condensed description in which it is said that he was shown "the Plain of the valley of Jehoshaphat, upon trees, unto Sodom." And, 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 on the Arabian side, the apparent limits do not extend to the Dead Sea; but we are by no means sure that the traditional site of Pisgah was the correct one, or that the limits of this language should be restricted to the points which are actually within range of vision.

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. This is supported by the fact that Jebel Uдум, the salt mountain at the southwest corner of the Dead Sea, still bears the name of Sodom, Uдум being simply another form of the word Uдум. 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. 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 logically in the progress of their campaign, and special mention is made of the sites of the salt or 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 circular plain which is better supplied with water for irrigation than is the region about Jericho, and which, on the supposition of slight geological changes, may have been extremely fertile 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 two ends of the Dead Sea, and 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 abrupt subsidence of a good many feet in the bottom of the Dead Sea and at the foot of the cliffs. 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 Scléma River sank during the last century beneath the waters of Lake Baikal. Professor R. H. Tarr of Cornell University has recently described the effects produced by earthquakes in the northern part of Alaska, in which there was a change of level of 47 ft.

More probably (see ARABAH; 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 alluvial floor. Out of this rise have been pushed into the main part of the depression by the Jordan, and various smaller streams descending from the highlands on either side. In
consequence of these encroachments, the equilibrium between precipitation and evaporation could be 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 bay of Sidon with the shoal water now found between el-Lisân and Jebel Ḫuslum.

GEORGE FREDERICK WEIGHT

SIDE, sîdā (Σίδη, Sîdî): 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 Mac 16:23). 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 cent. 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 Eski-Adâh, but among them there are no occupied houses. The two harbors 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 in ruins. Within the wall 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 sarcophagi, and among the shabbiness of the neighboring fields are traces of many buildings and of an aqueduct.

E. J. BANKS

SIDES, sîdz (Σῆδης, yarḥāhāh, "thigh," "flank"): RV substitutes "innermost parts" for AV "sides" in Jon 1:5; cf 1 S 24:2.

SIDON, sîdon (Σίδων, cîdhôn): The eldest son of Canaan (Gen 10:15).

SIDON, sîdon (Σίδων, Sîdôn; ΣΔων, Sîdon; AV Sidon and Zidon; RV SIDEON only): One of the oldest Phoen 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 fertile, and the surface of the city is elevated about 390 ft. above the sea, and was built on a small elevation formed from a little N. S. of Sarepta to the Bestrenus (Nahr et-Âlûy). 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, and a southern 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 Tal in 14, 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 Phoen 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 Phoen towns are not noticed. S. became early distinguished for its manufacture of 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 Phoen towns, but it also held a sort of hegemony over those to the S. as far as the limit of Phocinia. It likewise made use of the Nile valley with the shoal water now found between el-Lisân and Jebel Ḫuslum.

2. Historical

(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 (1580-1205 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 Tal. Ribaddi of Gebal writes to the king of Egypt that Zimri, king of S., had joined the enemy, but Zimrida himself claims, in the letters he wrote, to be loyal, declaring that the town belonging to him had been taken by them. In 147, the king of S. (Isaiah 21:19), with the other towns, eventually became independent of Egypt, and she retained the hegemony of the southern towns and perhaps added Dor, claimed by the Philis, to her dominion. This may have been the reason for the war that took place about the middle of the 12th cent. BC, in which the Philis 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 Phoenicia in general, as being the chief town.

(2) S. submitted to the Assyrian kings as did the Phoen cities generally, but revolted against Senacherib and again under Esar-haddon. 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-haddon"). The settlers readily mingled with the Phoenixians, and S. flourished again when Assyria fell, was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar at the time of his siege of Jerus and Tyre, and was taken, having lost about half of its inhabitants by plague. The fall of Babylon gave another short period of independence, extending to 196, but S. was subdued by Persia and fell into the hands of Darius, 50,000 horse, which so frightened Tabnit that he betrayed the city to save his own life. But the citizens, leaving the stronghold, first burned their fleet and then their houses, perishing with their wives and children rather than fall into the hands of Ochus, who butchered all whom he seized, Tabnit among them. It is said that 40,000 perished in the flames. A list of the kings of S. in the Persian period has been recovered from the inscriptions and the coins, but the dates of their reigns are not accurately known. The dynasty of the known kings begins with Esnunazar I, followed by Tabnit I, Amastoreth; Esnunazar II, Sennacherib, and Tabnit II (Tennes) and Strato II. Inscriptions from the time of Esnunazar recently discovered give name of a Boldastart and a son Yatonnellik, but whether the first is one of the Stratos above mentioned or a third is uncertain; also whether the son ever reigned or not. As Boldastart calls himself the grandson of Esnun-
azar, he is probably Strato I who reigned about 374-363 BC, and hence his grandfather, Esmonazar 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 Scopas (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

Mention 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 and Mk 3:8.

It was noted for its school of philosophy under Augustus and Tiberius, its inhabitants being largely Greek; and when Berystus 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.

H. PORTER

SIDONIANS, si-do\-ni-ans: Natives or inhabitants of Sidon (Dt 3:9; Jos 13:46; Jgs 3:3; 1 K 5:6).

SIEGE, si\-j ("iyor, ma\-go\r [Dt 28:52,53; 1 K 15:27; 2 K 25:2; Isa 29:3; Ezk 4:2]: "to besiege," "to suffer siege," be-ma\-go\'r ba\" [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) Line of Circumvallation
5. Siege Operations: Defense
   (1) Lattice-work
   (2) Storming of Walls and Rushing of Breach
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 Hebrews 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 10:10), Taanaah 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 rendered it untenable (2 S 11:1; 12:27). At Abel of Beth-maconah 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 for long became the scene of siege operations. The war between Judah 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 Nadab, 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 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 a city was invested for long siege, it should be summoned to capitulate.

3. Pre-

(Dt 20:10; cf 2 S 20:18; 2 K 18:6)

laminaries 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 [ma\-go\r, "siegeworks"] 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 "spoil 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 bread with stones" (2 K 3:19,20). When the assault of Jerus by the Chaldaeans was imminent, Jeh commanded his captains, standing down outside the city, in traditional Arabian warfare, we are told, the destruction of the enemy's palm groves was a favorite exploit (Robertson Smith, OTIFS, 369), and the Assyrians when they captured a city had no compunction in destroying its plantations (Inscription of Shalmaneser II on Black Obelisk).

From passages in the Predilect, upon which much light has been thrown by the ancient monuments of Assyria and Chaldaea, we gain a very

4. Siege clear idea of the siege works directed Operations: against a city by Assyrian or Chaldaean

Attack invaders. The siege of Laodice (2 K 8:20; Isa 36:1; Jer 34:14; Isa 37:6) 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 Niniveh 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 cutting off of water supplies, the laying and 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 piling, the desolation of houses—all—repeatedly 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 bent 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 f; 2 K 18 14 f). An attempt might be made to reduce the city by starvation (2 K 6 24 f; 2 K 17 5 f). The city might be invested and captured by assault and storm, as Lachish was by Sennacherib (2 K 18 13; 19 S; see Layard, op cit., II, plates 20–24). The chief operations of the besiegers were as follows: (1) There was the "invest," or the setting of siege works 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, the tents of his, and all the camp 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, "When 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 (dāyēl) with eachched forts round about the walls. These forts were towers manned by archers, or they were used as stations from which to discharge missiles (Jer 62 4; Ezek 17 17). In this connection the word "munitio" in AV and ERV (mānôt) disappears in ARV and is replaced by "fortress."

(3) Following upon this was the mound (gōdēl), 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 was covered with earth, and the besiegers were able to batter the upper and weaker part of the city wall (2 S 20 15; Isa 37 33; Jer 6 6; Ezek 4 2; Dan 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 with difficulty. To such roads there are references in Scripture (Job 19 12; Isa 29 3, "siege works"); of Layard, Niniveh 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 6). 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 if set and to work the battering-rams (kārim) which were 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 mantelet is prepared," and that Isaiah points when he declares that the king of Assyria "shall not come unto this city, nor shoot an arrow there, neither shall he come before it with shield [māğlēn], 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 (gīvād) being like the Rom testudo, or roof of shields, under cover of which the besiegers carried on operations (Exk 26 8; Colonel Billerbeck [op. cit., 178] is doubtful whether this device was known to the Assyrians). Under the shelter of their moveable 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 well 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 (Jgs 9 7; 2 3; Ezek 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

All sorts of obstructions were placed in the way of the besieging army.

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
make them impassable. 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 like a ship's fender in front of the place where the engine operated—a contrivance countered again by poles with reeds upon which they cut off the sacks (Jos, BJ, III, vii, 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 skillful 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 (1 S 11; cf I S 31:12, 13). When Zelekiah of Judah found himself besieged in Jerusalem by the Chaldean army under Nebuzaradan, he sent intelligence to Pharaoh Hophra who crossed the frontier with his army to attack the Chaldeans and obliged them to desist from the siege. The Chaldeans withdrew for the moment from the walls of Jerusalem and offered battle to Pharaoh Hophra and his host, but the courage of the Egyptian king failed him and he retired in haste without encountering the Chaldeans in a pitched battle. The siege was prosecuted to the bitter end, and Jesus was captured and completely overthrown (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 and Capture. Of the horrors there described they were reduced that they cooked and ate their own children (2 K 6:28). In the siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, 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 25:2; 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 surmounted 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 assailants, 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 (Zec 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 tortures, or carried away into slavery. The captured Zeleskiah had his eyes put out after he
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 (14:23): "Therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in 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, Hosea foresees the infants being dashed to pieces and the women with child being ripped open (Hosea 14:3; 15:18). The prophet Nahum predicting the overthrow of Nineveh recalls how at the capture of Nine-oman (Egyp 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 its coming doom: "... for the days shall come on thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank [...], and thy children within thee; and they shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children with thee; and they 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 2:10; Zech 1:10.

8. Siege in the NT.

Figurative: In St. Paul's Ep. there are figures taken from siege operations. In 2 Cor 10:4 we have "the casting down of strongholds," where the Gr word καινάρως, καθαρίσεως, from καθαρισμός, καθαταρήσως, is the regular word used in LXX in for 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. Jerosimus, Der Untergang Unnius; Billerbeck, Der Fortzubau im alten Orient.
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SIEVE, siv, SIFT. See Agriculture; Thrashing.

SIGLOS, siglos (σιγλος, sigozos): A Pera silver coin, twenty of which went to the gold Daric (q.v.).

SIGN, σῦν, "a sign," "mark," γραμμή, "wonder"; σημάδιον, σημεῖον, "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 interference. The popular belief in this kind of 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 5:11-11, 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 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 care in bringing His people out of bondage (Ex 13:3); the Sabbath is an oft-recurring proclamation of God's gracious thought for the wellbeing of man (Ex 31:13; Ezek 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 22); and they were submitted in demonstration of the Divine character of their message (2 K 20:9; Jn 20:31; Acts 22:1). Assurance of the resurrection of 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 Imm Emanuel.

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 16:17-18), i.e. in and forthwith characterize the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and mark the consummation of the ages (Rev 15:1). See also Miracle.

For "sign" of a ship (παρασίδημον, παράσιδημος, "ensign," Acts 28:11) see Diascuri; Ships and Boats, III, 2.

Charles M. Sturt

SIGNET, sig'net. See Seal.

SIGNS, NUMERICAL, n-mer'i-kal. See Number.

SIGNS OF THE HEAVENS. See Astronomy, I, 4.
SIHON, sîhon (םִהוֹן, sîhôn): King of the Amorites, who vainly opposed Israel on their journey from Egypt to Pæl, and who is frequently mentioned in the historical books and in the Psalms because of his prominence and as a warning for the Jews against idolatry (Gen. 15:19; Deut. 2:11, 21, and often; Dt 1:4; 31:4; Josh 2:10; Jgs 11.19. 20:21; 1 Kgs 22; Ps 135:11; 136 19; Jer 48 45).

SIHOR, sî'hôr. See Shihor.


SILAS, sî'lás (Σίλας, Silas), probably contraction for Σίλιανος, Silianos; the Heb equivalents suggested are שִׂלָּח, shîlâkh, "Tertius," or Σιλίας, Silias, "asked" [Zahn]). The Silas of Acts is generally identified with the Silvanus of the Epistle. His identification with Titus has also been suggested, based on 2 Cor 1:19; 8:23, but this is very improbable (cf. Knowing, Expositor's Gr. Text, II, 328). Silas, who was probably in fact Silianos [cf. Acts 16:37], accompanied Paul during the greater part of his 2d missionary journey (Acts 15-18). At the meeting of the Christian community under James at Jerusalem, which decided that circumcision should not be obligatory in the case of Gentile converts, Silas and Judas Barabas 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 Jerusalem, and therefore more officially representative of the Jerusalem 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 epistle 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" (Ry. V), or "unto the assemblies" (ASV, Acts 15 22-26).

Different readings now render the immediate moves of Silas somewhat obscure; ver 33 would imply that he returned to Jerusalem. But some texts proceed in ver 34 (cf. Acts 15 19) and tell of his going to Thessalonica, Thessalonians, and Corinth, where he held a church at Corinth (cf Acts 15:18). On the last journey Silas to Thessalonica is said to be still, and others add "and Judas alone proceeded." One of the principal derivations of the first half is accepted by Ry.

The principal texts however reject the whole verse and are followed in this by Ry. It is held by some that he remained in Antioch till chosen by Paul (ver 40). Others maintain that he returned to Jerusalem where John Mark then was (cf. Acts 15:19); and that either during the interval of "some days" (Acts 15:26), when the events described in Gal 2:1-14 took place (Wend.), he returned to Antioch along with Peter, or that he and John Mark were summoned thither by Paul and Barnabas, subsequent to their decision regarding Mark (cf. Knowing, 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 16:3). They were being through Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Phrygia and Mysia, where they delivered the decree of the Jerusalem council and strengthened the churches, and were joined by Timothy, they eventually reached Troas (Acts 16:10-15); the indications are given 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, 11, 544).

Upon the call of the Macedonians, 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 their 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 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 miraculously 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 12-39). 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 Knowing, op. cit., 354-51). 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 (16:40-41). 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 Athens (cf. Acts 17:15), and Timothy being left behind. On his arrival, he dispatched an urgent message back to Berea for Silas and Timothy to rejoin him at that city (17:11-15). The narrative of Acts implies, however, that Paul had left Athens and had reached Corinth before he was overtaken by his two followers (18:5). Knowing (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 4:15), and that the two 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, 8). In 1 Thess 3:10 he is not the same 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. Knowing). The epistle, in which assigns He to the authorship of Silas is untenable.

C. M. Kerr

SILENCE, sîl'ens: Five Heb roots, with various derivatives, and two Gr words are thus transliterated. The word is used lit. for dumbness, interrupted speech, as in Lam 2 10; Ps 32 3; Eccl 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 unanswered prayers of the believer (Ps 83 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).


The INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA
Silkworm.
1. Moth. 2. Chrysalis. 3. Cocoon.

Silkworm. The only undoubted reference to silk in the Bible is the passage cited from Rev, where it is mentioned among the merchandise of Babylon. *Seroton,* "silk," is from *Sfr,* the Gr name of China, when that silk was first obtained. The equivalent Lat *sericum* occurs frequently in classical authors, and is found in the Vulg (Est 8 15) for *bac,* "fine linen." For *bac,* *bassus,* and *shesh* EV has nearly always "fine linen," but for *shesh* in Prov 31 22, AV has "silk," and in Gen 41 42 and Ex 25 4, AV has "silk" and RV has "cotton." See LINEN; FINE.

There can be little doubt of the correctness of EV "silk" for *meshi* in Ezk 16 10, "I girded thee about with fine linen [sheth], 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 pupa 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 perniciosa,* and from the Japanese oak silk-moth, *Saturnia yama-maki.* The domestic moth of Syria and Pal is *Saturnia pyri,* from which silk has also been spun, but not commercially. See, further, WEAVING.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SILLA, *sil'a* (םיל, *silla*); B, Γαλλία, Galld, A, Γαλλαλδά, Gaullald; Jos: was assassinated by his servants "at the house of Millo, on the way that 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.

SILIOAM, si-l'ō-am, si-lō'am, SILOAH, si-lo'ā, SHELAL, she'lā, SHILAOH, shi-lō'ā: (1) נֵמְשָׁה, nemsha, mā ha-shilāh (shilah or shilôh) is a passive form and means "sent" or "conducted"), "the waters of [the] Shiloh" (Isa 8 6). (2) נֵמִשְׁתָּה, nemšeth, bvekhth ha-shelah, "the pool of [the] Shelah" (AV "Silloah") (Neh 3 15). (3) נֶפֶלְצָה, nefelzah, τοῦ τῶν (or τῶν) Σιλωάν, τῶν κοιλωθηκρίνων τοῦ (his) Siloam, "the pool of Siloam" (Is 9 7). (4) ἐν τῷ Ἐλλωύα, εἰς τὸν Σιλωάν, "the pool in 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, Siloan, 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 fellâhin 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 Wâdy en Nâr, is the wretched settlement of the lepers. How long the site of Siloan has been occupied it is impossible to say. The village is mentioned in the 10th cent. by the Arab writers, and 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 Siloan 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

2. The Modern Siloam Aqueduct

Siloam Aqueduct. Isa 8 6.0: "Forasmuch as this people have refused the waters of Shiloah that go softly, . . . now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the River."

The contrast between the little stream flowing from the Gihon and the great Euphrates is used as a figure of the vast difference between the apparent strength of the little kingdom of Judah and the House of David to the west, and the might of "Rezin and Remaliah's son" and "all his glory." Although it is quite probable that in those days there was an open streamlet in the valley, yet the meaning of Shiloah, "sent" or "conducted," rather implies
some kind of artificial channel, and there is also archaeological evidence that some at least of the waters of Gihon were even at that time conducted by a rock-cut aqueduct along the side of the Kidron valley (see Jerusalem, VII, 5). It was not, however, till the days of Hezekiah that the great tunnel aqueduct, Siloam's most famous work, was made (2 K 20:20): "Hezekiah also stopped the upper spring of the waters of Gihon, and brought them straight down on the west side of the City of David" (2 Ch 32:30). They stopped all the fountains, and the brook (nahr) that flowed through the midst of the land, saying, Why should the kings of Assyria come, and find much water? (2 Ch 32:4; Esclus 48:17). Probably the exit of the water at Gihon was entirely covered up and the water flowed through the 1,700 ft. of tunnel and merged in the pool made for it (now known as the Birket Silwan) near the mouth of the Tyropoan valley. This extraordinary winding aqueduct along which the waters of the Virgin's Point still flow is described in Jerusalem, VII, 4 (q.v.).

The lower end of this tunnel which now emerges under a modern arch has long been known as Ain Silwan, the "Fountain of Siloam," and indeed, until the rediscovery of the tunnel connecting this with the Wad, the Kidron is known to some in the 13th cent., but by no means generally known until the last century, it was thought this was simply a spring. So many springs all over Pal issue from artificial tunnels—it is indeed the rule in Judaea—that the mistake gives no hint that he knew of so great a work as this of Hezekiah's, and in the 5th cent. a church was erected, probably by the emperor Eudoxia, at this spot, with the high altar over the sacred spring. The only pilgrim who mentions this is Theodoretus (c. 520) and after its destruction, probably by the Persians in 614, it was entirely lost sight of until excavated by Messrs. Blais and Dickie. It is a church of extraordinary architectural features; the floor of the center aisle is still visible.

The water from the Siloam aqueduct, emerging at Ain Silwan, flows today into a narrow shallow pool, approached by a steep flight of modern steps; from the southern extremity of this pool, a watercourse runs under the modern road by means of an aqueduct, and after traversing a deeply cut rock channel below the scarped cliffs on the north side of el-Wad, it crosses under the modern Kidron and forms a number of channels of irrigation distributed among the gardens of the people of Silwan. The water here, as at its origin, is brackish and impregnated with sewage.

The modern Birket es-Silwan is but a poor survivor of the fine pool which once was here. Bliss showed by his excavations at the site that once there was a great rock-cut pool, 71 ft. N. and S. by 75 ft. E. and W., which may, in part at least, have been the work of Hezekiah (2 K 20:20), approached by a splendid flight of steps along its west side. The pool was surrounded by an arcade 12 ft. wide and 22 ft. high, and was divided by a central arcade, to make in all probability a pool for men and another for women. These buildings were probably Herodian, if not earlier, and therefore this, we may reasonably picture, was the condition of the pool at the time of the incident in Jn 9:7, when Jesus sent the blind man to wash in the pool of Siloam. This pool is also probably the Pool of Shelah described in Neh 3:15 as lying between the Fountain Gate and the King's Garden. It may also be the "king's pool" of Neh 2:14. If we were in any doubt regarding the position of the pool of 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 Tyropoan 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 1904 an ancient city sewer was rediscovered (see Jerusalem, VI, 5, 392-394), the sewage was diverted and the dry pool to the W. of it was sold west of it which surrounded it with a wall. Although this is no longer a pool, there is room enough but not a great deal of water in a pool because the great and massive dam which Bliss excavated here (see Jerusalem, VI, 5) had clearly been made originally to support a larger body of water. It is commonly supposed that the original pool here was older than Birket Silwan, having been fed by an 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 has 229, 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 1886, and reported by Dr. Schick. It was cut upon a stone from 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 lines of Aramaic, of which the Heb, and has been translated 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. . . .
(3) This passage, for there was an [7] excess in the rock on the west. They rose up . . . . .
(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 graffiti; the flowing nature of the writing is fully explained by Dr. Reisner's recent discovery of cuneiform at Samaria (1905). It is not in ink, but in black 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 out Hezekiah's great work (2 K 20:20) is now further confirmed by the character of the Heb in the ostraca which Reisner dates as of the time of Ahaz.

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. Masterman

SILIOAM, TOWER IN. See Jerusalem; Siloam.

SILVANUS, sil-van-us (Σίλβανος, Silvanos [2 Cor 1:19]). See Silas.

SILVER, sil'ver (σέλανος, kephel; ὄρυγμα, argurion, ὄρυγας, argura): 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 (Josh 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 27:3) and later of the temple (2 Ch 2:11).

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 Smiithi bowls, vases, ladles, rings, pins, and also ornaments of ancient silver were also furnished them. Later Phoenicians shipped quantities of it from Greece and Spain. The Arabians 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 jewelers' shops of Tyre the writer found objects of gold, bronze, lead, iron, but none of silver.

Figurative: Silver to be as stones in Jerus (1 K 10:27) typified great abundance (cf. Job 3:5; 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; 10:20; 16:16; 22:11). Silver become cross desolated deterioration (Isa 1:22; Jer 6:30). Breast and arms of silver was interpreted by Daniel to mean the inferior 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'vär-ling (σιλίνγκ, idéph keqeph [Isa 7:23]): 'A thousand of silver means a thousand shekels. See PIECE OF SILVER.**

**SILVERSMITH, sil'vér-smith (ἀργυρόκότας, argyrokótas): Mentioned only once (Acts 19:24), where reference is made to Demetrius, a leading member of the silversmiths' guild of Ephesus.**

**SIMALCUE, si-mal'-kú: AV = RV IMALCUE (q.v.).**

**SIMEON, sim'é-on (Σιμών, Simón; שִׂמְואֵן, Simeon, Simeon): the Heb root is from שֶׁמַע, sh'ma', "to hear" (Gen 29:33; some modern scholars [Hitzig, W. R. Smith, Stadermann] derive it from Arab. sim'a, "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 46:9 as the brother of Levi and Dinah. He was left 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.
   - "Woes upon violate idle words.
   - "Unto their assembly, my glory, he not thou united:"

2. Data:
   - For in their anger they slew a man.
   - And when they were found in their own fields, and took an ox.
   - Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; And their wrath, for it was cruel: it 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") (see S. A. Cook, Enc Brit, art. "Simeon"), 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 Levite (Gen 10:14) became distributed throughout the other tribes without any tribal inheritance of their own (De 13:1; 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 alien tribes were distributed through the commonwealth. Whatever the history of the tribe and number and raising 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 Fennari, a member of one of the leading families of this tribe, who was slain by the tribe in the affair of Baal-pear (Nu 26:14).

2. The Tribe in Phinehas in the affair of Baal-pear (Nu 26:14). The statistics in Nu 1:22f, where the Simeonites are given as 69,300, 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 Zinari.

At the recital of the laud at Mt. Gerizim, Simeon is mentioned from among those that are "blessed by the blessings" (De 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." (Gen 3:1; cf. ver 17). (Many scholars find in Num 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 of cause Simeon's subsequent dependence upon, and final absorption in, Judah.) In Gen 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 as 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 (Jgs 18:21-22; cf. Neh 11:26-29). 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 f), and in 1 Ch 12:23 it is stated that 30,000 Simeonite warriors came to David in Hebron. In 1 Ch 27:16 we have mention of a ruler of the Simeonites, Shephatiah, son of Maacah.
In 1 Ch 4:39 I mention is made of certain isolated exploits of Simeonites at Gedor (q.v.), against the Meunim (q.v.), and at Mt. Seir (q.v.). Later references associate certain Simeonites with the Northern Kingdom (2 Ch 15:9; 34:6), and tradition seems to view them as one of the ten tribes (cf. Ezek 48:21-25:38; Rev 7:7), although all the history of them we have is bound up with Judah and the Southern Kingdom. There is no mention of the return of any Simeonites after the captivity; their cities fall to Judah (Neh 11:20 f.). It has been supposed by many authorities that the name Shim'on occurs in the list of places plundered by Thothmes III (see Petrie, Hist., 11, 104: also Hommel, Assyri Inscriptions in Egypt and Judaea, 395). In the 7th cent. we have a doubtful reference in an inscription of Esar-haddan relating his Egyptian campaign when a city Ap-ku is mentioned as in the country of Su-me-na (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 Be, coll. 4225-30.)

4. The Simeonites of Simeon as given in Josh 19:2-6 and 1 Ch 4:28-31 are (the names in parentheses are variations in the latter reference): Beer-sheba, Moladah, Hazar-shual, Territory Balah (Diblah), Azem (AV) (Azen), of Simeon Eltolad, Bethacar, Hemath, Ziklag, Beth-marechah, Beth-sasseth (Hazaz Susim), Beth-lebaoth (Beth-biri), Sharuneh (Sharraim) (Etam), Ain Rimmon, Ether (Tochen), Ashan—in all, 16 cities in Josh and 17 in 1 Ch. Ashan (1 Ch 6:15) is the only one 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 7:6) as being the private property of the kings of Judah from the days of David, who received it from Achish, 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 (יִשְׂמָךְ, shim'on; Σιμών, Simeon): (1) The 2d son of Jacob by Leah (see separate art.). (2) Great-grandfather of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc 2:1). (3) A man in Jesus described as "righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel." 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 New name of Jesus. 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.

(1) An ancestor of Jesus (Lk 3:30); RV "Simeon". (5) RV "Symeon": one of the prophets and teachers in the Christian community at Antioch. He is also called Niger, which was the gentile name he had assumed, Symeon being Heb. He was associated with St. Paul in Damascus for their missionary work (Acts 13:12). Nothing more is known of him.

(6) RV "Symeon": the Heb name of Simon Peter (Acts 15:14). S. F. Hunter

SIMEON (NGIER, m'j'er): AV in Acts 13:1, RV "Symeon" (q.v.).

SIMEONITES, sim'è-ón-ìts. See Simeon.

SIMILITUDE, si-mil'i-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, "form" [so RV]); cf. Likeness. ERV has retained the word in 2 Ch 4:3; Dn 10:16 (ARV "likeness"), while the NIV and JPS have used "likeness" in Hos 12:10 (יהוֹנָה, dannah, "be like"). The meaning is "I have inspired the prophets to speak parables."

SIMON (Simon, Gr form of Simeon [q.v.]): The persons of the name of Simon mentioned in the Apocrypha are:

(1) Simon the Maccabean (Hasmonaean), surname Thassi (q.v.), the 2d son of Mattathias and elder brother of Judas Maccabaeus. On his deathbed, Mattathias commended Simon as a "man of counsel" to be his "father" to his brother (1 Macc 2:65), and a "man of counsel" he proved himself. But it was not till after the death of Judas and the capture of Jonathan that he played the chief rôle. Dispatched by Judas with a force to the relief of the Jews in Galilee, he fought against Tryphon (5:17 ff.; Jos, Ant, X, viii, 1 f). We find him next taking revenge along with Jonathan on the "children of Jambri" (1 Macc 9:33 ff.), and cooperating in the successful campaign around Bethbasa against Bacchides (c 156 BC) (9:62 ff.), and in the campaign against Apollonius (10:74 ff.). In the conflict between Tryphon and Demetrius II, Simon was appointed by Antiochus VI "captain from the Ladder of Tyre unto the borders of Egypt" (11:39). After the capture of Jonathan at Ptolemais by Tryphon, Simon became acknowledged leader of his party. He thwarted Tryphon in his attempts upon Jesus, in revenge for which the latter murdered Jonathan (13:29). Simon then took the side of Demetrius on condition of immunity for Judea, and so 'in the 170th year' (143-142 BC) 'the yoke of the heathen was taken away from Israel' (13:41). Simon applied himself to rebuild the strongholds of Judea, reduced Gazara, captured the Acra (citadel) and made Joppa a stronghold of Delos (14:6 ff.), and showed his wisdom most of all in his internal administration: "He sought the good of his country"; commerce and agriculture revived; lawlessness was suppressed, and "the land had rest all the days of Simon (14:4 ff.). His power was revivified, as by Sparta and Rome (14:16 ff). In 141 BC he was appointed by the nation leader, high priest and captain "for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet" (14:41 f.), and thus the Hasmonaean dynasty was founded. A new chronological era began with the first year of his administration, and he minted his own coins. A few years later Simon again meddled in Syrian politics (139 BC), this time at the entreaty of Antiochus VII (Sидetes) in his contest against Tryphon; when, however, Antiochus was assured of success, he refused the help of Simon and sent Cendebeaues against Judaea. Judas and John, sons of Simon, defeated the invaders near Modin (137-136 BC). In 153 BC Simon met his death by treachery. Ptolemy the son of Abubus, Simon's own son-in-law, determined to secure supreme power for himself and, in order to accomplish this, to assassinate the whole family of Simon. He accordingly invited Simon and his sons to a banquet at Jerusalem, where he treacherously murdered Simon with his two sons Mattathias and Judas. The other son, John Hyrcanus, governor of Gaza, received intimation of the plot and saved himself to become
the head of the Hasmonaean dynasty. "The significance 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 MACCABAEOI, II, 4.

(6) A man of Tyrege, who 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 Jn, Ant, XII, ii, 5) this Simon was called "the Disturber" (ἀναδίκαιος), "on account of his piety and his benevolent disposition toward his countrymen."

Many authorities (Herzfeld, Derenburg, Stanley, Cheyne) assert that Jos is wrong in attaching this epithet to Simon I instead of Simon II. and Schürer is not certain on this question. But the Tal'm passage which Derenburg cites means the opposite of what Joseph, viz., it is intended to show how splendid and holy were the days of Simon (ha-kaddik) 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 euologion in Sir 50 l f 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 what is said 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 Polenky captures Jerusalem and probably caused considerable destruction. The Tal'm states that this Simon (and not Jaddua) met Alexander the Great.

(3) 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 elders sons against Hyrcanus the younger. Schürer (probably incorrectly) thinks he is the Simon praised in Sir 50 l f. See (2) above (3 Macc 2; Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 10).

(4) Simon, a Benjamite, guardian of the temple, who, having quarreled with the high priest Onian III, informed Apollonius of the untold sums of money in the temple treasury. Apollonius laid the matter before the king Seleucus IV, who sent Heliodorus to remove the money. An apprization prevented Heliodorus from accomplishing his task (2 Macc 3; 4 f). It is further asserted, that Simon constrained his son to go to Onias. He is spoken of as brother of the renegade Menelaus (4 23). Of his end we know nothing.

(5) Simon Chosemus (I and Swetel, Σωτιώμων, Chosemas, A, Σωτιώμων, in the names of those who had married "strange wives" (I Esd 9 32). Simon apparently is "Shimeon" (şimון) of the sons of Harim (Ezr 10 31); Chosemus is probably a corruptstanding in the place of, but not resembling, any of the three names of Benjamin, Malluch, Shemaraiab, which Eed emits from the Ezr list.

S. ANGUS

SIMON, s'mon (Σίμων, Sim'on): (1) Simon Peter. See Peter (Simon).

(2) Another of the Twelve, Simon, the Canaanite (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 (Lk 17 11), whose house a woman poured upon the leper of precious ointment over 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 disposition in the past, as lepers were ostracized by law.

(5) A Pharisee in whose house a woman, "a sinner," wet the feet of Jesus with her tears, and anointed them with ointment (Lk 7 36 ff). By some he is identified with (4), this being regarded as Luke's version of the incident recorded in Mt 26 and Mk 14. Others as strongly deny this view. For discussion see Mary, IV.

(6) A man of Tyrege, who 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 Jn, Ant, XII, ii, 5) this Simon was called "the Disturber" (ἀναδίκαιος), "on account of his piety and his benevolent disposition toward his countrymen."

Many authorities (Herzfeld, Derenburg, Stanley, Cheyne) assert that Jos is wrong in attaching this epithet to Simon I instead of Simon II. and Schürer is not certain on this question. But the Tal'm passage which Derenburg cites means the opposite of what Joseph, viz., it is intended to show how splendid and holy were the days of Simon (ha-kaddik) 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 euologion in Sir 50 l f 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 what is said 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 Polenky captures Jerusalem and probably caused considerable destruction. The Tal'm states that this Simon (and not Jaddua) met Alexander the Great.

(3) 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 younger. Schürer (probably incorrectly) thinks he is the Simon praised in Sir 50 l f. See (2) above (3 Macc 2; Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 10).

(4) Simon, a Benjamite, guardian of the temple, who, having quarreled with the high priest Onian III, informed Apollonius of the untold sums of money in the temple treasury. Apollonius laid the matter before the king Seleucus IV, who sent Heliodorus to remove the money. An apprization prevented Heliodorus from accomplishing his task (2 Macc 3; 4 f). It is further asserted, that Simon constrained his son to go to Onias. He is spoken of as brother of the renegade Menelaus (4 23). Of his end we know nothing.

(5) Simon Chosemus (I and Swetel, Σωτιώμων, Chosemas, A, Σωτιώμων, in the names of those who had married "strange wives" (I Esd 9 32). Simon apparently is "Shimeon" (simdón) of the sons of Harim (Ezr 10 31); Chosemus is probably a corrupt standing in the place of, but not resembling, any of the three names of Benjamin, Malluch, Shemaraiab, which Eed emits from the Ezr list.

S. ANGUS

SIMON MAGUS, má'gus (Σίμων, Simón), Gr form of Heb סֵימֹן, simmôn; Gesenius gives the meaning of the Heb word as "hearing with acceptance"; it is formed from שים, shāmā, "to hear":

1. Simon, a Magician
2. Simon and the Apostles
3. Simon and Philip
4. Simon and Peter and John
5. The Magicians and the Gospel
6. Testament of Early Christian Writers
7. Sources of Legendary History
8. Traditions of His Death
9. The Simonian
10. Was Simon the Originator of Gnosticism?

The name or term "Magus" is not given in the NT; but, it is used or at least the participle magiános is used, and is tr4, 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" (μαγείαι). The Simon's claim, given in ver 6, that Simon indeed 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" (ver 10).

(1) It so happened, however, that Philip the deacon and evangelist went down from Jerusalem to Samaria, and "proclaimed unto them the Christ" (ver 5); and as the result of the proclamation of the gospel, many were gathered into the Christian church. Many miracles also were performed by Philip, sick persons cured, and demons cast out. 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 accompanied the introduction of the gospel to this city did not cease, and Simon seeing them "was amazed," The word denoting Simon's amazement at the "signs" wrought 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) Jews having reached Jerusalem of the events which had occurred in Samaria, the apostles sent Peter and John to establish the work there. These two apostles prayed for the converts that they might receive the Holy Ghost, which they had not yet received. And when they 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 then, 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 2nd centuries there were a multitude of such persons who pretended to possess supernatural powers, which they endeavored to deceiving men. They 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 "with his magies," Paul called him "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 "magoi," Elymas the magus (Acts 13:6 B). They were not only the organizers of all that came between the ears of the disciples and the Gospel. They were also the means to which the apologetics of the Christian faith had as an object to the progress of the Christian faith, which had to force its way through the delusions with which these sorcerers had surrounded the hearts of those whom they deceived. When the gospel came in contact with these magicians and with their works, it was necessary that there should be striking facts, works of supernatural power strongly appealing to men's outward senses, in order to bring them out of the bewilderment and deception in which they were involved, and to make them able to receive the impression of spiritual truth. Such miracles were wrought both in Cyprus and in Samaria, the spheres of influence of the magicians Elymas and Simon. These Divine works first arrested men's attention, and then dispelled the delusive influence of the sorcerers.

(1) The history 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.

Martyr, himself a Samaritan, states that Simon Magus was a "Samaritan from the village called Gittin." Justin Martyr says that, in the time of Claudius, Caesar, Simon was worshipped as a god at Rome upon 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 Sanclo, that is, "To Simon the sacred god." Curiously enough, in the year 1574, a stone monument appears in influx of the church of a statue of Simon Magus, was dug up in the Tiber at the spot described by Justin; and on it it was written: "Simon: Sanclo Deo Filio Sacrum, that is, the stone then discovered was dedicated to the god Semo Sanclo, the Sabine Sanclo. This stone might well prove that Justin was mistaken in what he said about a statue having been erected to Simon Magus. "It is incredible that the folly should ever be carried to such an extent as that a statue should be erected, and the senate should have voted a decree declaring Simon Magus among the deos Romas" (Neander, Church History, vol. iv. p. 125). The following inscription 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; some of them, perhaps, are true, and others are false; some are of legend and fable: some of them are improbable in the extreme and border on the impossible.

(3) Jerome, who proceeds to quote from writings of Simon, presents him as employing these words in reference to himself: "I am the Word of God, I am the Father, I am the Son, I am all there is of God" (Mansel, The Gnostic Heretics, 82). Trencaus (Mansel, ib. 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 the first conception of all things, by whom, in the beginning, he conceived the wisdom of nature. The angels and other powers which from this conception proceeded forth from him, and knowing her father's wishes, she descended to the lower world, and produced the gods and powers which made the world. After she had produced them, she was retained by them, as they were unwilling to be considered the offspring of any other being; for he himself was entirely unknown by Helen; but he delivered her by those powers and angels which were put forth from her, and suffered every insult and all that might 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 if from mother to mother. She said also that she was that Helen, on whose account the Trojan war was fought. Helen, after passing from one body to another, and constantly meeting with insult, at last she became a public prostitute, and that this was the Helen on whom the Jews had put their hope. On this account she is said that he might first of all reclaim her and free her from her chains, and then give salvation to men through the knowledge of himself. For since the angels ruled the world badly, because one of them desired the chief place, he had come down for the restoration of all things, and had descended, being changed in figure, and made like to principialities and powers and angels, so that he appeared among men as a man, and was thought to have suffered in Judaea, though he did not suffer..." Furthermore it should be noted that the entire history of Simon Magus is so inconsistent with itself that his prophecies under the inspiration of those angels who accompanied him in his travels were not preserved, but were lost. The apostles did not believe on him and his Helen no longer cared for them. But as few men would act as they pleased, for that men are saved by his [i.e. Simon's] practices, the angels to their own just works, for that no acts were just by nature, but by the apostle, accomplished by the angels, who made the world, and who attempted by their prophecies to bring men into bondage. For this reason it is promised that he will be released, and those who are his set at liberty from the government of those who made the world.

The chief sources of the legendary history of Simon Magus are the collection of writings known as The Clementines (see Literature, 5. Sources Sub-apostolic; Peter, First Epistle of Legend- or, Peter, Second Epistle of), which is the account of the sources.

What is there said of him is, that he studied at Alexandria, and that he went to Rome, and that he instructed in a city of the desert, and that he was the apostle of the Gentiles. This is the account of his travels, of which we have no other record. These record the supposed travels of Clement, a Roman citizen. Clement meets with Barnabas and with Peter. Then there is a narrated a discussion between Peter and Simon Magus. This disposition
lasts for three days, Simon maintaining that there are two gods, and that the God of the OT 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 dispute 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 discredits 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 Death was the end of him, for he did not rise again.

Simon is said to have met his death at Rome, after an encounter with the apostle 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 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 seem, at 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 scoffers at moral law. They regarded Simon Magus as their Christ, or at least as a form of the redemption, and manifested himself also in Jesus. The Simonians were one of the minor gnostic sects and were carried far away both from the doctrine and from the ethical spirit of the Christian faith.

Origin denies that the followers of Simon were Christians in any sense. The words of Origin 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 Origin 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., 1.9, quoted by Alford, GrNT, Acts 8 9).

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 first bishop of Rome. He gives of heretics, and also 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 been absorbed 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, N7, II, 58).

In the midst of the various legends regarding Simon, 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 heresies; but the facts of history show widespread tendencies at work, during and even before the Apostolic age, which may account for the origin of Gnosticism. These are found e.g. in the Alexandrian philosophy, and in the tenets of the false teachers at Colosse and in other places. These philosophical and theosophical ideas commingled with the influences of Zoroastrianism from 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.

SIMON PETER. See Peter, Simon.

SIMON THE CANAANITE, OR CANANAEN, OR ZEALOT (Σίμων Καναανητός, Simon Kananaos; NT: kanaanad, "the Jewish (or Israelite) sect"); One of the Twelve Apostles. This Simon was also named "the Canaanite" (Mt 10 4; Mk 3 18 AV) or "the Cananaean" (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).

According to the "Gospel of the Ebionites" or "Gospel of the Twelve Apostles" (of the 2nd cent. and mentioned by Origen) Simon received his call to the apostleship along with Andrew the brother of Peter, the sons of Zebedee, and Judas Iscariot at the Sea of Tiberias (cf Mt 4 18-22; see also Hennecque, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 24-47).

Although Simon, like the majority of the apostles, was probably a Galilean, the designation "Cananaean" 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 Quirinius, and would have hastened by the sword the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy.

Simon has been identified with Simon the brother of Jesus (Mt 6 3; Mt 13 55), but there also are 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 apocryphal 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) 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 apocryphal lists, while in St. John it is narrative. Further, in the Synoptists, Philip is connected in the narrative, not with Bartholomew but with Andrew.

(3) Simon is the zealot; or Simon son of Cleopas" (cf Budge, II, 70 f) has the heading, "The preaching of the blessed St. Simon, the son of Cleopas, who was surnamed Judas, which is interpreted Nathanael, who became bishop of Persia after Justin, who lives 56 years in the same city, and is also referred to a Simon who succeeded James as bishop of Judea and suffered martyrdom under Trajan and Hadrian, and whose prophecies, to quote, calls this Simon a son of Cleopas."
(3) The invitation of Philip to Nathanael (cf. Jn 1:45) was to one who would naturally be addressed to a follower of the Zealots, who based their cause on the fulfillment of Messianic prophecies.

(4) As Alphaeus, the father of James, is generally regarded as the same as Cleopas or Cleopas (see JAMES, A), this identity of the angel of the Annunciation and Simon Nathanael, son of Cleopas, with Simon Zelotes would shed light on the reason of the juxtaposition of Jn and Simon Zelotes in the apocryphal lists of St. Luke and Acts, i.e. they were brothers.

SIMPLE, sim'pl; in the OT the uniform tr of the Heb word pethî (root pâthâh, "be open"). Like the Eng. word "simple" (etymologically "of one fold"), the Heb pethî is used sometimes in a good sense, i.e. "open-minded" (Ps 19:17; 116:6; 119:130), possibly in all three cases the sense is neutral rather than positively good, and sometimes in a bad sense (Prov 7:7, 1 to "destitute of understanding"; 8:5, 1 to "fools" [blockheads]; 14:15, opposed to prudent). The fundamental idea of pethî seems to be open to influence, i.e. easily influenced. That openness to influence would as a rule be classed with the irreligious is one of many instances in which language is an unwilling witness to the misunstraining moral atmosphere in which we live. The line between moral weakness and moral turpitude, between negative good, and indeed such a thing be conceived of as positive badness, is soon passed.

In the NT the word "simple" is found only in Rom 16:18.9 AV. In the first of these passages it is used to translate abakos (RV "innocent"). In He 7:26 AV the same word is rendered "harmless"—the rendering of RV in this instance being "guileless." This would suit Rom 16:18 better than "innocent." Guilelessness is not a synonym for gullibility; but the guileless are frequently the prey of designing men. In Rom 15:19 the word "simple" is mentioned, but it is not defined, "sincere" (Trench and Godet; Young, erroneously "horrible" and so "harmless"). "Uncontaminated" seems to be the idea of the apostle. He would have those to whom he wrote "wise as regards good", and not ignorant as regards evil—for that would be impossible, even if desirable—but without that kind of knowledge of evil that comes from engaging in it, as we say, mixing themselves up with it, unalloyed with evil.

W. M. McPheeters

SIMPLICITY, sim-pli-"ti (σιμπλεξ, plothýth; ἀπλόντας, haplôta): The words in the OT commonly tr "simplicity" are pethî, "simple" (Prov 1:22), plothýth, "simplicity" (9:13m), ἀπλόντας, "simplicity," (2 S 15:27). They were used in their simplicity. In the NT, haplôtis, "simplicity of mind," "simplicity," occurs in Rom 12:8, "He that giveth him do it with simplicity," RV "liberality," Gr "simplicity" (2 Cor 1:12), in simplicity and godly sincerity; RV (with corrected text) "in holiness and sincerity of God"; 11:3, "the simplicity that is in Christ," RV (with corrected text) "the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ"; of Eph 6:5; Col 3:22, where the tr is "simplicity." In Wg 1:11 we have, "Think ye not to be a good mind [AV "heart"], and in singleness [AV "simplicity"] of heart seek ye him" (haplôtis). Our Lord also speaks (Mt 6:22; Lk 11:34) of the "single eye" (haplôtis), and James (1:5) applies haplôtis, "simply," "directly," without and with singleness, and RV (with corrected text) "in holiness and singleness," tr [who had been described by Plato (Rep. ii.382 E) as being perfectly simple (haplôtè) and true, both in word and deed. In such "simplicity"—openness, sincerity, freedom from double-mindedness—man most resembles God and is most open to His visitation and blessing.

W. L. Walker

SIMRI, sim'rt. See SIMRI.
enial spiritual truth is at once apparent. There has been much progress in religious thinking concerning sin during the Christian ages, but the progress has not been away from this central concept of sin in life, but rather toward a differentiation of sin from God.

In this early Bib. account there is implicit the thought of the freedom of man. The idea of transgression has sometimes been interpreted in such wise as to do away with the concept of sin completely. An unbiased reading of the Scriptures would, with the possible exception of some passages which designingly lay stress on the power of God (Rom 8 29-30), produce on the mind the impression that freedom is essential to sin. Certainly there is nothing in the account of the OT or NT narratives to warrant the conception that men are born into sin by forces over which they have no control. The argument of the tempter with the woman is an argument aimed at her will. By easy steps, indeed, she moves toward the transgression, but the transgression is a transgression and nothing else. Of course, the evil deed is at once followed by attempts on the part of the transgressors to explain themselves, but the futility of the explanations is part of the point of the narratives. The all-determining factor of the transgression as relating to sin, we must remember that the Bib. revelation is from first to last busy with the thought of the righteousness and justice and love of God (Gen 6 9 tells us that because of justice or righteousness, Noah walked with God). Unless we accept the doctrine that God is Himself not free, a doctrine which is nowhere implied in the Scripture, we must insist that the condemnation of men as sinful, when they have not had freedom to be otherwise than sinful, is out of harmony with the Bib. revelation of the character of God. Of course this does not mean that a man is free in all things. Freedom is limited in various ways, but we must retain enough of freedom in our thought of the constitution of men to make possible our holding fast to the Bib. idea of sin as transgression. Some who take the Bib. narrative as literal historical fact maintain that all men sinned in Adam (see IMPLICATION, III, 1). Adam may have been free to sin or not to sin, but, "in his fall we sinned all," they shall mention the hereditary influences of sin in a later paragraph; here it is sufficient to say that even if the first man had not sinned, there is nothing in our thought of the nature of man to make it impossible to believe that this or that instance of human sinfulness has been initiated by some descendant of the first man far down the line.

The progress of the Bib. teaching concerning sin also would seem to imply that the transgression of the law must be a transgression committed against the light (Acts 17 30; 1 Tim 1 13). To be sinful in any full sense of the word, a man must know that the course which he is adopting is an evil course. This does not necessarily mean the full realization of the evil of the course. It is a fact, both of Bib. revelation and of revelation of all times, that men who commit sin do not realize the full evil of their deeds until after the sin has been committed (2 Pet 1 13). This is partly because of the remorse of the conscience; and partly from the humiliation at being discovered; but in some sense there must be a realization of the evil of the course itself. E.g. in estimating the moral worth of Bib. characters, esp. those of earlier times, we must keep in mind the standards of the times in which they lived. These standards were partly set by the customs of the social group,

but the customs were, in many cases, made sacred by the claim of Divine sanction. Hence we find Bib. characters giving themselves readily to polygamy and warfare. The Scriptures themselves, however, throw light upon the action of men toward a course which he himself later considered evil, because of that earlier course he had acted ignorantly (Acts 26 9; 1 Tim 1 13).

The Bib. narratives, too, show us the passage over from sin conceived of as the violation of external commands to sin conceived of as an unwillingness to keep the commandments in the depths of the inner life. The course of Bib. history is one long protest against conceiving of sin in an external fashion.

(1) PROPHETS.—In the sources of light which are to help men discern good from evil, increasing stress is laid upon inner moral insight (cf Isa 58 5; Hos 6 1-7). The power of the prophets was in their direct moral insight and the fervor with which they made these convictions known to the people of their time.

Of course it was necessary that the spirit of the prophets be given body and form in carefully articulated law. The progress of the Hebrews from the insight of the seer to the statute of the lawmakcr was not different from our progress in any other nations. It is easy to see, however, how the hardening of moral precepts into formal codes, absolutely necessary as that task was, led to an externalizing of the thought of sin. The man who did not keep the formal law was a sinner. On such basis there grew up the artificial systems which came to their culmination in the NT times in Pharisaism. On the other hand, a fresh insight by a new prophet might be in violation of the Law, considered in its literal aspects. It might be necessary for a prophet to attack outright some additions to the Law. We regard as a high-water mark of OT moral utterances the word of Micah that the Lord requires men to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with Him (Mic 6 8). In the delivery of that utterance, the people were giving themselves up to multitudes of sacrifices. Many of these sacrifices called for the heaviest sufferings on the part of the worshippers. It would seem that an obligation was placed upon us, that sacrifices could be performed or offered in order that the Hebrews might not be behind the neighboring heathen nations in observances of religious codes. The simple direct word of Micah must have seemed heresy to many of its first hearers. The outcome, however, of this conflict between the inner and the outer in the thought of transgression was finally to deepen the springs of the inner life. The extremes of externalism led to a break with moral realities which tended to become apparent to the most ordinary observer. The inventive of Jesus against NT Pharisaism took its force largely from the fact that Jesus gave clear utterance to what everyone knew. Those who thought of religion as external gave themselves to formal keeping of the commandments and allowed the inner life to run riot as it would (Mt 23 23, et al.).

(2) PAUL.—With the more serious-minded the keeping of the Law became more and more a matter of the inner spirit. There were some who, like Paul, found themselves opposed to the mass of the people and find peace of conscience (Rom 7). It was this very impossibility which forced some, like Paul, to understand that, after all, sin or righteousness must be judged by the inner disposition. It was this which led to the search for a conception of
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 brought 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 glimmerings 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 evil. Yet the question of sin is defined as the mere absence of goodness.力

8. Sin a 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 regarded as 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, 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 only something in and of itself, but that Scripture deals with evil men, and the evil men are as positive as their natures permit them to be. In this sense the word sin does run a course of positive destruction. In the thought, e.g., of the writer with whom we are concerned in Gen 6 we were 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 gases of various sorts which poison human life. A large part of modern scientific effort has been to rid the world of these gaseous, 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 these souls 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 rather pressed. The thought of the environment that will correct the abnormal tendency. But there can be little gain saying 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 by the sin of Adam. The Bib. conception is in order to hold that there is a curse upon the world because of the presence of sinful men. Men have sinful disposed the world for their own selfish purposes. They have wasted its resources and by their behavior have had the grace put to have made good into the channels of evil. In their contacts with one another also, evil men furnish an evil environment. If the employer of 100 men be himself evil, he is to a great extent the evil environment of those 100 men. The curse of his evil is upon them. So with the relations of men in larger social groups: the forces of state-life which are intended to work for good can be made to work for evil. So far has this gone that some earnest thinkers have thought of the material conditions of man’s lives, as necessarily and inherently evil. In other days this led to retreats from the world in monasteries and in solitary cells. In our present time the same thought is back of much of the pessimist idea that the world itself is like a sinking ship, absolutely doomed. The most we can hope for is for saving individuals here and there from imminent destruction. Yet a more Bib. conception keeps clear of all this. The material forces of the world—apart from certain mass-destroying physical necessities (e.g. earthquakes, storms, floods, pestilence, famines), whose presence does more to furnish the conditions of moral growth than to discourage that growth—are what men cause them to be. Social forces are nothing apart from the men who are themselves the
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 groaned together in travail of 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 surge upon him from below (Rom 12:2). From the realization of the positiveness 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 righteousness. 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 inward force at work to make 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 blood is sprinkled upon the sinner for 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). 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 changing man is the essence of the positive 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 affect the heart (see REDEMPTION).

We are thus in a position to see something of the positiveness of the life that must be in Christ if it is to be a Saviour from sin. That positiveness 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 check of a sense of forgiveness. Sin frightens 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 is serious in the sight of a Holy God that He Himself, because of His very holiness, must be under stupendous 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 idea adequately only on condition that men seek forgiveness in the name of the highest manifestation of holiness which they have known. For those who have had 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 the 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 after is everywhere enjoined as an obligation (Gal 6:1).

There is nothing 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 can only be 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 a universe, He must keep personal relations with Himself, and these relations must be 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, through his own personal forgiveness may be complete, but the elimination of the consequences of the evil life is possible only through the long lines of healing set 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 upbuilding of a great experience of God, but, from a conservative point of view the curative processes may have to work through long years (see SANCTIFICATION). The will which has been given to sin may feel the stirrings 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 up any limit to the working 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
abundantly" (Jn 10:10). Sin is serious, because it thwart 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 man 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 Forbearance; 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 (אֵין, "clay or mud"). Sinai, Subn, A, Tavn, Tavn: A city of Egypt mentioned only in Ezek. 30:15, 16. This seems to be a pure Sem. name. The ancient Egyptian name, if the place ever had one such, is unknown. Pelusium (Gr. Peladoe or Pelasion) also meant "the clayey or muddy town." The Pelusiac 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. Ramesses II built a wall from S. to Heropolis, probably by the aid of Hebrew 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. Sennacherib and Cambyses both fought Egypt near Pelusium (Herod. ii, 141; iii, 10-15). Antiochus IV defeated the Egyptians here (Budge, VII, 25), and the Romans under Gabinius defeated the Egyptians in the same neighborhood. Pelusium was also accessible from the sea, or it was 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, s'na: In Acts 7:38 AV, RV "Sinai" (q.v.).

SINAI, s'n, s'nâ-i (אֵין, "clay or mud"); A, Sivá, Siná, B, Ziíná, Seind): The name comes probably from a root meaning "to shine," which occurs in Syr. and which in Bab is found in the name sinu for "the moon." The old explanation, "clayey," is inappropriate to any place in the Sinaiic desert, though it might apply to Sin (Ex 30:15), and Pelusium; even there, however, the applicability is doubtful. The desert of Sin (Ex 16:1; 17:1; Nu 33:11) 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 Jehovah 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 shadowy crags 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 Sinaic peninsula...
(Nu 22:47; 26:31), and when he wandered with his flocks to Horeb (Ex 31) 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—

in the mountains—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 Mûsa. 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 thereabouts," 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, y, 1). Evidently in his time Sinai was supposed to be one of the peaks of the great granitic block called et Tûr—a term applying to any lofty mountain. This block has its highest peak in Jebel Kûtorû (so named from a legend of St. Catherine of Egypt), rising 8,550 ft. above the sea. N.E. of this is Jebel Mûsa (7,570 ft.), which, though less high, is more conspicuous because of the open plain called er Râhôh ("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 EXOYU, 3) of Israel.

Jebel Mûsa 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 Rûâ-er-Sâfôfèh, or "the willow top." N. of the Convent is the lower top of Jebel ed Deir ("mountain of the monastery").

These heights were accurately determined by Royal Engineer surveyors in 1868 (Sir C. Wilson, Ordnance Survey Jebel Mûsa 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 Tûr 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 Serbûl, 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 24:15 f.), 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 Sinaic desert only in December and January, but thunderstorms are not unknown in Palestine 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 or Mount Sinai near Paran, which in their time was evidence (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 of the world in regard to its supply of water. There is also no other district in the Peninsula which affords such excellent fasturage.

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 to Sinai, 1854, Dr. Sayce (Higher Criticism, 1894, 268).

7. Greene's Theory

Mr. Greene supposed Elana (Ex 15: 27) to be Elath (De 2: 8), now 'Atha at the head of the Gulf of Akaba, and the Gulf of Suez was the scene of many early events (Phil. 1: 7), "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, "un corruption," "sincerity," RV "uncorruptness," etc. (2 Cor 8: 8); elikrinias, lit., judged of in the sunlight, hence, "clear," "manifest" (Phil 1: 10); elikrinia, with same meaning, is tr "sincerity" (1 Cor 8: 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 elikrinias in the description of Wisdom as a "pure influence," RV "clear influence."

W. L. WARKER

SINWEN, sin'ən (שִׁיוֹנ, giō: 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: becoming 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) 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 varies opposite to that of a "iron sinew" (Isa 48: 4). AV "my sinews take no rest" (w'ə'rər'kəy 1'əō gīshkābbān, Job 30: 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'ərz, 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 trained to their numbers. Isa 25: 10 suggests that it was not uncommon for foreign female ministrs 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 insistent leadership
of apostles. The elaborate regulations drawn up for
the constitution of the temple orchestra and chorus are referred to under Musaeq (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 men
tioned were of the class usually employed at banquets,
festivals, etc. The temple choir consisted exclu-
sively 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 orient-
al 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 modes that have 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 Hebrew and the Anglican
chant. See Music; Praise; Song; Temple.

JAMES MILLAR

SINGLE, 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 thine eye be evil, thy whole body
shall be full of darkness." "Single," and "evil" here represent παρθένος, haplous, and πονερός, poneros. 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 poneros as
"diseased," so rendering "Just as physical enlighten-
ment depends on the condition of the eye, so
divine understanding depends 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 poneros a sense unique in the 73 NT examples
of the word. Moreover, the similar English word "evi-
locard" is found in Mt 20 15; Mk 7 22, where it
means "jealousy" or "covicateness." With
poneros="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
ter of Christ's words used by Matthew and Luke
may have taken the moral terms haplous and
poneros to translate physical terms ('healthy' and
"diseased") employed in the original Aramaic.
The Sinaic Syr version of Lk 11 36 may perhaps
contain a trace of an older rendering. See Juthe

SINGULAR, sin'g-lar: "Pertaining to the single
person," "individual," and so sometimes "unusual," "remarkable." So Wisd 14 18, AV "the singular
diligence of the artificer" (ποιοτικός, philotimia, "love
of honor," RV "ambition"). In Lev 27 2 by AV a man shall make a singular vow; RV seems to have
understood a "personal" or "private" vow. RV
has "accomplish a vow," with m "make a special
vow." The same phrase (γεμάτα [γεμάτε] neither)
used of the Nazirite vow in Nu 6 2.

SINIM, sin'im, sin'im, LAND OF (סִינִימ), 'ereq sinim; γῆ Πορέων, εἰς Πορέα: 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 12, RV). 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 identifica-
tion with China, the classical Sinamese. It seems
improbable that Jews had already found their own
way to China; but from very early times trade
relations were established with the Far East by
the 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 (Pelusium, 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 this part of Persia
(A.D. s.v.). While no certain decision is possible, pro-
ability points to the E., and China cannot be quite

SINITES, sin'itsu (סינִיטִים), A CANADIAN
people mentioned in Gen 10 17; 1 Ch 1 13. The
identification is uncertain. Jerome mentions a ruined
city Sin, near Arka, at the foot of Lebanon.

SINLESSNESS, sin'les-nas: The 15th Anglian
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 (προσωπικός) void, both
in His flesh and in His spirit. . . . Sin, as Saint
John saith, was not in Him. But all we the rest,
thought 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 is a true and not an elaborated truth.
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
moral character, the perfect personal manifestation 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 representa-
tion is self-evident of its truth. Had it been
the invention of worshiping disciples, we may
say with confidence that they (supposed thus capa-
ble of "free handling") would have been certain
to betray some moral aberrations in their por-
traiture of their Master. They must have failed
to put before us the profound ethical paradox of
a person who, on the one hand, enjoys pene-
tance 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." Mean-
while the Scripture represents the sinlessness of the
Innarnated Lord as no mere automatic or effortless
condition. He is sensitive to temptation, to a
degree which makes it "when a man shall make a
singular vow, he seems to have understanding a "personal"
or "private" vow. RV
has "accomplish a vow," with m "make a special
vow." Of the same phrase (γεμάτα [γεμάτε] neither)
used of the Nazirite vow in Nu 6 2.
2. SAINTE

Not Sinless

In John 3:9, 10 (which affirm of the regenerate man that he "sineth not.") But it seems obvious to remark that such words, taken without context and balance, would prove too much; they would make the smallest sense 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 John 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 sanctified 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 verse 24). See further Pusey, Stuart.

HANDLEY DUNELM SINNER, sin'ér (ἡ σινή, κοτία; ἀμαρτολός, λαμαρ-

tόλας, "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, 13:1; Tim 1:15; He 7:20), the term is applied to those who lived in disregard of ceremonial provision (Mt 9:11-12; Mk 2:15ff; 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 (Mk 8:38; Jn 9:24. 31; Gal 2:17; 1 Tim 1:9; Jude verse 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 and also). For the general Heb. conception of the term, see SIN.

M. O. EVANS

SION, sión (יוֹסִיָּה, סִיů; סִיאַ, סִין. (1) A name given to Mt. Hermon in Dt 4:45. The name may mean 'protuberance' or 'peak,' and may have denoted the high, snow-covered horn of the mountain as seen from the S. It may, however, be a scirbal 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.

SIPHMOTH, sip'moth, sip'moth (טִּפְפִּים, siph-
môth) [Ginsburg]. הָעַפַּה, siphâphâh [Barz]; סַפְּת, Sip'th. One of the titles to which David presents from Zikklag (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. Zadbi the Shiphmite (1 Ch 27:27) may quite probably have been a native of this place.

SIPPAI, sip'î, sip'î. See SAPPH.

SIR, sir: In the OT this word in Gen 43:20 AV (אַבָּדוּ) is changed in RV into "my lord." In the NT the word sometimes represents ἄραγον, andρός, as in Acts 7:26; 14:15; 19:25, etc.; more frequently σέαρος, ἄριος, "lord," as in Mt 13:27; 21:30; 27:36; Jn 4 11.15.19.40 (RVm "lord"); 20:15. In Rev 7:14, RV renders "my lord."
attempt to represent in writing the natural sound of the final letter ʿaleph in the Heb name as in the Gr. Ακλαμανακλαμανακ, Ακλαμανακ, for the Aram. ḫēkāl demā (Acts 1:19). Da lkman, however (Aram. Gram., 161, n. 6), follows his source, and makes that the Aklam is simply a sign that the word is indecipherable; cf ḫêkāl, ḫō skeptical.

II. Canonlcy.—Though older than both Dal and Est, this book was never admitted into the Jewish Canon. There are numerous quotations from it, however, in Talmudic and Rabbinic literature, and 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 (419) and Carthage (397), yet it was omitted from the lists of accepted books given by Melito (c 150 AD), Origen, in the Apoll. Canon, and in the lists of the Councils of Laodicea (341 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 "Berthold Homer," etc., that is prefixed frequently in the Ep. of Jas (Jas 1:4—cf Sir 2:1—5; Jas 1:5—cf Sir 1:26; 41:22; 51:13 f; Jas 1:8 ["double 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 Scripture 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 lay down any consistent scheme of thought, for the author's 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 Seriapode, etc.) that the book is a Farrago of sayings with no connection, or with Berthold that "the work is but a haphazard," for the whole is informed and controlled by one master thought, the supreme value to every one of Wisdom. By this last the writer means the Jewish religion as conceived by enlightened Jews toward the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC, and as reflected in the Law of Moses (see 24.23—31), and in a degree less 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 very occasional digressions, largely confined 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 an adequate continuous line of reasoning in the book, but the vital differences in the schemes propounded suggest what an examination of the book itself confirms, that the compiler and author put his materials together with little or no regard to logical connection, though he never losses sight of his main theme—Wisdom the chief thing.

Kichthorn (Einleitung, 50 f.) divides the book into three parts (chs 1—23; 24—10; 11—50), and maintains that at first each of these was a separate work, united subsequently by the author. For the work into three, Scholz into twelve, Fritzsche (Einleit., xxvii), and Ryssel (op. cit., 240) into seven, Eberspielm (op. cit., 201, 304 and 305) and R. G. Moulton (Moo. Cosm. Bible: Eccles, xvi ff) into five portions, and many other arrangements have been proposed. The portionings of Ewald, Holzmann, Bissell, Zöckler, etc. That there are small independent sections, essays, etc., poems, etc., was seen by the early critics to whom the Law in its present form was largely due, for they have prefixed headings to the sections of various parts of the book: "The Son of Man" (Temperance of Soul); 20:27 (Proverbs); 23:7 (Discipline of the Mouth); 24:1 ("The Praise of Wisdom"); 29:18 ("Concerning Prayer"); 30:18 ("Concerning Foods"); this is also the view of many Mos, though retained by Swete, who however, omits the preceding headings. 30:24 (Ev 33:24; 1 Concerning Servants); 35:21 ("Concerning Rulers"); 34:17 ("The Praise of the Father"); 51:1 ("The Prayer of Jesus, Son of Sirach"). Probably this whole book possessed such headings at one time, and it is quite evident, that as guide readers after the book had become one of the chief church reading-books (so W. J. Deane in Fos., ii, vi, 327). These headings are given in Ev, in proper (i.e., the margin, though in modern reprints, as also in Ev, they are unfurled). The whole book has been arranged in headed sections by H. J. Holo (Bunsen's Berliner, 139 ff) and by R. G. Moulton (op. cit.).

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 Alexandria Judaism are absent from the teaching of Palestinian Judaism are to be found in this book, though of some at least are represented in Wiel (Wisom of Solomon, vi, 36). The outstanding features of Alexandrianism are the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, its conception of the Christian city of God, and its teaching of mediating powers between man and God and its adoption of purely Ger ideas. None of these can be traced in Sir. The Hebrews never developed a theoretical or speculative theology or philosophy; all their thinking was gathered in the practical 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 (q.v.). The main lines of the teaching of Sir may be set out as follows, under the three heads of religion, morals, and manners.

(i) God.—The view of God given in this book agrees generally with that put forth by the later of the Old Testament prophets, e.g., 1

1. Religion (Second Isa, Job, etc.) onward, though the God of this book lacks the love and tenderness of the Jeh of the OT prophets. God is present everywhere (16.17—23); He created the world which is founded on Gen 1, and it may fairly be inferred that creation out of nothing is meant. Wesl, on the other hand, teaches the Christian doctrine of half of 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 ff). His works are past finding out (18 2 f); but His compassion is upon all flesh (18 13), i.e. upon every soul that accepts His chastening and seek to do His will (18 14). In 43 27 God is said to be "the all" (כְּכֵל, כְּכַנ), which simply means 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 "Weekly Men," Sir sets out upon natural lines the revelation 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 t. not, however, always, even with the sense of "the Law." 1 Esdo 17:3, where the usage 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). This was 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 sin (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 ff).

(5) Satan.—The word "Satan" (Sara, Sarode, Sotade), in 21 27 (it occurs nowhere else in the Apoc) denotes one's own wicked heart, as the parallelism shows.

(6) 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," i.e., the removal of guilt) (cf the Gr. hagiasmos, exáslakómaí, the great LXX word for the Heb ἡσσή, kipper, "to atone").

(7) 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 they be accompanied by heartlessness 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 1 f). 12 ff.

Sirach nowhere clearly expresses his belief in angels or uses language which implies such a belief. For "an angel [טטם עטני, הוֹעַגְלֶה] destroyed them" the Heb of the original passage (2 K 19 35) has גַּלְפָּם, magpaphah, "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 be indeed rewarded according to their conduct, but in 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 11 15 ff; 18 1-10). The 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 (Psa, Job, etc), none of which give any intimation of a life beyond the grave. For this reason 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 (Scheuchzer, Eschatology, pp. 61-65), 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 conception of Wisdom in the OT and in the Apoc see Wisom Literature, 1. the development of 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 14.16.18.21); 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 we have a blend of Alexandrian, Jewish, Platonic, Stoic, and Christian elements. It would be a mistake to suppose that Sirach finds the general idea of Wisdom in the OT; he is more concerned with the conception of Wisdom as given by Socrates, and in a less exclusive sense in that of Plato and Aristotle, the good man is the wise one. 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 Hedonism or individual utilitarianism, as is that of Prov and the OT generally, though in the Ps and Moralists in the prophetic writings gratitude to God for the love He has shewn and the kind act He has performed has been an end in itself, appeals and vows. 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 to the state, and to no one else. See what is said in (11) "Ecclesiastical," above; see also 2 7 f.; 11 17; 16 6 f.; 40 13 f.

The hedonistic principle is carried far that we are urged to help the good because they are most likely to prove serviceable to us (22 2); to aid our fellow-man in distress, so that in his days of prosperity he may be our friend (22 23); contrast the teaching of Jesus Christ (Lk 6 30-36). Friends are to be bemoaned for appearance's sake (38 17). Yet many of the precepts are lofty. We are exhorted to show kindness and forbearance to the poor and to give help to our fellow-man (29 8-20); to give alms (12 3); speak kindly (18 15-18); masters should treat servants as brethren, nay as they would themselves be treated (7 20-22; 33 30 f.); parents should give heed to the proper training of their children (3 2; 7 23; 30 1-13); and children ought to respect and obey their parents (3 1-16). It is men's duty to defend the truth and to fight for it. So well do they for their faith (4 25-28). Pride is denounced (10 2 ft.); and humility (3 18), as well as forgiveness (28 2), commended.

Sir is as much a code of etiquette as one of ethics, the motive being almost invariably the individual's own good. Far more attention is given to "manners" in Sir than in Prov, owing to the fact that a more complex and artificial state of society had arisen in Pal. When one is invited to a banquet he is not to show good manners, or to be too sparing in helping himself to the good things provided. He is to be the first to leave and not to be insatiable (31 12-18). Moderation in eating is necessary for health as well as for appearance's sake (31 19-22). Mourning for the dead is a social propriety, and it should on that account be carefully carried out, since failure to do this brings bad repute (38 16 f.). It is quite wrong to stand in front of people's doors, peeping and listening; only fools do this (21 23 f.). Music and wine are praised: nay even a "concert of music" and a "banquet of wine" are good in their season and in moderation (32 [LXX 35] 5 f.). The author has not a high opinion of woman (25 13). A man is to be on his strict guard against singing and dancing girls and harlots, and adultery is an evil to be avoided (36 1-27). As.Prov. has it, the woman sin began, and it is through her that we all die (25 4). Yet no one has used more eulogistic terms in praising the good wife than Ben Sira (26 1 ff.), and in extolling the happiness of the home when the husband and wife "walk together in agreement" (25 1). Never lend money to a man more powerful than thyself or thou wilt probably lose it (8 12). It is unwise to become surety for another. 4. Counsels (29 15; 5 19), yet for a good man one of Prudence would become surety (29 14) and he would even lend to him (29 1 f.). It should be remembered that in those times lending and becoming financially liable were acts of kindness, pure and simple: the Jewish Law (Deut 23 19) forbade the taking of interest, even in any form (see Century Bible, "Eara," 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 this in mind when he speaks in the proverbs of his time of the "heathen 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 poetical in form, abounding in that parallelism which characterizes Heb poetry, though it is less antithetic and regular than in Prov. No definite metre has been assigned, 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. für katholische Theol., 1882) trsf 51 1-20 back into Hebraic, good proof that 51 is a诗etic acrostic ps. and Taylor supports this view by an examination of the lately discovered fragments of the Heb text (see The Book of Ben Sira). After Ps 15 1-93; 29 7 f. (Ps 15 1-3, 30 1-15 and C. Taylor, lxxix f). After 51 12 the Gr and other versions select the Heb text for 40 1-163; but the Heb V8 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 (Jeshua, Gr Ioseph!), the family name being Ben Sira.' The full name would be therefore "Jesus Ben Sira." In Son of the Talm 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 title: "Ben Sira." In the best Gr MSS (BNA) of 50 27, the author's name appears as Ἰερώνυμος ὁ Σεραχίας Ἰεροσολύμων ἐξ οཏοιοῦτος ἐξελανεῖ ἡ ἱεροσολύμητις, "Jesus the son of Sirach [son of] Eleazar the Jew of Jerusalem." In the last two words Ἰερώνυμος has by a copyist's error, Ἰερώνυμος ὁ Ἱεροσολύμων, ho hiero-solymētis, "the Solomon-like priest." The Heb text of 50 27 and 51 30 gives the following genealogy: Simeon son of Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sira, making him the grand-son and not the son of Sira, and so he is called by Saadia; see HDB (Nestle) and EB, II, 1165 (Tov).

We know nothing of Ben Sira beyond what can be gathered from the book itself. He was a resident in Pal (34 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) That the author was a priest: so in cod. N (50 27). In 7 29-31 he makes much of the priest's power and his divine mission. There are numerous references to sacrifices in the book. In 45 6-26 he has a long poem in praise of a certain high priest. Yet on the whole Ben Sira does not write like a priest.

(2) That he was a high priest: so Syncellus (Chron, ed Dindorf, I 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 38 11, 12 ff and other references to the professional skill 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, Goldschmied, a wholly unsupported 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, Ecc, 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 Ben Sira. 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 a surety with him (29 13; 29 18); and it is possible that in 28 1-5: 25 1 f. and 26 18-26; the varying estimates of life (36 16-35;
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 indecisive. There is nothing in this chapter inconsistent with the rest of the book.

In the recently discovered fragments of Heb text there is a passage which is that of the round EV which seems to be a copy of Ps 136. It is absent from the VSS and its thought is lost. But in the Heb and Gr texts there are undoubted additions and omissions. There are, in the Gr, frequent glosses by Christian editors which were later changes (by the translators) in the direction of Alexandrian Judaism; see *Speaker's Apoc and Tob*. 

**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 or ancestor (Gr ἀνθέας ιδωνος) wrote the book (the younger Siracides, as he is called), says that he reached Egypt, where he found and transcribed this book in the reign of Euergetes, king of Egypt. But there were two Egyptian kings called Euergetes, viz. Ptolemy Euergetes, or Euergetes I (247–222 BC), and Ptolemy VII Physis, or Euergetes II (218–198 BC). Sirach mentions the greatest among whom 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 Siracides. But there were two high priests called 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 Physis (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 lived and died in the 2nd century BC, 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 ff.) 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 Mish. (Ab. i.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 adduced to it in modern tradition shows that Simon I is that which is thought of.

(e) In the Syr. PS (Pesh.) 50 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 Ederheim have in this case the parallel text 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. 3:8–10 he is called), a son of Tobias against Hyrcanus, son of Joseph, the wrong side from the orthodox Jewish point of view.

(g) The high priest Simon is said (50 13) to have repaired the temple and fortified the city. Edersheim 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 (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 Dengerbourg 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 show that the city and temple of Jerusalem will be fully restored. 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) while the Heb text was composed 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, 1890). 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 Physis, or Euergetes II, seems proved by the translator’s statement that he came to Egypt in the 38th year, *ετῶν τοῦ Εὐεργέτου δεκαπενήχυρον*, i.e. almost certainly of the reign of Euergetes II. Euergetes I and Simon I are, relatively speaking, the most sure foundation for giving him his own age? Now Euergetes I reigned but 25 years, but Euergetes II (Physis) 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* (1893) this note has become expunged, and the article as edited by D. S. Margoliouth (I, 841) teaches the contrary view, which is now accepted by nearly all scholars (Scherer, 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 the year 241 BC for the younger Siracides came to Egypt in 132 BC, and he gives us to understand in the Prologue that he transcribed 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 that the date for the Heb work is given to Simon II 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 Energetes of the Prologue and the Simon of ch 50 are in both cases the first so called. So Hug, Scholz, Weit, Kell, Edersheim, Lampard and many others. The book was accordingly written after 200 BC, perhaps some time after, and the translation was made some time after 220 BC, say 200 BC (2) That Energetes II (d. 116 BC) and the actual Energetes are the very persons referred to. So Elchhorn, De Wette, Ewald, Franz Delitzsch, Hitzig, Schürer.

IX. Original Languages.—Even before the discovery of the substantial fragments of what is probably the original Heb text of this book, nearly all had reached the conclusion that Sir was composed in Hebrew. (1) The fact of a Heb original is definitely stated in the Prologue. (2) Jerome (Proef. in vers. libri Sed.) 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 rabbinical literature. (4) There are some word-plays in the book which in the Gr are lost, but which reappear in the discovered Heb text, e.g. (43 8) δὲ ἡρῴν κατὰ τὸ βοῶν ἀνάιθεν κενν ἀναγεννηθεὶς (read ἀναγέννηθε, ho μην κατὰ τὸ βοῶν αλλὰ εστίν αὐξανόμενες (read αὐξανάμενες). (The month) is called after her name, [ἡ] βαρμᾶνια, [ἡ] ἤρῳνία ἤρῳνίαν ἄνω ἢν ἵθηκεν, [ἡ] βαρμᾶνια τὰ μιθηθόρα, “the moon, according to its name renews itself”; the Heb words for “moon” and “renews itself” come from one root, as if 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 in 1889 and after, of the fragments of a (probably the) Heb text called now A B C and D. These contain much over half the whole book, and that the text in them, nearly always identical when the same passages are given in more than one, is the original one, is exceedingly likely, to say the least.

D. S. Margoliouth (Origin of the Original Heb of Ecclesiastes, 1889) has tried to prove that the Heb text of the fragments is a tr of a Pers text, which is itself derived from Gr, the words he offers have not convinced scholars.

(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, it underlines the copies which have wholly gone wrong or the word is indecipherable.
(2) There do appear to be Pers glosses, but they are not a part 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 ff).
(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 2, f) 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 לֵבֶת, ἰσχυρός, 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 impsense. 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 Sir or the Gr 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, 1899-1900), Nöeldeke (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 Siry 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 1 248 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 Ν α and part of A. All extant Gr MSS except the late cursive 248 seem to go back to one original Μ, 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 Fritzche (Exeg. Handbuch zu der Apokalypse, V, 21 f) of which these two parts (of similar size) were written got mixed, the wrong 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 Sir (Pesh.), which seems to be the latest part of the Gr VS of the Compiutnens 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 read “islands,” Vulg, Sir, 23 and the Heb, but older Gr MSS read “Jesus, whom he planted” (“Jesus planted there”) [σωρν, αὐτοῦ] for “he planted islands therein”). 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 Sir (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 tr² from the Gr.

The Vulg agrees with the Old Lat which follows the LXX closely. Lapide, Sabatier and Bengel tried to show that 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 LXX (except 248) are also transposed in the Lat, showing that the latter is based on the LXX. The Lat text of both Sir and Wis according to the cod. Amlant is given by Lagarde in his Mittheilungen, I, 248–54. This closely follows the Gr text.

AV follows the cursives and often repeats their errors. RV try to indicate the uncertainty, 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. 219, the Syr and the Heb. Both EV should be corrected by the Heb in 7 26 and 38 1.5.

For fuller details concerning VSS see Speaker's Apoc, II, 23–32 (Edersheim); Kautzsch, Die Apok. des AT, I, 242 ff (Rysseil), and the art. by Nestle in ZAW, vol. 50, p. 42 ff.

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 f (Nestle); Bible Polyglotte (Vulgares), V, 44 f; Schürer, GJV, III, 221 f. The text of the Heb as yet remains to be printed. In the following: H. Strack, Die Sprache Jesus, etc. (with notes and glossary), Leipzig, 1903; Issac Levi, The Heb Text of Ecclesiastical (Heb), notes and index, Ledson, 1908; J. Rudolf Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, Heb and Deutsch (with notes and index), Berlin, 1906. The Heb appears also in the Bible Polyglotte, ed. L. Vigouroux, with the LXX, Vulg and a French translation in 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 16–49 11, by Cowley and Neubauer, Oxford, 1897. Still later and fuller is The Wisdom of Ben Sira in Heb and Eng., with notes on the Heb by Schulten and Taylor, Cambridge, 1899.

(2) Commentaries: The works of Fritzsch (1858), which note the evidence of the Syr and ignore the Heb idiom in the book, and of Bissell (1880) and Edersheim (1880) were the first to give a critical account of these Heb fragments. The last-named shows both learning and ingenuity in tracking the Heb idiom and in explaining difficulties. The following comments take full note of the Heb text as far as discovered: Issac Levi, La langue en la sapiencer de Jesus Sire; traduit et comenté, Paris, 1898, 1901; Rysseil in Kautzsch's Apok. des AT, I, 290–475, exceedingly valuable, esp. for the text and Introduction, but he takes account of the Heb fragments published by Cowley and Neubauer only in this book. To complete his treatment of the Heb parts published after he wrote, see further articles by him in Stud. u. Krit., 1900, 2; Knabenhaur, Commentarii in Ecclesiasticum, Paris, 1902; Peters, Der jüngst wieder ausgesandte hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticum, 1902; (cf the notice by Smend, TIZ, 1903, 72–77; Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erneut, etc. of his second edition of the commentary); and also by Eisengrein, Die Prophetenbaum (1874), Tiberias, 1875. The Heb text is not published, and there is no complete critical edition of the Heb text, as far as we know. The limitation of the following treatment is that the Heb is not printed, but the principal authorities, MS and printed. Of the Diet. articles those in HDB (Nestle, strong in the critical, but weak and defective on the historical and exegetical side); EB (C. H. Toy, sound and well balanced); see also Jen Err (Israel Levi) and Enc Brit (W. Bancroft). There are also several specialized references to the literature as given by HDB (Nestle); Jen Err, "Sirach" (Israel Levi); and esp. Schürer, GJV, III, 219 f. T. WITTON DAVIES

SIRACH, THE ALPHABET OF: Usually called The Alphabet of Ben Sira. The compilation so designated consists of two lists of proverbs, 22 in Aram, and 21 in Heb, arranged in such a manner as to present them as alphabet acrostics. Each of these proverbs is followed by a homiletic comm., with legends and tales, many of them homiletic. Some of the proverbs in the Alphabet are probably genuine compositions by Ben Sira and are quoted as such in the Talmud, but in their present form the Alphabets are at least as late as 11th cent. AD.

LITERATURE.—The only complete copy of the text known is in the British Museum, the copy in the Bodleian being defective. S. Steinschneider (Jahresberichte, 1909) has published the last-named of this last with critical notes (Alphabetum Syntaxis, Berlin, 1864). Cowley and Neubauer (the Original Text of a Portion of Ecclus.), besides giving a general account of this work, add a tr into Eng. of the Aram. books, O.S.A., and show in this the Gr text.

Dr. Louis Ginzberg (New York) also gives a tr of the 22 Aram. proverbs with useful remarks after each. The words appear in Yiddish (often), Judaeo-Spanish, Fr. and Ger., but never so far, completely into English.

T. WITTON DAVIES

SIRAH, ʾṣr, WELL OF (יָּרֵד הַשַׁרְרָה, bêr ha־shârâh, "the pit," "well" or "citizen of Sarah"): The spot from which Abner was enticed back to Hebron to his death (2 S 3 26). Jos. (Ant., VII, 1, 5) calls it Be(b)pard, Be(b)cred, implying that it was a "well." It is possible that this spot is now 'Āin Sārah, a spring which flows into a little tank near the west side of the road about a mile out of ancient Hebron, on the way to Jerusalem. There is, however, a curious cistern with steps known as Hamam Sarah (Sarah's bath) near Barahim, which is also possibly the site (PEF, 314, Sh XXI).

SIRION, sīr-i-on (סִרְיֹון), sîr-yôn, Zānār, Sanār): The name of Mt. Hermon among the Phœnicians (Dt 3 9). It is given as "Shirion" in Ps 29 6 (Heb, "breastplate" or "body armor"). Here it is named with Lebanon. Sirion therefore probably did not denote a particular part of the Hermon Range, as did Senir, but may have been suggested by the construction of the range itself, as seen from the heights above the Phœn coast.

SISMAI, sîs-mî. See SISMAI.

SISERA, sīs-erā (スキル), sîs′erd, of doubtful meaning; סִירָא, Sîrā (םי). (1) Given in Jgs 4 as the captain of the army of Jabin, king of Hazor. The accounts given of the battle of Sisera with Barak, as found in Jgs 4 and 5, have important points of difference. The first is the presence of the second and important Barak in the first only. Napoleon and Zeno mention Jabin as being under the command of Barak; in the second 6 tribes are given as being under his command. In Jgs 4 Sisera is known as the captain of Jabin's forces, while in Jgs 5 he seems to have been an independent leader. There is also a difference as to the scene of the battle and as to the manner in which Sisera met his death at the hand of Jael. Because of these points of difference, added to the fact that this is the only account, in these early times, where a king did not lead his own forces, it is thought by many that there is here the combination of two traditions dealing with different and distinct events.

Sisera resided in Harosheth of the Gentiles, a place identified with el-Ḥafirīyeh, on the right bank of the Kishon and commanding the way from the Central Plain to the sea. Taking the versions in the two chapters of Jgs as being the account of a single campaign, we find Deborah urging Barak to combine the forces of Israel to wage war with Sisera as the representative of Jabin, the king of Hazor. The scene of the battle was on the plain at the foot of the slopes of Mt. Tabor (4 12–14), or at the foot of the Carmel heights (6 19). The attack of Barak and Deborah was so furious, animated as it was by the hatred of Sisera and the Canaanites, that the hosts of Sisera were put to rout, and Sisera,
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Sisimai, si-sim-'ai (Σίσιμαι, Sisimai); AV Sisaimai. A Judahite, of the descendants of the daughter of Sheshan and Jarha, his Egyop servant (1 Ch 2:40). Commentators have compared the name to סִיָּם (sīyam), a Phoen god (cf. Rudolph Kittel, Comm. ad loc.; DBB, s.v.).

Sister, sis-'ter (Σίστρο), 'áthóth): 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 a kinswoman (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 33:7 ff.). (6) Confederate cities are conceived of as sisters (Ezk 16:45 ff.). (7) 'áthóth is used of objects which go in pairs, as curtains, each 'coupled to its sister' (Ex 23:36), and of wings in pairs (Ex 1:9; 3:13); (8) of virtues or conditions, with which one is closely connected ("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, ádeλφη, adelphé, used (1) in sense of physical blood kinship (Mt 12:50; 13:56; 19:28; Lk 10:49; 14:26; Jn 11:1 ff.; 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 2:15); (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) τιτριδήν, ben-'áthóth (Gen 29:13); and (2) κόσμησαν ἐν ἀδελφῆ, húdós its adelphês (Acts 23:16), and wrongly, (3) ἀνέφες, anepheis (Col 4:10), where, without doubt, the real meaning is "cousin," as in RV. See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

Sith, sith: An Anglo-Saxon word meaning "afterward," "since" (Ezk 35:6 AV and ERV, ARV "since").

Sithri, sith-'ri (σίθριον, sithri): A grandson of Kohath (Ex 6:22).

Sithnah, sith-'nah (σίθνα, sithnah); "hatred," "hostility"; ἔχονθρα, echhrión, the name of the second of the two wells dug by the herdsmen of Isaac, the cause of further "enmity" with the herdsmen of Gerer (Gen 26:21, m "That is, Enmity"). The site is unknown, but Palmer (P ERP, 15) sees an echo of the name in Shuhnet or Ruhebebe, the name of a small valley near Ruhebebe. See RMRBOTH.

Sitting, sit'ing (σάδη, yáshab, "to sit down or still," aáth, dághar, "to brood," "latch; katathó- ma, kathékmaw, "to sit down," áadhēm, and- kemaw, "to lie back," "rectline"). The favorite position of the Orientals (Mal 3:1; Mt 9:9; Lk 25:35; Lk 14:18; Lk 18:35; Jn 2:14, etc.)

"In Paul 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-counters the turbaned salesmen squat in the midst of the gay wares" (L. B., 111, 144, 275; 111, 72, 75).

Sith, sith: An Anglo-Saxon word meaning "afterward," "since" (Ezk 35:6 AV and ERV, ARV "since").

Sithri, sith-'ri (σίθριον, sithri): A grandson of Kohath (Ex 6:22).

Sithnah, sith-'nah (σίθνα, sithnah); "hatred," "hostility"; ἔχονθρα, echhrión, the name of the second of the two wells dug by the herdsmen of Isaac, the cause of further "enmity" with the herdsmen of Gerer (Gen 26:21, m "That is, Enmity"). The site is unknown, but Palmer (P ERP, 15) sees an echo of the name in Shuhnet or Ruhebebe, the name of a small valley near Ruhebebe. See RMRBOTH.

Sitting, sit'ing (σάδη, yáshab, "to sit down or still," aáth, dághar, "to brood," "latch; katathó- ma, kathékmaw, "to sit down," áadhēm, and- kemaw, "to lie back," "rectline"). The favorite position of the Orientals (Mal 3:1; Mt 9:9; Lk 25:35; Lk 14:18; Lk 18:35; Jn 2:14, etc.)

"In Paul 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-counters the turbaned salesmen squat in the midst of the gay wares" (L. B., 111, 144, 275; 111, 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); (3) "a night and darkness, ignorance, unlearning" (Ezk 14:6) and trouble (Mic 7:8); (3) to sit on thrones denotes authority, judgment, and glory (Mt 19:28).

M. O. Evans

Sivan, sî-vân, sîf'van (םיונ, sīvān); The third month of the Jewish year, corresponding to June (Est 8:9). See CALENDAR.

Sixty, sik'ti (שישים, shishēmim; ἥκοννα, hekkonta). See Number.

Skill, skil, skilful, skil'ful (forms of סִיָּם, yāshāh' [2 Ch 2:14, etc.], סִיָּם, bīh [1 Ch 15:28], סִיָּם, sikkhal [Dan 1:4, etc.], סִיָּם, lāmāh [1 Ch 6:18], סִיָּם, lākham [1 Ch 28:21], סִיָּם, hārash [Ezk 21:31], סִיָּם, yāshāh [Ps 33:3], in Apoc דעומל, ὕπερκία [Wis 13:13], וְשִׁרֵת, epōstēmē [Sir 1:19; 38:36]); advb. ταῦτα, evamathōs [Wis 13:11]: As a vb. "to skill," meaning to have understanding or to be dexterous, common in Elizabethan Eng. and in AV and ERV (1 K 5:6; 2 Ch 2:7; 34:12), is obsolete. ARV substitutes such expressions as "manage well" (1 K 5:6) and "were skilful with" (2 Ch 34:12). As a noun the word is used in the sense of "knowledge" (Eccl 9:11), "insight" (Dan 1:17), and "wisdom" (1 Ch 28:21). The adj. skilful is used in corresponding senses, esp. in ARV, where it takes the form of "cunning" (Ex 26:31; 31:4; 35:33:35; 36:23; 2 Ch 2:7; 13:14; Cant 7:1; Isa 40:20; Jer 10:9) and of "curious" (Ex 36:32), where the Heb bāshāh suggests planning or devising, and thus what we should call "original" work. Both ERV and ARV use the word in place of "eloquent" (Isa 3:3), "right" (Eccl 4:4) and "cunning" (1 Ch 25:5).

In the first of these instances the Heb word means "understanding"; in the second, it refers to the manner of doing a thing, and in the third, to the training that makes one "skilled." RV uses the word "skilled" of those that "took the war upon them" (Nu 31:27 AV). Skillfulness (Ps 78:72) is used with reference to the hands, not only in their work, but also in guiding (as, e.g., a pilot). To play well (Heb kēdōnāb nāgās) is rendered "play skillfully" (Ps 33:3). "Unskilful" is used with reference to the initiates in the sense of "inexperienced" (He 6:13, ἀορίστος, ἀορίστος).

Nathan Isaacs

Skin (הָדָם, heled, "human skin") [Job 16:15], בָּדָא, bādāh, "flesh," in the sense of "nakedness" (Ps 102:5 AV); ἑπικον, dērma):
SKIRT, skâr't: (1) .Up, kâbdhâb, "wing," "extremity" (Ruth 3 9, etc), is the usual word. But in 1 S 24 4 if perhaps "corner" is the best tr. (2) .ápp, shâl, "loose hanging" (Ex 28 33, etc; in AV often rendered "hem"). (3) 7p, peh, "mouth," "opening" (Ps 133 2, "the precious oil . . . that came down upon the skirt"). But the word "opening" does not for the hand, that RVm "collar" is the correct tr. "Skirt" is frequently used in a euphemistic sense, for which the comm's must be consulted. See Dress; Train.

SKULL, skul (����, gulpdeth; kparav, kra'men): The Heb word, which is well known to Bible readers in its Aram.-Gr form "Golgotha," expresses the more or less globular shape of the human skull, being derived from a root meaning "to roll." It is often tr in EV by "head," "pulp," etc. In the meaning "skull" it is found twice (Jgs 9 53; 2 K 9 35). In the NT the word is found only in connection with Golgotha (q.v.), "the place of a skull" (Mt 27 33; Mk 15 22; Jn 19 17), or "the skull" (Lk 23 33).

SKY, ski (����, shabab, "fine dust" or "cloud," apparently from ����, shabok, "to rub," "to pulverize"; Sam m'skâh, sh'dbâdgh). 1. In the OT ����, shâmâgin; ����, sâk=k = "cloud"; "small dust"): RV has "skies" for AV "clouds" in Ps 36 5; 37 21; Ps 36 5; 57 10; 68 34; 75 23; 104 8; Prov 20 8; 25, in which passages BDB supports the rendering of AV. In Ps 89 6.37 RV has "sky" for AV "heaven." EV has "sky" in Dt 33 20; 2 S 29 12; Job 37 18; Ps 18 11; 77 17; Isa 45 5; Jer 51 9. The word occurs mainly in poetical passages.

In the OT sô'ânâth, ouandâs, is trd "heaven" (AV "sky") in connection with the weather in Mt 16 2; Lk 12 56. In He 11 12 2. In the NT ����, ouandâs, is trd "heaven" (the NT "sky") as a figure of multitude. The conception, however, that the visible "sky" is but the dome-like floor of a higher world often makes it hard to tell whether "heaven" in certain passages may or may not be identified with the sky. See Heaven; Cosmogony.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SLANDER, slan'dér (subst. , ribbâh, "slander"; , di'dobos, "slanderer"); vb, , ragitd, "to sink about" as a talebearer, tr, lâhan, "to use the tongue," "to slander"; di'dâbâ, di'dâbôb, "to calumniate," "to slander"; and other words): Slander (etymologically a doublet of "scandal," from OFr. ecaudre, Lat scandalam, "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," and LXX has di'dalbôb, "slander"). 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 16; Eph 4 29; Col 3 8; Jas 4 11; 1 Pet 3 10), which is the cause of such strife between man and man (Prov 16 27-30), and which recoils on the speaker himself to his destruction (Ps 101 3; 140 11). Esp. is false witness, which is "slander carried into a court of justice," to be condemned and punished (Ex 20 16;
SLAUGHTER, sô'tér, of the Innocents.

See Innocents, Massacre of.

SLAUGHTER, VALLEY OF: In Jer 7 32; 19 6, a name given to the valley of Hinnom. See Hinnom, Valley of; Jerusalem, III, 2.

SLAVE, slâv, SLAVERY, slâv'ér-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. släve, meaning a captive of the Slavonic race who had been forced into servitude (cf. Slav); Fr. esclave; Dutch slaaf, 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 yôâdôh bârîth, "one born in the house"); Gr ephô, "body"). More often the Heb word בָּנַי (Barâhî), in the OT and the Gr word δουλος, doulos, in the NT more properly might have been used as "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 in the OT is servâh, and in the servant under the law render 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 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 f). Heb slavery broke into the ranks of every human relationship:
   a. a father could sell his daughter (Ex 21 7; Neh 5 5); b. a widow's children might be sold to pay their father's debt (2 K 4 1); c. a man could sell himself (Lev 25 39); d. a woman could sell herself (Dt 15 12.13.17), etc. Prices paid were somewhat indefinite. According to Ex 21 20 thirty shekels was a standard price, but Lev 27 3—7 gives a scale of 10 from 3 to 50 shekels according to age and sex, with a provision for an appeal to the priest in case of undue value (v 5). This scale is the price set for a young man (ver 5), and this corresponds with the sum paid for Joseph (Gen 27 28).

But in Ex 21 7 b 11 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 is (K 20 39) more than that of a slave was set on this particular captive.

There were certain limitations on the right of sale (Lev 25 1 f).

2. Exchange.—Slaves, i.e. non-Heb slaves, might be traded for food, beasts, or provisions.

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 Torâh (cf. Oser Yîsrâ'el, vii 29). 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" (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 possessions.

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 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 mere 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 concubination (Dt 21 10.11.14). 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) Phenicians (the greatest slave traders of ancient times), (2) Phills, (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; Pharoah; Servant, etc.

The freedom of slaves was possible in the following ways:

1. By redemption.—Manumission by (a) the nearest to the seventh year or the Jubilee year, (b) the first purchase price, and (c) personal consideration, and the freedom of the one in bondage. A slave could be redeemed as follows:

2. Hebrews 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; Pharoah; Servant, etc.

The freedom of slaves was possible in the following ways:

1. By redemption.—Manumission by (a) the nearest to the seventh year or the Jubilee year, (b) the first purchase price, and (c) personal consideration, and the freedom of the one in bondage. A slave could be redeemed as follows:
(a) by himself, (b) by his uncle, (c) by his nephew or cousin, (d) or by any near relative (Lev 25 48–55). The price depended on certain conditions as indicated above.

4. Rights of Slaves

(a) Human cruelty. Certain rights were discretionary, it is true, but many Hebrew slaves enjoyed valuable individual and social privileges. As far as Scripture statements throw light on this subject, the slaves of OT times might claim the following rights, viz.: (1) Freedom. Freedom might be gained in any one of the above-mentioned ways or at the master’s will. The non-Hebrew could be held as a slave in perpetuity (Lev 25 44–46). (2) Good treatment. “You shall not rule over him [Heb slave] with rigor, but shall fear thy God . . . . Ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigor” (Lev 25 43–46). The non-Hebrew seemed to be left unprotected.

5. Voluntary slavery. Even when the seventh year came, the slave had a right to pledge himself, with awi-pierced ear, to perpetual service for his master (Ex 21 5; Dt 15 16). The traditional interpretation of “for ever” in these passages is “until the next Jubilee year” (cf Koldaasen 21).

6. Money or property. Some cases at least indicate that slaves could have money of their own. Thus, if a poor slave “waxed rich” he could redeem himself (Lev 25 49). Of 1 S 9 5–10, where, however, the Heb throughout calls the “servant” n’or, “a youth,” never ‘ebosh.

7. Children. If married free, the slave could take wife and children with him when freedom came, but if he was married after becoming a slave, his wife and children must remain in possession of his master. This law led him often into perpetual slavery (Ex 21 3 f).

8. Elevation. A chance to rise was allowable in some instances, e.g., Eliezer, a foreign slave in a Heb household, and Joseph, a Heb slave in a foreign household. Each rose to a place of honor and usefulness (Gen 15 2; 39 4).

9. Religious worship. After being circumcised, slaves were allowed to participate in the paschal sacrifice (Ex 12 44) and other religious occasions (Dt 12 12).

10. Gifts. Upon obtaining freedom, slaves, at the discretion of masters, were given supplies of cattle, grain and wine (Dt 15 13 f).

As noted in the beginning of this article, the Heb slaves fared far better than the Grecian, Rom and other slaves of later years. In general, the treatment they received and the rights they could claim made their lot reasonably good. Of course, a slave was a slave, and there were masters who disobeyed God and even abused their “brothers in bonds.” As usual the unfortunate female slave got the full measure of cruelty. Certain rights were discretionary, it is true, but many Hebrew slaves enjoyed valuable individual and social privileges. As far as Scripture statements throw light on this subject, the slaves of OT times might claim the following rights, viz.: (1) Freedom. Freedom might be gained in any one of the above-mentioned ways or at the master’s will. The non-Hebrew could be held as a slave in perpetuity (Lev 25 44–46). (2) Good treatment. “You shall not rule over him [Heb slave] with rigor, but shall fear thy God . . . . Ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigor” (Lev 25 43–46). The non-Hebrew seemed to be left unprotected. (3) Justice. An ancient writer raises the query of fairness to slaves. “If I have despised the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me; what then shall I do when God riseth up?” (Job 31 13 f). No doubt the true Heb master was considerate of the rights of his slaves. But on the contrary, Abram seems to contemplate with horror the possibility that Eliezer will take possession of his goods in the absence of an heir. In view of the fact that adoption, the adrogatio of the Rom law, was unknown both to Bib. and Talmudic law (see Jev Ene, e.v.), the statement in Gen 15 2 does not seem to indicate any such custom as the adoption of slaves. If any method of emancipation is here suggested, it is by the death of the master without heir, a method thoroughly discussed in the Talm (mibhah ha’atidah).

By direct command of Jeh.—“The word that came unto Jeremiah from Jeh, . . . . that every man by paying ransom shall purchase the slave and an heir to his possessions. But on the contrary, Abram seems to contemplate with horror the possibility that Eliezer will take possession of his goods in the absence of an heir. In view of the fact that adoption, the adrogatio of the Rom law, was unknown both to Bib. and Talmudic law (see Jev Ene, e.v.), the statement in Gen 15 2 does not seem to indicate any such custom as the adoption of slaves. If any method of emancipation is here suggested, it is by the death of the master without heir, a method thoroughly discussed in the Talm (mibhah ha’atidah).

By direct command of Jehovah.—The word that came unto Jeremiah from Jehovah, . . . . that every man by paying ransom shall purchase the slave and an heir to his possessions. But on the contrary, Abram seems to contemplate with horror the possibility that Eliezer will take possession of his goods in the absence of an heir. In view of the fact that adoption, the adrogatio of the Rom law, was unknown both to Bib. and Talmudic law (see Jev Ene, e.v.), the statement in Gen 15 2 does not seem to indicate any such custom as the adoption of slaves. If any method of emancipation is here suggested, it is by the death of the master without heir, a method thoroughly discussed in the Talm (mibhah ha’atidah).
pation other than at the Sabbatical and Jubilee years was evidently the right of masters; (6) to circumcise slaves, both Jew and Gentile, within his own household (Gen 17:12); (7) to sell, give away, or trade slaves (Gen 29:24). According to Tovrath Kôhântîm a Hebra servant could be sold only under certain restrictions (See 2, [1]), (8); to sell 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 a daughter to a slave (1 Ch 2:34 f.); (11) to purchase slaves in foreign markets (Lev 25:46); (12) to keep or hire out, the remainder 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 16:14); (16) but the reference here is open to doubts. 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 said to be the settled code. 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 equal dignity, justice and love of Christ's teachings changed the whole attitude of man to man and master 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 to Paul's letters to live, go up, and make Christ-like relations on them to the other—obedience to masters and forbearance with slaves. "Bondervants [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 dynamitic. It was heaven, electric with power, but permeated with love. Christ's life and teachings 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, Heb Arch.; Ewald, Alltherr Ab; III. 280–88; Grünfeld, Die Stellung des Sklaven bei den Juden, nach bibl. und talmud. Quellen, 1890; Michel, Der Sklave bei den alten Hebräern, 1895; Mandel, Das Sklavenrecht des AT, 1896; Kahn, L'Esclavage dans la Bible et le Talmud, 1887; Sayce, Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians; Lane, Manners and Customs of Modern Egyptians, 2nd ed. (London, 1886); Denslow, Arabian Nights; London, H.P.M., 1894; Trumbull, Studies in Oriental Social Life, 1894. There is a wealth of material in the Talmudic tractate Kiddushin (pp. 17–22).

WILLIAM EDWARD RAPFETY

SLAYING, slâying (by spear, dart, or sword). See Punishments.

SLEEP, slâp: Represents many words in Heb and Gr. For the noun the most common are ύπνος, shênâh, and ζώος, hîpons; for the vb., τεθύνειν, yâkhên, ùphnôs, shâkhâbîn, and καθάειν, kateâdôs. The figurative uses for death (Dt 31:16, etc.) and sluggishness (Eph 5:14, etc.) are very obvious. See Dreams.

SLEEP, DEEP (",.,, ταρδῆμα, tardêmâh, vb., ταρδημά), râdham, from a root meaning "to be deaf"!). The vb. râdham 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 Dn 8:15; 10:9, where a sleep supernaturally caused (a "trance") is meant (cf. "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 tardêmâm has the same meaning of "tranced" in Gen 21:16; 15:12; 1 S 2:4; Job 4:14. In Prov. 19:15; Isa. 29:10, it is used figuratively of torpor.

In Acts 20:9 (hîpôs bathûs), heavy natural sleep is meant.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

SLAVE, slaves (Gen 37:3 m.). See Dress.

SLEIGHT, slît: No connection with 'slight,' but from the same root as "sly" and so-called. So in Eph 4:14, "slight of men," for κυβέλα, κυβέλα, "dice-playing" (cf. "cubicle," "gamblers' trickery.

SLIME, slim, SLIME PITS, slim'pits (םו, bêtôm, LXX δαφαλός, asbestos; Vulg bitumen; RVv 'bitumen'; cf. Arab. ج," hammār, "bitumen;" and מז"ה, hōmer, "clay," "mortar"): In the account of the ark in Gen 6:14, "םס, kopher (LXX δαφαλός, asbestos; Vulg bitumen; c fr. Ar. حفر, "kuff, "pitch") does not necessarily denote vegetable pitch, but may well mean bitumen. The same may be said of פס, ze'pheth, "pitch" (cf. Arab. حفر, zīf, "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 dry bricks, and daubed it with slime and with pitch" (Ex 2:3).

Bitumen is a hydrocarbon alloyed 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 Hûdâyra 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 Gomorrahs. Diodorus Siculus calls the Dead Sea "lake asbestos," an "lake of asphalt." See SDHM; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

ALFRED EDY DAY

SLING. See Armor, III, 2.

SLIP: As meaning "a cutting from a plant," it is still good Eng. In this sense in Isa 17 10 for
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SLOPES, slôps. See AEIDOTHE-PISGAI.

SLOW, slô: Chiefly for סָלֹו, 'erekh, lit. "long," in the phrase "slow to anger" (Neh 9 17, etc.). In Ex 4 10; Lk 24 25; Jas 1 19, for זָלֵו, kâbdhêth; בָּזָלָו, brudais, both meaning "heavy," "sluggish," while Sir 35 uses "be slow" for ובוים, okômê; "hesitate." In addition, AV uses "slow" for אָדוּס, "inactive," in Wisd 15 15, "slow to go" (RV "helpless for walking"), and in Tit 1 12, "slow belies" (RV "idle gluttons"). In Sir 61 24, AV has "be slow" for בָּזָוֶע, kusterêth, "be lacking" (so RV).

SLUGGARD, slug'ard: Found only in the OT, and there only in Prov. It is the rendering given the word 'גֶּל everywhere in RV, but in AV only in Prov 6 9; 10 28; 13 4; 20 4; 26 16 (elsewhere AV translates by "idolatrous" or "disorderly"). The literal meaning of גֶּל is "to be sluggis;" "stupid." The Eng. word "slug" is said to be "allied to slack" (Webster).

SLUICE, slûs (םֵּלח, sekker, lit. "hire"): In Isa 19 10, AV reads, "all that make sluices and ponds for fish." RV entirely alters the tr of the whole verse. It reads, "And the pillars of Egypt shall be broken in pieces; all they that work for hire [m "that make dams"] shall be grieved in soul.

SMELL, smell (Heb and Aram. סִּימָל, râ'h, as noun, "savor," "scent"); סִלֶּמ, râ'h, as vb., lit. "to breathe," "to inhale," thence "to smell;" בָּרָה, osmê, the smell, "savor," "savor," εὐώδια, εὐώδια, "sweet smell," "fragrance," ἐνόφριον, ἐνόφριον, "the sense of smell;" vb. ἐνόφριον, ἐνόφριον, ἐνόφριον, ἐνόφριον). And he came near, and kissed him: and he smelled [nose- yârâh] the smell [râ'h] of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell [râ'h] of my son is as the smell [râ'h] of a field which Jeh hath blessed" (Gen 27 27). Idols are described as "gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell" (Dt 4 28). Acceptable sacrifices and pious conduct are called a "sweet smell" or "savor" (Ex 29 18; Eph 5 2; Phil 4 18), well-pleasing to God. The godless life, which dishonors God, is hateful to Him: "I will not smell the savor of your sweet odors" (Lев 26 31). The phrase, "being in bad odor with a person," can be traced to Bib. language: "Ye have made our savor to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants" (Ex 5 21). Thus "smell" is occasionally equivalent with "quality," "character." His [Moab's] taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed" (Jer 48 11). Character or quality is the most infaillible test, the most manifest advertisement of a thing or a person; thus we find the following very instructive passage: "[God] maketh manifest through us the savor [osmê] of his knowledge in every place. For we are a sweet savor [εὐώδια] of Christ unto God, in better: "among" them that are saved, and in better: "among" them that perish; to the one a savor [osmê] from death unto death; to the other a savor [osmê] from life unto life" (2 Cor 2 14–16). See TITHING. In the passage Isa 3 24; AV "sweet smell" (םֵּלח, bâemân, "balsam plant") has been changed to "sweet spices" in RV.

SMITH, smith. See CHAPTS, 10; TUBAL-CAIN.

SMITING BY THE SUN. See SUN SMITING.

SMOKE, smôk: tesp figuratively of the Divine jealousy (Dt 29 20) and anger (Ps 74 1); symbolic of the glory of the Divine holiness (Isa 4 5; 6 4; Rev 15 8)

SMYRNA, smôr'na (Σμύρνα, 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 Asiaties 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 Rom 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 Homatrum, for Smyrna was one of several places which claimed to be the birthplace of the poet. On the slope of Mt. Pagus was a theatre 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 Rom 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 Tunar 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 ancient Aqueduct at Smyrna.
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 but a Turkish corruption of the ancient name. Even under the Turkish government the city is progressive, and is the capital of the Aidin 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, as far as theies, is not near 13 Mace (18 ft.), and is covered 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; Eccl 9 12. "But this is a people robbed and plundered; they are all of them ensnared in holes, and they are hid in prisons; when 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 the pit 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 3, "A fowler's snare is in all his ways"; Am 5 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 that 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.

SNAEEZE, snæz (םְגָע, zörér, Pā'el-form טְג, zörar): "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 are as the horn of a great herd, and are like the eyes of the morning." (Job 41 18 (Heb 10)). See NEEZING.

SNOW, snaw (םָג, shlekh, GO, επικ, Dnl 7 9): (1) Snow is not uncommon in the winter in Jerusalem, but it never reaches any depth and in many wares it is not secret at all. It 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 it is often seen 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 are 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 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 falls there is sure to be a lack of water in the fountains: "Shall the snow of Lebanon fall . . . 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 into the treasures of snow?" (Job 38 18). The snows of the mountains were 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 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” (Dn 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).

SNUFFERS, snuf'ters. SNUFFDISHES, snuf'dish-es (םוֹרֶפֶן, melkahayim, פֹּּרֶפֶן, mahôth): These two utensils are three mentioned in connection with the wilderness tabernacle (Ex 30:26; 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 is 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, and 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 melkahayim was used to describe this utensil. It is שִׁפְרֶפֶן, me'ammaroth, 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 Q573, a talmudic MS, the Eng. text reads, “the snuffers and the bases’; the 5th is merely a summary of things taken to Babylon (2 K 25:14). In this constant later association of “bases” and “snuffers” it is seen that the bases 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, sô (סֹו, ָּּ), although the Heb might be pointed סֹּו, شו: Assyr Sôw; LXX Σπαρ, Σαγηρ, סַּּד; Σεναχος, Σειιαλος, Σειεκοθος, Σειεκοτος; Lat Senechus; Herod. [ii. 137ff], Σαβακιν, Sababkôn: In all probability the “Subaen” of Herodotus, the Shabaka, who founded the Ethiopian dynasty, the XXVth of Egypt kings. Its 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, Hoshea, king of Israel, made an appeal for assistance to enable him to throw off the yoke of the Assyry Shalmaneser IV (2 K 17:3ff). 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., 1, 422; Schrader, COT, 1, 1697; T. N. COO.

SOAP, sôp (םוֹרֶפֶן, bornîth; AV sope): Bôrîth is a derivative of כֹּר, bôr, “purify,” 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 bôrîth is rendered by σάλα, pòla = “gruss”) and Mal 3:2 was probably the vegetable lye called in Arab. el kali (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 kali were exported from Syria to Europe.

For washing the women sprinkle the powdered kali 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 kali rubbed on and the whole slimy mixture rinsed off with water. Kali 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 kali to the imported caustic soda for soap-making.

In Sus (ver 17) is a curious reference to “washing balls” (emégmate). JAMES A. PATCH

SOBER, sôbër, SOBERIETY, sôb'ri-e'ty, SOBERNESS, sôb'ër-ness (Gr adj. sôphron, and its related nouns, sôphroíne, sôphronímos; vbs. sôphronoî, and sôphronizô; adv. sôphronós, “of sound mind,” “self-possessed,” “without excesses of any kind,” “moderate and discreet”): In Mk 8:5; Lk 8:35, “sane,” said of one out of whom demons had just been cast. In the Pastoral Epp., this virtue is esp. commended 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 wanton 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 sobriety” (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. nêpháio and its derivative adj. nêphálos 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 Epp. and 1 Pet, as sometimes in the classics, for “cool,” “unimpassioned.” Eliocott, on 1 Tim 3:211, distinguishes between the two words by regarding sôphrôn “as pointing to the outward exhibition of the inward virtue” implied in nêphálos. H. E. JACOBS

SOCHO, sô'kô: Occurs in 1 Ch 4:18, RV “Soco.” See Socon.