

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

**INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD BIBLE
ENCYCLOPEDIA
VOL. 2
B-CYRUS**

Books For The Ages
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA
Version 1.0 © 1997

B

BAAL (1)

<ba'-al:> (l [B" [ba`al]; or [Bóαλ Baal]): The Babylonian Belu or Bel, "Lord," was the title of the supreme god among the Canaanites.

1. NAME AND CHARACTER OF BAAL:

In Babylonia it was the title specially applied to Merodach of Babylon, which in time came to be used in place of his actual name. As the word in Hebrew also means "possessor," it has been supposed to have originally signified, when used in a religious sense, the god of a particular piece of land or soil. Of this, however, there is no proof, and the sense of "possessor" is derived from that of "lord." The Babylonian Bel-Merodach was a Sun-god, and so too was the Can Baal whose full title was Baal-Shemaim, "lord of heaven." The Phoenician writer Sanchuniathon (Philo Byblius, Fragmenta II) accordingly says that the children of the first generation of mankind "in time of drought stretched forth their hands to heaven toward the sun; for they regarded him as the sole Lord of heaven, and called him Beel-samen, which means 'Lord of Heaven' in the Phoenician language and is equivalent to Zeus in Greek" Baal-Shemaim had a temple at Umm el-Awamid between Acre and Tyre, and his name is found in inscriptions from the Phoenician colonies of Sardinia and Carthage.

2. ATTRIBUTES OF BAAL:

As the Sun-god, Baal was worshipped under two aspects, beneficent and destructive. On the one hand he gave light and warmth to his worshippers; on the other hand the fierce heats of summer destroyed the vegetation he had himself brought into being. Hence, human victims were sacrificed to him in order to appease his anger in time of plague or other trouble, the victim being usually the first-born of the sacrificer and being burnt alive. In the Old Testament this is euphemistically termed "passing" the victim "through the fire" (<2Kings>2 Kings 16:3; 21:6). The forms under which Baal was worshipped were necessarily as numerous as the communities which

worshipped him. Each locality had its own Baal or divine “Lord” who frequently took his name from the city or place to which he belonged. Hence, there was a Baal-Zur, “Baal of Tyre”; Baal-hermon, “Baal of Hermon” (~~<1088>~~ Judges 3:3); Baal-Lebanon, “Baal of Lebanon”; Baal-Tarz, “Baal of Tarsus.” At other times the title was attached to the name of an individual god; thus we have Bel-Merodach, “the Lord Merodach” (or “Bel is Merodach”) at Babylon, Baal-Melkarth at Tyre, Baal-gad (~~<6117>~~ Joshua 11:17) in the north of Palestine. Occasionally the second element was noun as in Baal-Shemaim, “lord of heaven,” Baalzebub (~~<1002>~~ 2 Kings 1:2), “Lord of flies,” Baal-Hamman, usually interpreted “Lord of heat,” but more probably “Lord of the sunpillar,” the tutelary deity of Carthage. All these various forms of the Sun-god were collectively known as the Baalim or “Baals” who took their place by the side of the female Ashtaroth and Ashtrim. At Carthage the female consort of Baal was termed Pene-Baal, “the face” or “reflection of Baal.”

3. BAAL-WORSHIP:

In the earlier days of Hebrew history the title Baal, or “Lord,” was applied to the national God of Israel, a usage which was revived in later times, and is familiar to us in the King James Version. Hence both Jonathan and David had sons called Merib-baal (~~<1388>~~ 1 Chronicles 8:31; 9:40) and Beeliada (~~<1347>~~ 1 Chronicles 14:7). After the time of Ahab, however, the name became associated with the worship and rites of the Phoenician deity introduced into Samaria by Jezebel, and its idolatrous associations accordingly caused it to fall into disrepute. Hosea (2:16) declares that henceforth the God of Israel should no longer be called Baali, “my Baal,” and personal names like Esh-baal (~~<1383>~~ 1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39), and Beelinda into which it entered were changed in form, Baal being turned into [bosheth] which in Hebrews at any rate conveyed the sense of “shame.”

4. TEMPLES, ETC.:

Temples of Baal at Samaria and Jerusalem are mentioned in ~~<1008>~~ 1 Kings 1:18; where they had been erected at the time when the Ahab dynasty endeavored to fuse Israelites and Jews and Phoenicians into a single people under the same national Phoenician god. Altars on which incense was burned to Baal were set up in all the streets of Jerusalem according to Jeremiah (11:13), apparently on the flat roofs of the houses (~~<2472>~~ Jeremiah 32:29); and the temple of Baal contained an image of the god in the shape

of a pillar or Bethel (^{<1206>}2 Kings 10:26,27). In the reign of Ahab, Baal was served in Israel by 450 priests (^{<1189>}1 Kings 18:19), as well as by prophets (^{<1209>}2 Kings 10:19), and his worshippers wore special vestments when his ritual was performed (^{<1202>}2 Kings 10:22). The ordinary offering made to the god consisted of incense (^{<2409>}Jeremiah 7:9) and burnt sacrifices; on extraordinary occasions the victim was human (^{<2495>}Jeremiah 19:5). At times the priests worked themselves into a state of ecstasy, and dancing round the altar slashed themselves with knives (^{<1185>}1 Kings 18:26,28), like certain dervish orders in modern Islam.

5. USE OF THE NAME.

In accordance with its signification the name of Baal is generally used with the definite art.; in the Septuagint this often takes the feminine form, [ἄισχύνῃ *aischane*] “shame” being intended to be read. We find the same usage in ^{<5104>}Romans 11:4. The feminine counterpart of Baal was Baalah or Baalath which is found in a good many of the local names (see Baethgen, *Beltrage zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1888).

6. FORMS OF BAAL.

1. *Baal-berith*:

Baal-berith **tyrB]I [B"** [ba`al berith]; [**Βααλβερίθ** *Baalberith*], “Covenant Baal,” was worshipped at Shechem after the death of Gideon (^{<0883>}Judges 8:33; 9:4). In ^{<0946>}Judges 9:46 the name is replaced by El-berith, “Covenant-god.” The covenant was that made by the god with his worshippers, less probably between the Israelites and the native Canaanites.

2. *Baal-gad*:

Baal-gad **dG:I [B"** [ba`al gadh]; [**Βαλαγάδα** *Balagada*], “Baal [lord] of good luck” (or “Baal is Gad”) was the god of a town called after his name in the north of Palestine, which has often been identified with Baalbek. The god is termed simply Gad in ^{<2511>}Isaiah 65:11 the Revised Version, margin; where he is associated with Meni, the Assyrian Manu (King James Version “troop” and “number”).

3. Baal-hamon:

Baal-hamon $\text{w}^{\text{h}}\text{h};\text{I} [\text{B}^{\text{h}}]$ [ba`al hamon]; [$\text{B}\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ *Beelamon*] is known only from the fact that Solomon had a garden at a place of that name (Song 8:11). The name is usually explained to mean “Baal of the multitude,” but the cuneiform tablets of the Tell el-Amarna age found in Palestine show that the Egyptian god Amon was worshipped in Canaan and identified there with the native Baal. We are therefore justified in reading the name Baal-Amon, a parallel to the Babylonian Bel-Merodach. The name has no connection with that of the Carthaginian deity Baal-hamman.

4. Baal-hermon:

Baal-hermon $\text{w}^{\text{h}}\text{r}^{\text{h}} \text{ j, I} [\text{B}^{\text{h}}]$ [ba`al chermon]; [$\text{B}\alpha\lambda\alpha\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ *Balaermon*] is found in the name of “the mountain of Baal-hermon” (QRT^{h} Judges 3:3; compare QRT^{h} 1 Chronicles 5:23), which also bore the names of Hermort, Sirion and Shenir (Saniru in the Assyrian inscriptions), the second name being applied to it by the Phoenicians and the third by the Amorites (QRT^{h} Deuteronomy 3:9). Baal-hermon will consequently be a formation similar to Baal-Lebanon in an inscription from Cyprus; according to the Phoenician writer Sanchuniathon (Philo Byblius, Fragmenta II) the third generation of men “began sons of surprising size and stature, whose names were given to the mountains of which they had obtained possession.”

5. Baal-peor:

Baal-peor $\text{r}^{\text{h}}\text{w}^{\text{h}}\text{P}^{\text{h}}\text{I} [\text{B}^{\text{h}}]$ [ba`al pe`or]; [$\text{B}\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\phi\epsilon\gamma\acute{\omicron}\nu$ *Beelphegor*] was god of the Moabite mountains, who took his name from Mount Peor (QRT^{h} Numbers 23:28), the modern Fa`ur, and was probably a form of Chemosh (Jerome, Comm., Isaiah 15). The sensual rites with which he was worshipped (QRT^{h} Numbers 25:1-3) indicate his connection with the Phoenician Baal.

6. Baal-zebul:

Baal-zebul $\text{b}^{\text{h}}\text{w}^{\text{h}}\text{z}^{\text{h}} \text{ I} [\text{B}^{\text{h}}]$ [ba`al zebhubh]; [$\text{B}\alpha\alpha\lambda\mu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha \text{ Θεός}$ *Baalmuia Theos*] (“Baal the fly god”) was worshipped at Ekron where he had famous oracle (QRT^{h} 2 Kings 1:2,3,16). The name is generally translated “the Lord of flies,” the Sun-god being associated with the flies which

swarm in Palestine during the earlier summer months. It is met with in Assyrian inscriptions. In the New Testament the name assumes the form of Beelzebul [**Βεελζεβοὺλ** *Beelzeboul*], in King James Version: **BEELZEBUB** (which see).

A. H. Sayce

BAAL (2)

<ba'-al> | [**B**] [ba`al], “lord,” “master,” “possessor”):

(1) A descendant of Reuben, Jacob’s first-born son, and the father of Beerah, prince of the Reubenites, “whom Tiglath-pileser (^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 5:5,6) king of Assyria carried away captive.”

(2) The fourth of ten sons of Jeiel (King James Version “Jehiel”), father and founder of Gibeon. His mother was Maacah; his brother Kish father of Saul (^{<1389>}1 Chronicles 8:29 f; 9:35,36,39; compare ^{<1441>}1 Samuel 14:50 f). These passages identify Jeiel and Abiel as the father of Kish and thus of Baal. For study of confusions in the genealogical record, in ^{<1386>}1 Chronicles 9:36,39, *see KISH; ABIEL; JEIEL*.

(3) In composition often the name of a man and not of the heathen god, e.g. Baal-hanan, a king of Edom (^{<1358>}Genesis 36:38; ^{<1449>}1 Chronicles 1:49); also a royal prefect of the same name (^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 27:28). Gesenius thinks that Baal in compound words rarely refers to the god by that name.

See BAAL (deity).

(4) A city of the tribe of Simeon (^{<1363>}1 Chronicles 4:33).

See BAALATH-BEER.

Dwight M. Pratt

BAAL (3)

| [**B**] [ba`al]; [**Βάαλ** *Baal*] ^{<1363>}1 Chronicles 4:33.

See BAALATH-BEER.

BAALAH

<ba'-a-la> hl [Ḃ] [ba`alah]; “possessor,” “mistress “): Three occurrences of this name:

(1) = **KIRIATH-JEARIM** (which see) (<699> Joshua 15:9,10; <1306> 1 Chronicles 13:6).

(2) A city in the Negeb of Judah (<699> Joshua 15:29). In <698> Joshua 19:3 Balah and in <1309> 1 Chronicles 4:29 Bilhah; perhaps also Boaloth of <699> Joshua 15:24. The site is unknown; but see PEF, III, 26.

(3) Mount Baalah (<699> Joshua 15:11), a mountain ridge between Shikkeron (Ekron) and Jabnoel unless, as seems probable, the suggestion of M. Clermont-Ganneau (Rev. Crit, 1897, 902) is correct that for rh [har] (= “mount”), we should read rhn [nahar] (“river”). In this case the border in question would be the Nahr rubin. Here there is an annual feast held — attended by all classes and famous all over Syria — which appears to be a real survival of “Baal worship.”

E. W. G. Masterman

BAALATH

<ba'-a-lath> tl [Ḃ] [ba`alath]; A, [Βααλὼν Baalon):

(1) A town on the border of Daniel (<694> Joshua 19:44) associated with Eltekeh and Gibbethon — possibly Bela`in.

(2) (“Mistress-ship”): A store city of Solomon, mentioned with Beth-horon (<1098> 1 Kings 9:18; <1486> 2 Chronicles 8:6) and possibly the same as (1).

BAALATH-BEER

<ba'-a-lath-be'-er> raḂ]tl " [Ḃ] [ba`alath be'er] “lady (mistress) of the well”; <698> Joshua 19:8 (in <1303> 1 Chronicles 4:33, Baal): In Joshua this place is designated “Ramah of the South,” i.e. of the Negeb, while in <697> 1 Samuel 30:27 it is described as Ramoth of the Negeb. It must have been a prominent hill ([ramah] = “height”) in the far south of the Negeb

and near a well [be'er]. The site is unknown though Conder suggests that the shrine Kubbet el Baul may retain the old name.

BAALBEK

<ba'-bek>, <bal-bek'>.

See AVEN; ON.

BAAL-BERITH

<ba-al-be'-rith> tyrB]l [B" [ba`al berith] = "Baal of the Covenant"): An idol worshipped by the Shechemites after Gideon's death (^{<0083>}Judges 8:33), as protector and guardian of engagements. His temple is also referred to in ^{<0090>}Judges 9:4.

See BAAL. (1).

BAALE-JUDAH

<ba'-al-e-joo'-da>.

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

BAAL-GAD

<ba'-al-gad> dG:l [B" [ba`al gadh]; [Βαλαγάδα Balagada], [Βαλγόδ Balgad]: Joshua in his conquest reached as far north as `Baal-gad in the valley' of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon (^{<0017>}Joshua 11:17). This definitely locates it in the valley between the Lebanons, to the West or Northwest of Hermon. It must not be confused with Baal-hermon. Conder thinks it may be represented by `Ain Jedeideh.

BAAL-HAMON

<ba-al-ha'-mon>.

See BAAL. (1).

BAAL-HANAN

<ba-al-ha'-nan> ^nj ;l [B" [ba`al chanan], "the Lord is gracious"):

- (1) A king of Edom (^{<1338>}Genesis 36:38 f; ^{<3149>}1 Chronicles 1:49 f).
- (2) A gardener in the service of David (^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 27:28).

BAAL-HAZOR

^{<ba-al-ha'-zor>} רַחֲצֹר [ba`al chatsor]; [Βαίλασώρ Bailasor], [Βελλασώρ Bel-la-sor): A place on the property of Absalom where his sheep-shearers were gathered, beside Ephraim (^{<1033>}2 Samuel 13:23). The sheep-shearing was evidently the occasion of a festival which was attended by Absalom's brethren. Here he compassed the death of Amnon in revenge for the outrage upon his sister. The place may be identified with Tell `Asur, a mountain which rises 3,318 ft. above the sea, 4 miles Northeast of Bethel.

BAAL-HERMON

^{<ba'-al-hur'-mon>} ἑρμών j ,l [B" [ba`al chermon]; [Βαῶλ Ερμών Baal Ermon]: Baalgad under Mount Hermon is described as "toward the sunrising" in ^{<1035>}Joshua 13:5. If Mount Lebanon proper is here intended the reading may be taken as correct. But in ^{<1038>}Judges 3:3 Baalgad is replaced by Baal-hermon. One or the other must be due to a scribal error. The Baal-hermon of ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 5:23 lay somewhere East of the Jordan, near to Mount Hermon. It may possibly be identical with Banias.

BAALI

^{<ba'-a-li>} yl [B" [ba`ali], "my master"): Baal, a common name for all heathen gods, had in common practice been used also of Yahweh. Hosea (2:16,17) demands that Yahweh be no longer called [Ba`ali] ("my Baal" = "my lord") but 'Ishi ("my husband"), and we find that later the Israelites abandoned the use of Ba`al for Yahweh.

BAALIM

^{<ba'-a-lim>} μyl [Bh" [ha-be`alim]: Plur. of BAAL (which see).

BAALIS

<ba'-a-lis> syl [B" [ba`lic], perhaps for Baalim, “gods”; Septuagint [Βελεισά, Beleisa], [Βελισά, Belisa], [Βααλίζ Baalis]; Ant, X, ix, 3, [Βάαλιμος Baalimos]: King of the children of Ammon, the instigator of the murder of Gedaliah (²⁴⁰¹⁴Jeremiah 40:14). Compare Ant, X, ix, 3.

BAAL-MEON

<ba'-al-me'-on> ὠμ[B" [ba`al me`on]; [Βεελμεών Beelmeon]:

A town built by the children of Reuben along with Nebo, “their names being changed” (⁴⁶²³⁸Numbers 32:38), identical with Beon of ⁴⁶³¹³Numbers 32:3. As Beth-baal-meon it was given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben (⁴⁶³¹⁷Joshua 13:17). Mesha names it as fortified by him (MS, L. 9). It appears in ²⁴⁸²³Jeremiah 48:23 as Beth-meon, one of the cities of Moab. Eusebius, Onomasticon speaks of it as a large village near the hot springs, i.e. Callirrhoe, in Wady Zerka Ma`in, 9 miles from Heshbon. This points to the ruined site of Ma`in, about 4 miles Southwest of Madeba. The ruins now visible however are not older than Roman times.

W. Ewing

BAAL-PEOR

<ba-al-pe'-or>.

See BAAL. (1).

BAAL-PERAZIM

<ba-al-pe-ra'-zim>, <ba-al-per'-azim> πυξιρπαι [B" [ba`al peratsim]; [Βααλφαρασείν Baal`pharasein], “the lord of breakings through”): The spot in or near the Valley of Rephaim where David obtained a signal victory over the Philistines; it was higher than Jerusalem for David asked, “Shall I go up against the Philis?” (⁴⁰⁵¹2 Samuel 5:20; ⁴³⁴¹1 Chronicles 14:11). The exact site is unknown, but if the Vale of Rephaim is el Beka`a, the open valley between Jerusalem and Mar Elias, then Baal-perazim would probably be the mountains to the East near what is called the “Mount of Evil Counsel” (*see JERUSALEM*). The Mount Perazim of ²³³²¹Isaiah 28:21 would appear to be the same spot.

BAALSAMUS

<*ba-al'-sa-mus*> [Βάλλσαμος, Baalsamos; the King James Version Balasamus]: B. stood at the right side of Ezra, when the law was read to the people (1 Esdras 9:43). Compare Maaseiah (<1887> Nehemiah 8:7).

BAAL-SHALISHAH

<*ba-al-shal'-i-sha*>, <*ba-al-shale-'sha*> חַלְשִׁי [B" [ba`al shalishah]; [Βαιθσαρισά, Baithsarisa]: Whence a man came to Gilgal with first-fruits (<1842> 2 Kings 4:42) was probably not far from the latter place. According to the Talmud (Sanh. 12a) the fruits of the earth nowhere ripened so quickly. It is called by Eusebius Baithsarith (Jerome "Bethsalisa"), and located 15 miles North of Diospolis (Lydda). Khirbet Sirisia almost exactly fits this description. Gilgal (Jiljulieh) lies in the plain about 4 1/2 miles to the Northwest Khirbet Kefr Thilth, 3 1/2 miles farther north, has also been suggested. The Arabic Thilth exactly corresponds to the Hebrew [Shalishah].

*W. Ewing***BAAL-TAMAR**

<*ba-al-ta'-mar*> תַּמָּר [B" [ba`al tamar]; [Βαάλ Θαμάρ, Baal Thamar], "Baal of the palm tree"): Evidently a seat of heathen worship (<1818> Judges 20:33) between Bethel and Gibeah (compare <1818> Judges 20:18,31). The place was known to Eusebius (Onomasticon, which see), but trace of the name is now lost. Conder suggests that it may be connected with the palm tree of Deborah (<1848> Judges 4:5) which was between Bethel and Ramah (HDB, under the word).

BAALZEBUB

<*ba-al-ze'-bub*> זְבֻב [B" [ba`al zebhubh] = "Lord of flies"; [Βάλ-μυῖαν, Baal-muian]: A deity worshipped by the Philistines at Ekron (<1802> 2 Kings 1:2,3,6,16). All that can be gathered from this one reference to him in ancient literature is that he had some fame as a god that gave oracles. Ahaziah, son of Ahab, and king of Israel, went to consult him

whether he should recover of his sickness, and was therefore rebuked by Elijah, who declared that his death would be the result of this insult to Yahweh. Why he was called “lord of flies,” or whether his real name has not been corrupted and lost are matters of conjecture.

See BAAL, (1).

BAAL-ZEPHON

<ba-al-ze'-fon> ^{ⲡⲣⲱ}ⲓⲓ [B"] [ba`al tsephon]; [Βεελσεπφών, Beelsepphon]; ^{ⲉⲃⲁⲓⲣ}Exodus 14:2,9; ^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}Numbers 33:7): The name means “Lord of the North,” and the place was opposite the Hebrew camp, which was between Migdol and the sea. It may have been the shrine of a Semitic deity, but the position is unknown (*see EXODUS*). Goodwin (see Brugsch, Hist. Egt., II, 363) found the name Baali-Zapuna as that of a god mentioned in an Egyptian papyrus in the British Museum.

BAANA

<ba'-a-na> (Old Testament and Apocrypha; [Βαανά, Baana]; an[^ⲡ] [ba`ana'] “son of oppression”):

(1, 2) Two commissariat-officers in the service of Solomon (^{ⲉⲃⲁⲓⲣ}1 Kings 4:12; 4:16; the King James Version “Baanah”).

(3) Father of Zadok, the builder (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}Nehemiah 3:4).

(4) A leader who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:8). Compare Bannah (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}Ezra 2:2; ^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}Nehemiah 7:7; 10:27).

BAANAH

<ba'-a-na> hn[^ⲡ] [ba`anah], “son of oppression”):

(1) Captain in the army of Ish-bosheth (^{ⲉⲃⲁⲓⲣ}2 Samuel 4:2 ff).

(2) Father of Iteleb, one of David's mighty men (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}2 Samuel 23:29; ^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}1 Chronicles 11:30).

(3) Returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem; a leader and one who sealed the covenant (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}Ezra 2:2; ^{ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲧ}Nehemiah 7:7; 10:27).

See BAANA (4).

BAANI

<ba'-a-ni> (A, [Βαανί, Baani]; B, [Βαανεί, Baanei]; the King James Version Maani =Bani [^{<15064>}Ezra 10:34]): The descendants of Baani put away their “strange wives” (1 Esdras 9:34).

BAANIAS

<ba-a-ni'as>.

See BANNÉAS (Apocrypha).

BAARA

<ba'-a-ra> ar[**B**] [ba`ara'], “the burning one”): A wife of the Benjamite Shaharaim (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 8:8).

BAASEIAH

<ba-a-si'a>, <ba-a-se'-ya> hyc[**B**] [ba`aseyah], “the Lord is bold”): Perhaps for hyc[**B**] [ma`aseyah], after the Greek [Μασαί, Maasai], B, [Maasai], “the work of the Lord.” Compare Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 293. An ancestor of Asaph, the musician (^{<1360>}1 Chronicles 6:40).

BAASHA

<ba'-a-sha> av[**B**] [ba`sha'], “boldness”): King of Israel. Baasha, son of Ahijah, and of common birth (^{<1142>}1 Kings 16:2), usurped the throne of Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, killed Nadab and exterminated the house of Jeroboam. He carried on a long warfare with Asa, the king of Judah (compare ^{<3449>}Jeremiah 41:9), began to build Ramah, but was prevented from completing this work by Ben-hadad, the king of Syria. He is told by the prophet Jehu that because of his sinful reign the fate of his house would be like that of Jeroboam. Baasha reigned 24 years. His son Elah who succeeded him and all the members of his family were murdered by the usurper Zimri (^{<1156>}1 Kings 15:16 ff; 16:1 ff; ^{<1440>}2 Chronicles 16:1 ff). The

fate of his house is referred to in ^{<1212>}1 Kings 21:22; ^{<1219>}2 Kings 9:9. Compare *ASA*; *ELAH*; *ZIMRI*.

A.L. Breslich

BABBLER

^{<bab'-ler>} ^ˆwOLh" I [B" [ba`al ha-lashon]; the King James Version of ^{<2001>}Ecclesiastes 10:11 literally, "master of the tongue"; the Revised Version (British and American) CHARMER; [^{λαπιστής}, lapistes], the King James Version of Ecclesiasticus 20:7; the Revised Version (British and American) BRAGGART; [^{σπερμολόγος}, spermologos]; the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of ^{<4178>}Acts 17:18): The latter Greek word is used of birds, such as the crow, that live by picking up small seeds ([*sperma*], "20 seed," [*legein*], "to gather"), and of men, for "hangers on" and "parasites" who obtained their living by picking up odds and ends off merchants' carts in harbors and markets. It carries the "suggestion of picking up refuse and scraps, and in the literature of plagiarism without the capacity to use correctly" (Ramsay). The Athenian philosophers in calling Paul a [*spermologos*], or "ignorant plagiarist," meant that he retailed odds and ends of knowledge which he had picked up from others, without possessing himself any system of thought or skill of language — without culture. In fact it was a fairly correct description of the Athenian philosophers themselves in Paul's day. Ramsay, *Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen*, 141 ff.

T. Rees

BABBLING

^{<bab'-ling>} j " yCi[siach]; the Revised Version (British and American) COMPLAINING): The consequence of tarrying long at the wine (^{<1219>}Proverbs 23:29 the King James Version); [^{λαλία}, alia], the Revised Version (British and American) "talk" (Ecclesiasticus 19:6; 20:5 the King James Version); [^{κενοφωνία}, kenophonía], literally, "making an empty sound" (^{<5161>}1 Timothy 6:20; ^{<5126>}2 Timothy 2:16 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)).

BABE

^{<bab>}:

(1) **ῥ[᾿]** [na`ar]; **παῖς**, pais] of a male infant 3 months old (**Exodus** 2:6) translated elsewhere “boy” or “lad.”

(2) **οἱ υἱοὶ** [olei], **μυλῶν** [᾿] [ta`alulim], in the general sense of “child” (**Psalm** 8:2; 17:14; **Isaiah** 3:4).

(3) **βρέφος**, brephos] an unborn or newborn child (King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of **Luke** 1:41,44; 2:12,16; **1 Peter** 2:2 and the Revised Version (British and American) of **Luke** 18:15 [AV “infants”]; **Acts** 7:19 [King James Version, “young children”] and **2 Timothy** 3:15 [King James Version, “child”]).

(4) **νέπιος**, nepios] = Latin infans) “a child that cannot speak.” (King James and the Revised Version (British and American) of **Matthew** 11:25; 21:16; **Luke** 10:21; **Romans** 2:20; **1 Corinthians** 3:1; **Hebrews** 5:13) the same word is translated “child,” plural “children” (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of **1 Corinthians** 13:11; **Galatians** 4:1,3; **Ephesians** 4:14) the verb [*nepiazete*] is translated in the King James Version “be ye children” and in the Revised Version (British and American) “be ye babes” (1 Cor 14:20). [*Nepios*] is used metaphorically of those who are like children, of simple and single minds, as opposed to the “wise and understanding” (**Matthew** 11:25 = **Luke** 10:21; compare **1 Corinthians** 14:20). “Babes in Christ” are men of little spiritual growth, carnal as opposed to spiritual (1 Cor 3:1; compare **Hebrews** 5:13; **Ephesians** 4:14). [*Nepios*] is also used of a child as a minor or infant in the eye of the law (**Galatians** 4:1,3).

T. Rees

BABEL; BABYLON (1)

<ba'-bel>, **<bab'-i-lon>** (Topographical): Babylon was the Greek name of the city written in the cuneiform script of the Babylonians, bab-ili, which means in Semitic, “the gate of god.” The Hebrews called the country, as well as the city, Babel. This name they considered came from the root, [balal], “to confound” (**Genesis** 11:9). The name in Sumerian ideographs was written Din-tir, which means “life of the forest,” and yet ancient etymologists explained it as meaning “place of the seat of life” (shubat balaTe). Ka-ding’irra, which also means “gate of god,” was

another form of the name in Sumerian. It was also called Su-anna (which is of uncertain meaning) and Uru-azagga, “the holy city.”

Herodotus, the Greek historian, has given us a picture of Babylon in his day. He says that the city was a great square, 42 miles in circuit. Ctesias makes it 56 miles. This, he writes, was surrounded by a moat or rampart 300 ft. high, and 75 ft. broad. The earliest mention of Babylon is in the time of Sargon I, about 2700 BC. That monarch laid the foundations of the temple of Annnit, and also those of the temple of Amal. In the time of Dungi we learn that the place was sacked. The city evidently played a very unimportant part in the political history of Babylonia of the early period, for besides these references it is almost unknown until the time of Hammurabi, when its rise brought about a new epoch in the history of Babylonia. The seat of power was then transferred permanently from the southern states. This resulted in the closing of the political history of the Sumerians. The organization of the empire by Hammurabi, with Babylon as its capital, placed it in a position from which it was never dislodged during the remaining history of Babylonia.

The mounds covering the ancient city have frequently been explored, but systematic excavations of the city were not undertaken until 1899, when Koldewey, the German excavator, began to uncover its ancient ruins in a methodical manner. In spite of what ancient writers say, certain scholars maintain that they grossly exaggerated the size of the city, which was comparatively small, especially when considered in connection with large cities of the present era.

In the northern part of the city there was situated what is called the North Palace on the east side of the Euphrates, which passed through the city. A little distance below this point the Arakhtu canal left the Euphrates, and passing through the southern wall rejoined the river. There was also a Middle and Southern Palace. Near the latter was located the Ishtar gate. The temple E-makh was close to the east side of the gate. Other canals in the city were called Merodach and Libilkhegala. In the southern portion of the city was located the famous temple E-sag-ila. This temple was called by the Greek historian, “the temple of Belus.” Marduk or Merodach (as written in the Old Testament), the patron deity of the city, received from Enlil, as Hammurabi informs us, after he had driven the Elamites out of Babylonia, the title “bel matate,” “lord of lands,” not the name which Enlil of Nippur had possessed. In the past there has been a confusion. The

idcogram Enlil or Ellil had been incorrectly read Bel. This necessitated speaking of the old Bel and the young Bel. Beyond being called bel, “lord,” as all other gods were called; Enlil’s name was not Bel. Marduk is the Bel of the Old Testament, as well as the god called Bel in the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions.

The temple area included an outer, central and inner court. The shrine of Ishtar and Zamama occupied the central court, and the ziggurra the inner court. In the temple proper, the shrine Ekua was located, in which stood the golden image of Marduk. This, the ancient writers say, was 40 ft. high. On the topmost stage there was a shrine dedicated to Marduk. It is assumed that it was 50 ft. long by 70 ft. broad and 50 ft. in height. Nabopolassar rebuilt the temple and its tower. Nebuchadnezzar enlarged and embellished the sanctuary. He raised the tower so that “its head was in the heavens,” an expression found in the story of the Tower of Babel in Gen, as well as in many of the building inscriptions. See *Clay, LOTB*, Babel, 121 ff, and the article on *BABEL, TOWER OF* One of the chief works of Nebuchadnezzar was the building of Aiburshabu, the famous procession street of the city, which extended from the Ishtar gate to E-sag-ila. It was a great and magnificent causeway, built higher than the houses. Walls lined it on either side, which were decorated with glazed tiles, portraying lions, life size in relief. The pavement was laid with blocks of stone brought from the mountains. This procession street figured prominently on the New Year’s festal day, when the procession of the gods took place.

A knowledge of the work Nebuchadnezzar did serves as a fitting commentary to the passage in ~~2000~~ Daniel 4:30: “Is not this great Babylon, which I have built?” He had made the city one of the wonders of the world.

The two sieges by Darius Hystaspes and the one by Xerxes destroyed much of the beauty of the city. Alexander desired to make it again a great center and to build an immense fortress in the city; but in the midst of this undertaking he was murdered, while living in the palace of Nebuchadnezzar. The temple, though frequently destroyed, was in existence in the time of the Seleucids, but the city had long since ceased to be of any importance.

See also BABYLONIA.

A.T. Clay

BABEL, BABYLON (2)

𒂗𒍪; [babhel]; Assyro-Bab Bab-ili, Bab-ilani, “gate of god,” or “of the gods,” rendered in Sumerian as Ka-dingira, “gate of god,” regarded as a folk-etymology):

See BABEL, TOWER OF, section 14.

1. NAMES BY WHICH THE CITY WAS KNOWN:

The name of the great capital of ancient Babylonia, the Shinar of ~~Gen~~Genesis 10:10; 14:1, other names of the city being Tin-dir, “seat of life,” E (ki), probably an abbreviation of Eridu (ki) “the good city” (=Paradise), Babylonia having seemingly been regarded as the Garden of Eden (PSBA, June 1911, p. 161); and Su-anna, “the high-handed” (meaning, apparently, “high-walled,” “hand” and “defense” being interchangeable terms). It is possible that these various names are due to the incorporation of outlying districts as Babylon grew in size.

2. PROBABLE DATE OF ITS FOUNDATION:

According to ~~Gen~~Genesis 10:9, the founder of Babylon was Nimrod, but among the Babylonians, it was Merodach who built the city, together with Erech and Niffer (Calneh) and their renowned temples. The date of its foundation is unknown, but it certainly went back to primitive times, and Babylon may even have equaled Niffer in antiquity (the American explorers of that site have estimated that its lowest strata of habitations go back to 8,000 years BC). Babylon’s late assumption of the position of capital of the country would therefore be due to its rulers not having attained power and influence at an earlier period. Having once acquired that position, however, it retained it to the end, and its great god, Merodach, became the head of the Babylonian pantheon — partly through the influence of Babylon as capital, partly because the city was the center of his worship, and the place of the great Tower of Babel, concerning which many wonderful things were said.

See BABEL, TOWER OF; CONFUSION OF TONGUES.

3. ITS WALLS AND GATES FROM HERODOTUS:

According to Herodotus, the city, which lay in a great plain, was square in its plan and measured 120 furlongs (stadia) each way — 480 in all. Each side was therefore about 14 miles long, making a circuit of nearly 56 miles, and an area of nearly 196 square miles. As the space enclosed is so great, and traces of the walls would seem to be wanting, these figures may be regarded as open to question. Around the city, Herodotus says, there was a deep and broad moat full of water, and then came a wall 50 royal cubits thick and 200 cubits high, pierced by 100 gateways with brazen gates and lintels. Reckoning the cubit at $18 \frac{2}{3}$ inches, this would mean that Babylon's walls were no less than 311 ft. high; and regarding the royal cubit as being equal to 21 inches, their thickness would be something like 87 ft. Notwithstanding that Babylon has been the quarry of the neighboring builders for two millennia, it is surprising that such extensive masses of brickwork should have disappeared without leaving at least a few recognizable traces.

4. IT POSITION, DIVISIONS, STREETS, AND TEMPLE:

The city was built on both sides of the Euphrates, and at the point where the wall met the river there was a return-wall running along its banks, forming a rampart. The houses of Babylon were of 3 and 4 stories. The roads which ran through the city were straight, and apparently intersected each other at right angles, like the great cities of America. The river-end of each of the streets leading to the river was guarded by a brazen gate. Within the great outer wall was another, not much weaker, but enclosing a smaller space. Each division of the city contained a great building, the one being the king's palace, strongly fortified around, and the other the temple of Zeus Boles — an erection with brazen gates measuring two furlongs each way. Within this sacred precinct was a solid tower measuring a furlong each way, and surmounted by other towers to the number of eight. An ascent ran around these towers, with a stopping-place about the middle where the visitor might rest. Upon the topmost tower a large cell was built, wherein was a couch and a golden table. No image was placed in the cell, and no one passed the night there, except a woman of the people, chosen by the god. In another cell below was a golden image of Zeus sitting, his seat and footstool being likewise of gold, with, near by, a large golden table. The total weight of the precious metal here was 800 talents. Upon a

small golden altar outside the cell young sucklings only were sacrificed, and upon another (not of gold) full-grown animals were offered.

5. THE WORKS OF SEMIRAMIS AND NITOCRIS:

The hydraulic works of Babylon are attributed by Herodotus to two queens, Semiramis and Nitocris. The former made banks of earth on the plain which were worth seeing, preventing the river from flooding the plain like a sea. The second, Nitocris, altered the channel of the river in such a way that it flowed three times in its course to the village Andericca, and the traveler by water therefore took three days to pass this spot. She also raised the banks of the river, and dug a great lake above Babylon. The place which was dug out she made into a swamp, the object being to retard the course of the river. The many bends and the swamp were on the shortest route to Media, to prevent the Medes from having dealings with her kingdom and learning of her affairs. Other works were a bridge across the Euphrates, and a tomb for herself over the most frequented gate of the city.

Both Herodotus and Ctesias were eyewitnesses of the glory of Babylon, though only at the period when it had begun to wane. It is exceedingly probable, however, that their accounts will be superseded in the end, by those of the people who best knew the city, namely, the inhabitants of Babylon itself.

6. CTESIAS' DESCRIPTION — THE PALACES AND THEIR DECORATED WALLS:

According to Ctesias, the circuit of the city was not 480, but, 360 furlongs — the number of the days in the Babylonian year — and somewhat under 42 miles. The East and West districts were joined by a bridge 5 furlongs or 1,080 yards long, and 30 ft. broad. At each end of the bridge was a royal palace, that on the eastern bank being the more magnificent of the two. This palace was defended by three walls, the outermost being 60 furlongs or 7 miles in circuit; the second, a circular wall, 40 furlongs (4 1/2 miles), and the third 20 furlongs (2 1/2 miles). The height of the middle wall was 300 ft., and that of its towers 420 ft., but this was exceeded by the height of the inmost wall. Ctesias states that the walls of the second and third enclosures were of colored brick, showing hunting scenes — the chase of the leopard and the lion, with male and female figures, which he regarded as Ninus and Semiramis. The other palace (that on the West bank) was

smaller and less ornate, and was enclosed only by a single wall 30 furlongs (3 1/2 miles) in circuit. This also had representations of hunting scenes and bronze statues of Ninus, Semiramis and Jupiter-Belus (Bel-Merodach). Besides the bridge, he states that there was also a tunnel under the river. He seems to speak of the temple of Belus (*see BABEL, TOWER OF*) as being surmounted by three statues — Bel (Bel-Merodach), 40 ft. high, his mother Rhea (Dawkina, the Dauke of Damascius), and Bel-Merodach's spouse Juno or Beltis (Zer-panitum).

7. THE TEMPLE OF BELUS AND THE HANGING GARDENS:

The celebrated Hanging Gardens he seems to describe as a square of which each side measured 400 ft., rising in terraces, the topmost of which was planted with trees of various kinds. If this was the case, it must have resembled a temple-tower covered with verdure. The Assyrian sculptures, however, indicate something different (see section 27).

8. OTHER DESCRIPTIONS:

With regard to the size of the city as given by other authorities, Pliny copies Herodotus, and makes its circuit 480 furlongs (Nat. Hist. vi.26); Strabo (xvi.i. section 5), 385; Q. Curtius (v.i. section 26), 368; Clitarchus (apud Diod. Sic. ii.7), 365. Though the difference between the highest and the lowest is considerable, it is only what might be expected from independent estimates, for it is doubtful whether any of them are based on actual measurements. Diodorus (ii.9, end) states that but a small part of the enclosure was inhabited in his time (he was a contemporary of Caesar and Augustus), but the abandonment of the city must then have been practically completed, and the greater part given over, as he states, to cultivation — even, perhaps, within the space enclosed by the remains of walls today. It is noteworthy that Q. Curtius says (v.i. section 27) that as much as nine-tenths consisted, even during Babylon's most prosperous period, of gardens, parks, paradises, fields and orchards; and this the later contract-tablets confirm. Though there is no confirmation of the height of the walls as given by these different authorities, the name given to the city, Su-anna, "the high walled" (see above), indicated that it was renowned for the height of its defensive structures.

9. NEBUCHADREZZAR'S ACCOUNT:

Among the native accounts of the city, that of Nebuchadrezzar is the best and most instructive. From this record it would seem that there were two principal defensive structures, Imgur-Enlil and Nemitti-Enlil — "Enlil has been gracious" and "Enlil's foundation" respectively. The construction of these, which protected the inner city only, on the eastern and western sides of the Euphrates, he attributes to his father Nabonidus, as well as the digging of the moat, with the two "strong walls" on its banks, and the embankment of the Arabtu canal. He had also lined the Euphrates with quays or embankments — probably the structures to which the Greek writers refer — but he had not finished the work. Within Babylon itself he made a roadway from Du-azaga, the place where the fates were declared, to Aa-ibur-sabu, Babylon's festival-street, which lay by the gate of Beltis or Mah, for the great New-Year's festival of Merodach and the gods.

10. NEBUCHADREZZAR'S ARCHITECTURAL WORK AT BABYLON:

Nebuchadrezzar, after his accession, completed the two great walls, lined the ditches with brick, and increased the thickness of the two walls which his father had built. He also built a wall, traces of which are apparently extant, on the West side of Babylon (he apparently refers to what may be called the "city," in contradistinction to "greater Babylon"), and raised the level of Aa-ibur-sabu from the "holy gate" to the gate of Nana; together with the gateways (in consequence of the higher level of the pathway) through which it passed. The gates themselves were constructed of cedar overlaid with copper (bronze), most likely in the same manner as the gates of Imgur-Bel (Balawat) in Assyria (reign of Shalmaneser II, circa 850 BC). Probably none of Babylon's gates were of solid bronze, notwithstanding the statements of Herodotus; but the thresholds were wholly of that metal, stone being very rare, and perhaps less durable. These gates were guarded by images of bulls and giant serpents or composite dragons of the same metal. Nebuchadrezzar also built a wall on the East bank of the river, 4,000 cubits distant, "high like a mountain," to prevent the approach of an enemy. This wall also had cedar gates covered with copper. An additional defense made by him was an enormous lake, "like unto the broad sea to cross," which was kept in by embankments.

11. THE ROYAL PALACES:

The royal palaces next claimed the great king's attention. The palace in which Nabopolassar had lived, and wherein, in all probability, Nebuchadrezzar had passed his younger days, had suffered from the floods when the river was high. The foundations of this extensive edifice, which extended from the wall called Imgur-Enlil to Libil-hegala, the eastern canal, and from the banks of the Euphrates to Aa-ibur-sabu, the festival-street, were thoroughly repaired with burnt brick and bitumen, and the doorways, which had become too low in consequence of the raising of that street, were raised to a suitable height. He caused the whole to tower aloft, as he has it, "mountainlike" (suggesting a building more than one story high). The roof of this palace was built of cedar, and the doors were of the same wood covered with bronze. Their thresholds, as in other cases, were bronze, and the interior of the palace was decorated with gold, silver, precious stones and other costly material.

12. QUICK BUILDING:

Four hundred and ninety cubits from Nemitti-Enlil lay, as the king says, the principal wall, Imgur-Enlil, and in order to guarantee the former against attack, he built two strong embankments, and an outer wall "like a mountain," with a great building between which served both as a fortress and a palace, and attached to the old palace built by his father. According to Nebuchadrezzar's account, which is confirmed by Berosus (as quoted by Josephus and Eusebius), all this work was completed in 15 days. The decorations were like those of the other palace, and blocks of alabaster, brought, apparently, from Assyria, strengthened the battlements. Other defenses surrounded this stronghold.

13. THE TEMPLES RESTORED BY NEBUCHADREZZAR:

Among the temples which Nebuchadrezzar restored or rebuilt may be mentioned E-kua, the shrine of Merodach within E-sagila (the temple of Belus); the sanctuary called Du-azaga, the place of fate, where, on every New-Year's festival, on the 8th and 9th of Nisan, "the king of the gods of heaven and earth" was placed, and the future of the Babylonian monarch and his people declared. Every whit as important as E-sagila, however, was the restoration of E-temen-an-ki, called "the Tower of Babylon" (*see BABEL, TOWER OF*), within the city; and connected, as will be seen from the plan, with that structure. Among the numerous temples of Babylon

which he rebuilt or restored were E-mah, for the goddess Nin-mah, near the Ishtar-gate; the white limestone temple for Sin, the Moon-god; E-dituralama, “the house of the judge of the land,” for Samas, the Sun-god; E-sa-tila for Gula, the goddess of healing; E-hursag-ella, “the house of the holy mountain,” etc.

14. THE EXTENT OF NEBUCHADREZZAR’S ARCHITECTURAL WORK:

The amount of work accomplished by this king, who, when walking on the roof of his palace, lifted up with pride, exclaimed “Is not this great Babylon, which I have built?” (⁽²⁰⁰⁰⁾ Daniel 4:30), was, according to his own records and the Greek writers, enormous, and the claim he made fully justified. But if he boasts of the work he did, he is just in attributing much to his father Nabopolassar; though in connection with this it is to be noted that his ascribing the building of the walls of Babylon to his father is not to be taken literally in all probability he only restored them, though he may have added supplementary defenses, as Nebuchadrezzar himself did.

15. DETAILS CONCERNING THE CITY FROM CONTRACT-TABLETS:

Besides Nebuchadrezzar’s inscriptions, various other texts give details concerning the topography of Babylon, among them being the contract-tablets, which mention various districts or quarters of the city, such as Te which is within Babylon; the city of Sula which is within Babylon; the new city which is within Babylon, upon the new canal. Within the city were also several Hussetu — perhaps “farms,” such as Hussetu sa Iddina-Marduk, “Iddina-Marduk’s farm,” etc. The various gates are also referred to, such as the gate of Samas, the city-gate of Uras, and the gate of Zagaga, which seems to have lain in “the province of Babylon,” and had a field in front of it, as had also the gate of Enlil.

16. DETAILS CONCERNING BABYLON FROM OTHER SOURCES:

According to an Assyrian and a Babylonian list of gates, the streets bore names connected with those of the gates to which they led. Thus, the street of the gate of Zagaga, one of the gods of war, was called “the street of Zagaga, who expels his enemies”; that of the gate of Merodach was “the street of Merodach, shepherd of his land”; while the street of Ishtar’s gate

was “the street of Ishtar, patron of her people.” The city-gates named after Enlil, Addu (Hadad or Rimmon), Samas the Sun-god, Sin the Moon-god, etc., had streets similarly indicated. Certain of the streets of Babylon are also referred to on the contract-tablets, and such descriptive indications as “the broad street which is at the southern gate of the temple E-tur-kalama” seem to show that they were not in all cases systematically named. If the streets of Babylon were really, as Herodotus states, straight, and arranged at right angles, this was probably outside the walls of the ancient (inner) city, and most likely due to some wise Babylonian king or ruler. Details of the streets have been obtained at the point called Merkes (sec. 22) and elsewhere, and seem to show that the Babylonians liked the rooms of their houses to be square. Such streets as slanted were therefore full of rectangles, and must have presented a quite peculiar appearance.

17. MODERN EXPLORATION:

It is this inner city which has most attracted the attention of explorers, both English and German, and it is on its site that the latter have carried on their systematic excavations. Indeed, it is probable that the houses of the most numerous class of the people — artisans, merchants, workmen, etc — lay outside the walls to which the Babylonian royal inscriptions refer. It may be supposed that the houses in this district were mainly low buildings of unbaked city (of which, indeed, portions of the temples and palaces were built), and these would naturally disappear more easily than if they had been built of baked brick. Even when baked, however, the brick-built ruins of Babylonia Assyria have a tendency to disappear, owing to the value which bricks, both baked and unbaked, have for the erection of new houses in the neighborhood. Concerning the extent of the exterior city much doubt naturally exists, but it may well have covered the tract attributed to it (see section 3, above). Nineveh, at the time of its prosperity, also had enormous suburbs (*see NINEVEH*).

18. DESCRIPTION OF THE RUINS — THE EASTERN WALLS:

The ruins of Babylon lie between 80 and 90 kilometers (50 miles or less) from Bagdad. The first thing seen on approaching them is the broad high ridge of Babil, which marks the site of the ruins of the Northern Palace. After some time, the ruins of the ancient walls are reached. They are still several yards high, and slope down gently to the plain. Starting to the North of Babil, the wall stretches for about 875 yds. due East, and then

runs southwards for another 930 yds., taking at that point a course to the Southeast for about 2 miles 160 yds. (3,300 meters). A wide gap occurs here, after which it runs to the Southwest, and is lost in the open fields at the end of about miles (2 kilometers). “That this is the old citywall,” says Weissbach, “there can be no doubt, and the name Sur, ‘city-wall,’ given it by the Arabs, proves that they have fully recognized its nature.” At the northern end it exists in its original extent, the plain out of which it rises being the old bed of the Euphrates, which, in the course of the centuries, has become filled up by the desertsand. At the period of Babylon’s glory, the river had a much straighter course than at present, but it reoccupies its old bed about 600 meters (656 yds.) South of Babil, leaving it afterward to make a sharp bend to the West. From the point where the city wall first becomes recognizable on the North to its apparent southernmost extremity is about 3 miles.

19. THE WESTERN WALLS:

On the West side of the river the traces of the wall are much less, the two angles, with the parts adjoining them, being all that is recognizable. Beginning on the North where the Euphrates has reached its midpoint in its course through the city, it runs westward about 547 yds. (500 meters) West-Southwest, and then, bending almost at a right angle South-Southeast, turns East again toward the Euphrates, but is lost in the plain before reaching the river. The distance of the two angles from each other is about 1 mile, 208 yds. (1,800 meters), and its distance from the Euphrates is at most $\frac{5}{8}$ of a mile (1 kilometer). The western portion of the city therefore formed a rectangle with an area of about 1.8 miles, and the eastern quarter, with the projection on the North, $6\frac{1}{4}$ square miles. According to Fried. Delitzsch, the size of Babylon was about the same as Munich or Dresden. This, of course, is an estimate from the extant remains — as has been indicated above, there was probably a large suburban extension beyond the walls, which would account for the enormous size attributed to the city by the ancients.

20. THE PALACES:

Among the Arabs, the northern ruin is called Babil, though it is only the remains of a palace. Its present height is 30 meters (98 feet, 5 inches), and its rectangular outline is still easily recognizable. Its sides face the cardinal points, the longest being those of the North and South. This building,

which measures 100 meters (109 yds.), was well protected by the city wall on the North and East, the Euphrates protecting it on the West. Continuing to the South, the path at present leads through orchards and palm-groves, beyond which is a rugged tract evidently containing the remains of ancient structures, probably of inconsiderable height. After further palm groves, an enormous ruin is encountered, steep on the East and South, sloping on the North and West. This is the Gasr (Qasr), also called Emjellibeh (Mujellibah), “the overturned,” identical with the great palace of Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadrezzar, referred to so prominently by the latter king in his records. Its longest side skirts the old Euphrates bed, and measures 300 meters (328 yds.). Its surface is very uneven, projections of 15 meters (over 49 ft.) alternating with deep depressions. On the Northwest side enormous walls of exceedingly hard yellow brick still tower to a considerable height. South of this the plain, broken only by a few inconsiderable mounds, extends for a distance of half a kilometer (5/16 mile), and terminates on the South with another enormous ruin-mound, called Ishan Amran ibn `Ali. It measures 600 meters (656 yds.) from North to South, and 400 (437 yds.) from East to West, its average height being 25 meters (82 ft.). About the middle, and close to each other, are two Moslem domed tombs, the first called Ibrahim al-Khalil (“Abraham the Friend” (of God) — probably a late addition to the name of another Abraham than the Patriarch), and the other Areran ibn `Ali, from which the ruin receives its modern name.

21. THE SITE OF BABYLON’S GREAT TOWER:

Near the South termination of the plain on which the village of Jim-jimeh lies, there is a square depression several yards deep, measuring nearly 100 meters (over 100 yds.) each way. In the middle of this depression, the sides of which do not quite face the cardinal points, there rises, to a height of about 13 ft., a platform of sun-dried brick about 60 meters (197 ft.) each way, its sides being parallel with the outer boundary of the depression. This depression, at present called Sahan, “the dish,” is partly filled with foundation-water. Centered in its southern side is a rectangular hollowing-out similarly formed, about 50 meters (164 ft.) long, extending toward the ruin called Areran.

22. THE CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN RUINS:

East of the Qasr and Emjellibeh are several mounds bearing the name of Ehmereh, so called from the principal mound on the Southeast, named Ishan al-Oheimar, "the red ruin," from the color of its bricks. Close to the Southeast corner of the Qasr lies the ruin called Merkes, "the central-point," and to the South of that again is a long and irregularly shaped mound bearing the name of Ishan al-Aswad, "the black ruin." From this enumeration of the principal remains on the site of Babylon, it will be easily seen that public buildings in this, the most ancient quarter of the city, were exceedingly numerous. Indeed, the district was regarded as being of such importance that the surrounding walls were not thought altogether sufficient to protect it, so another seemingly isolated rampart, on the East, was built, running North and South, as an additional protection. The remains on the western side of the river are insignificant, the changed course of the river being in all probability responsible for the destruction of at least some of the buildings.

23. A WALK THROUGH BABYLON:

There is much work to be done before a really complete reconstruction of the oldest quarter of Babylon can be attempted; but some thing may be said about the sights to be seen when taking a walk through the more interesting portion, which, as we know from Herodotus' narrative, could be visited by strangers, though it is possible that permission had to be obtained beforehand. Entering by the Urash-gate, some distance to the East of the Euphrates, one found oneself in Aa-ibursabu, the Festival-street, which was a continuation of the royal roadway without the inner wall, coming from the South. This street ran alongside the Arahtu canal, on its western bank. After a time, one had the small temple of Ninip on the right (on the other side of the canal), and E-sagila, the great temple of Belus, on the left. This celebrated shrine was dedicated to Merodach and other deities associated with him, notably his spouse Zer-panitum (= Juno), and Nebo, "the teacher," probably as the one who inculcated Merodach's faith. The shrine of Merodach therein, which was called E-kua, is said by Nebuchadrezzar to have been magnificently decorated, and into the temple itself that king had caused to be brought many costly gifts, acquired by him in the lands over which he had dominion. Connected with E-sagila on the Northwest by a causeway and probably a staircase, was the great temple-tower E-temen-an-ki, which, as is indicated above, is not now represented

by a tower, but by a depression, the bricks having been employed, it is said, to repair the Hindiyyeh canal. This great building was a striking monument of the city, and must have been visible for a considerable distance, its height being something over 300 ft. The stages of which it was composed are thought to have been colored like those of the similar tower laid bare by the French excavations at Khorsabad (DurSarru-ukin) in Assyria. Causeways or streets united this building with Aa-ibur-sabu, the festival-street along which the traveler is supposed to be proceeding. Continuing to the North, the visitor crossed a canal at right angles, named Libilhegalli, “may he (the god) bring fertility,” and found himself immediately opposite the royal palace — the extensive building now known as the Qasr. According to Weissbach, its area occupied no less than 4 1/2 hectares (rather more than 11 acres) and it was divided, as we know from the inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar, into two parts, connected by a corridor. The building was richly decorated, as the Babylonians understood such things, the interior walls being lined with enameled brick and other material.

Passing along the eastern side of the palace, the visitor came to the Ishtar-gate — a massive doorway faced with enameled brick in Nebuchadrezzar’s time, and decorated with colored enameled reliefs of the lion, the bull and the dragon of Babylon. On the right of this gateway was to be seen the temple of the goddess Nin-mah, Merodach’s spouse — a temple of sun-dried brick with traces of white coloring. It was a celebrated shrine of the Babylonians, in the usual architectural style with recessed buttresses, but modest from our modern point of view. Nin-mah was the goddess of reproduction, who, under the name of Aruru, had aided Merodach to create mankind, hence the honor in which she was held by the Babylonians.

24. THE ISHTAR-GATE AND THE MIDDLE PALACE:

The Ishtar-gate was apparently a part of the more ancient fortifications of Babylon, but which portion of the primitive city it enclosed is doubtful. In the time of Nebuchadrezzar it pierced the continuation, as it were, of the wall on the western bank of the river. Passing through this gateway, the visitor saw, on the West, the “middle-palace,” an enormous structure, built by Nebuchadrezzar, as he boasts, in 15 days — a statement which seems somewhat of an exaggeration, when we come to consider the massiveness of the walls, some of which have a thickness of several yards. He describes this as having been “a fortress” (*duru*), “mountainlike” (*sadanis*), and on its

summit he built an abode for himself — a “great palace,” which was joined with his father’s palace on the South of the intervening wall. It is possibly this latter which was built in 15 days — not the whole structure, including the fortress. It was raised “high as the forests,” and decorated with cedar and all kinds of costly woods, its doors being of palm, cedar, cypress, ebony(?) and ivory, framed in silver and gold, and plated with copper. The thresholds and hinges of its gates were bronze, and the cornice round its top was in (an imitation of) lapis-lazuli. It was a house for men to admire; and it is not improbable that this was the palace upon which he was regarded as having been walking when he referred to “great Babylon,” which he had built.

25. THE FESTIVAL-STREET:

But the street Aa-ibur-sabu, along which the visitor is conceived to be walking, was also a highly decorated causeway, fitted for the pathway of the great gods. Its width varied from 11 to 22 yds., and it was paved with regularly hewn and fitted natural stones — limestone and a brownish-red stone with white veins — while its walls were provided with a covering of brick enameled in various colors with representations of lions, some of them in relief. The inscriptions which it bore were white on a rich dark-blue ground, also enameled. There were various other streets in Babylon, but these have still to be identified.

26. THE CHAMBER OF THE FATES:

At the end of the Procession-street, and at right angle to it, was the Merodach canal, which communicated directly with the Euphrates. At this point also, and forming its end-portion, was the Chamber of Fates (Patak simate), where, yearly, the oracles were asked and declared. In close connection with this was the Temple of Offerings (Bit nike) or festival-house (Bit akiti). Concerning these places more information is needed, but it would seem that, before Nebuchadrezzar’s time, the Chamber of Fates was simply decorated with silver — he, however, made it glorious with pure gold. It is at this point that the Procession-street is at its widest. The position of the Temple of Offerings is at present uncertain.

27. THE NORTHERN PALACE AND THE GARDENS:

What may have lain on the other side of the Arabtu-canal, which here made a bend to the Northwest, and flowed out of the Euphrates somewhat

higher up, is uncertain; but in the extreme North of the city was the palace now represented by the ruin called Babil. This was likewise built by Nebuchadrezzar, but it may be doubted whether it was really founded by him. The presence of traces of wells here made Hormuzd Rassam think that this was probably the site of the Hanging Gardens, but further exploration is needed to decide the point, though it may be regarded as not unlikely that this identification is correct. In that case it would represent the palace shown in the Assyrian saloon at the British Museum — a building apparently protected by three walls, and adorned with columns resting on the backs of lions in an attitude of walking. On the adjoining slab is a representation of a small building — also with columns — on a hill. A figure of a king sculptured on a stele is seen on the left, with an altar in front of it, showing that divine honors were paid to him. The hill is thickly wooded with trees which may be olives, poplars, etc., and on the right is a series of arches on which other trees are planted. Irrigation channels stretch in a long stream to the left and in shorter streams to the right. As this belongs to the time of Ashur-bani-apli, about 650 BC, and refers to that king's operations against his brother Samas-sum-ukin, the king of Babylon, it is clear that something similar to the Hanging Gardens existed before the time of Nebuchadrezzar, and therefore, if it was his queen who had them made, before the time of their reputed founder. This would be the point first reached by the Assyrian army when advancing to the attack. Such a park as is represented here with its hills and streams, and thickly planted trees, must have made the palace in the vicinity the pleasantest, in all probability, in all Babylonia, and excited the admiration of every one who visited the sights of the city.

28. HISTORICAL REFERENCES TO BABYLONIAN BUILDINGS:

The architectural history of the city of Babylon has still to be written, but something is already known about it, especially its central point of interest, the great temple E-sagila, wherein Merodach was worshipped. The 5th year of Sumu-la-ila was known as that in which the great fortress of Babylon was built; and his 22nd was that in which a throne of gold and silver was completed and made for Merodach's supreme abode (paramaha). Later on Abil-Sin, in his 17th year, made a throne(?) for Samash of Babylon; and Hammu-rabi, in his 3rd, 12th and 14th years, also made thrones for the gods — Nannar of Babylon (the Moon-god), Zerpantum, Merodach's consort, and Ishtar of Babylon. Samsuiluna, his son, in his 6th year, placed a "praying statue" in E-sagila before Merodach,

followed, in his 8th, by the dedication of some bright-shining object (mace?) of gold and silver, to the god; and on that occasion it is stated that he made E-sagila to shine like the stars of heaven. Passing over many other references to kings who adorned the temples of the city, the work done there by Agukakrime (circa 1480 BC) may be mentioned. This ruler, who belonged to the Kassite dynasty, not only brought back the images of Merodach and Zer-panitum to their temple, but also restored the building and its shrine, and made rich offerings thereto. Later on, after the destruction of the city by Sennacherib, his son Esarhaddon, and his grandsons Samas-sum-ukin, king of Babylon, and Ashurbani-apli, king of Assyria, all took part in the restoration of Babylon's temples and palaces. The work of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar has already been referred to. In 330 BC (reign of Alexander the Great), an attempt was made, by the tithes of the pious, to clear away the rubbish around E-sangil (E-sagila), but to all appearance no real restorations were made — or, at least, the stage at which they could have been put in hand was not reached. In the year 269 BC Antiochus Soter claims, like Nebuchedrezzar and other Babylonian kings, to have restored the temples E-sagila and E-zida (the latter at Borsippa). Though in late times the temples were more or less dilapidated, the services to all appearance continued to be performed, and may even have gone on until well in the Christian era, Babylonian religion and philosophy being still held in honor as late as the 4th century. The downfall of Babylon as a city began with the founding of Seleucia on the Tigris, in the reign of Seleucus Nicator (after 312 BC). The inhabitants of Babylon soon began to migrate to this new site, and the ruined houses and walls of the old capital ultimately became the haunts of robbers and outlaws. It is said that the walls were demolished by later (Seleucid) kings on that account, and it is not improbable that, with the walls, any houses which may have remained habitable were cleared away. Fortunately, the palaces restored by Nebuchadrezzar were too firmly built to be easily demolished, hence their preservation to the present day.

LITERATURE.

Fried. Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*. 1903; French H. Weissbach, *Das Stadtbild von Babylon*, 1904; R. Koldewey, *Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa*. 1911.

T. G. Pinches

BABEL, TOWER OF

This expression does not occur in the Old Testament, but is used popularly for the tower **l Dø' mi**[mighdol] built by the inhabitants of the world who, traveling in the East, built a city on the Plain of Shinar, with a tower “whose top may reach unto heaven” — an expression which is regarded as meaning “a very high tower.”

1. GENERAL FORM OF BABYLONIAN TEMPLE-TOWERS:

There was a great difference, however, between a Canaanite [mighdol] or watchtower, and the great Tower at Babylon. The watchtower was simply a high structure, probably without any special shape or form, which depended upon the will of the architect and the nature of the ground upon which it was erected. The Tower of Babel or Babylon, however, was a structure peculiar to Babylonia and Assyria. According to all accounts, and judging from the ruins of the various erections extant in those countries, Babylonian towers were always rectangular, built in stages, and provided with an inclined ascent continued along each side to the top. As religious ceremonies were performed thereon, they were generally surmounted by a chapel in which sacred objects or images were kept.

2. THEIR BABYLONIAN NAME:

These erections had, with the Babylonians, a special name: ziqquratu, meaning, apparently, “peak,” or the highest point of a mountain, this word being applied to the mountain-height upon which Ut-napishtim, the Babylonian Noah, offered sacrifices on coming forth from the ark (or ship) when the waters of the great Flood had sufficiently subsided. It has also been thought that they were used as observatories when the Babylonians studied the starry heavens. This is probable, but as these structures were of no great height, it is possible that, in the clear atmosphere of the Babylonian plains, there was no real necessity to go above the surface of the earth when making their observations.

3. WHEREABOUTS OF THE TOWER OF BABEL:

There has been much difference of opinion as to the geographical position of the Tower of Babel. Most writers upon the subject, following the tradition handed down by the Jews and Arabs, have identified it with the great Temple of Nebo in the city of Borsippa, now called the Birs-Nimroud

(explained as a corruption of Birj Nimroud, “Tower of Nimrod”). This building, however, notwithstanding its importance, was to all appearance never regarded by the Babylonians as the Tower of Babel, for the very good reason that it was not situated in Babylon, but in Borsippa, which, though called, in later times, “the second Babylon,” was naturally not the original city of that name. The erection regarded by the Babylonians as the great Tower of their ancient city was E-temen-ana-ki, “the Temple of the foundation of heaven and earth,” called by Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar ziqqurat Babili, “the Tower of Babylon” — the world-renowned temple dedicated to Merodach and his consort Zer-panitum, Babylon’s chief deities.

4. ITS POSITION AT BABYLON:

This structure was situated in the southern portion of the city, not far from the right bank of the Euphrates, and according to Weissbach, is now represented by a depression within which is the original rectangular core of unbaked brick. From its shape, the Arabs have made this site Sahan, “the dish.” These remains of the great temple-tower of Babylon, within the memory of men not so very old, towered, even in its ruined state, high above the surrounding plain. The burnt bricks of the ancient Babylonians, however, who “had brick for stone, and slime (bitumen) for mortar” (~~GEN~~ Genesis 11:3), are still good and have a commercial value, so they were all cleared out, with whatever precious material in the way of antiquities they may have contained, to repair, it is said, the banks of the Hindiye Canal. Certain records in the shape of conical “cylinders,” however, came into the market, and were acquired by the museums of Europe and America. As these refer to the restoration of the building by Nabopolassar, and the part taken by his sons Nebuchadrezzar and Nabu-sum-lisir in the ceremonies attending the rebuilding, it is very probable that they formed part of the spoils acquired.

5. A BABYLONIAN DESCRIPTION OF THE TOWER:

E-temen-ana-ki, to give the Babylonian (Sumerian) name, consisted of six stages built upon a platform, and provided with a sanctuary at the top. A tablet seemingly giving a detailed description of this building was for a time in the hands of the late George Smith in the year 1876. Unfortunately he had not time to give a translation of the document, or to publish the text,

but his detailed account of it (Athenaeum, February 12, 1876) is exceedingly interesting.

First there was the outer court called the “grand court,” measuring, according to G. Smith’s estimate, 1,156 ft. by 900 ft., and a smaller one, called “the court of Ishtar and Zagaga,” 1,056 ft. by 450 ft. Round the court were six gates admitting to the temples:

- (1) the grand gate;
- (2) the gate of the rising sun (east);
- (3) the great gate;
- (4) the gate of the colossi;
- (5) the gate of the canal; and
- (6) the gate of the tower-view.

6. THE PLATFORM:

After this came a space or platform apparently walled — a ki-gallu square in form, and measuring 3 ku each way. Its size is doubtful, as the value of the ku is unknown. The sides of this enclosure faced the cardinal points. In its walls were four gates, one on each side, and named from the points toward which they looked. Within this enclosure stood a large building measuring 10 gar (Smith: 200 ft.) each way. Unfortunately, the name of this erection was damaged, so that its nature and use are uncertain.

7. THE CHAPELS AND SHRINES:

Round the base of the Tower were small temples or chapels dedicated to the various gods of the Babylonians. On the East were 16 shrines, the principal of them being dedicated to Nebo and Tasmetu, his spouse; on the North were two temples dedicated to Ea. (Ae) and Nusku respectively; on the South was a single temple to the two great gods, Anu and Bel (Enlil?). It was on the West, however, that the principal buildings lay — a double house with a court between the wings 35 cubits (Smith: 58 ft.) wide. These two wings were not alike in dimensions, the erection on one side being 100 cubits by 20 (166 ft. by 34 ft.) and on the other 100 cubits by 65 (166 ft. by 108 ft.). In these western chambers stood the couch of the god, and the golden throne mentioned by Herodotus, with

other objects of great value. The couch was stated to have measured 9 cubits by 4 (15 ft. by 6 feet 8 inches).

8. THE TOWER IN ITS FIRST STAGE:

In the center of these groups of buildings stood the great Tower in stages, called by the Babylonians “the Tower of Babel” (ziggurat Babili). The stages decreased from the lowest upward, but each was square in plan. The first or foundation-stage was 15 gar each way by 5 1/2 gar high (300 ft. by 110 ft. high), and seems to have been decorated with the usual double recesses which are a characteristic of Assy-Bab architecture.

9. THE REMAINING STAGES:

The second stage was 13 gar square and 3 gar high (260 ft. by 60 ft.). A term was applied to it which G. Smith did not understand, but he notes that it probably had sloping sides. The stages from the 3rd to the 5th were all of equal height, namely, 1 gar (20 ft.), and were respectively 10 gar (200 ft.), 8 1/3 gar (170 ft.) and 7 gar (140 ft.) square. The dimensions of the 6th stage were omitted, but may be restored in accordance with the others, namely, 5 1/2 gar square (110 ft.) by 1 gar (20 ft.) high.

10. THE CHAPEL AT THE TOP:

On this was raised what Smith calls the 7th stage, namely, the upper temple or sanctuary of the god Bel-Merodach, 4 gar long, 3 1/2 gar broad and 2 1/2 gar high (80 ft., 60 ft., and 50 ft., respectively). He does not mention the statue of the god, but it may be supposed that it was set up in this topmost erection. The total height of the tower above its foundation was therefore 15 gar (300 ft.), the same as the breadth of its base. It cannot be said that it was by any means a beautiful erection, but there was probably some symbolism in its measurements, and in appearance it probably resembled (except the decoration) the temple tower of Calah as restored in the frontispiece to Layard’s *Monuments of Nineveh*, 1st series, in which a step-pyramid with a similarly highbasement stage is shown.

11. HERODOTUS’ DESCRIPTION:

With this detailed description, which is quite what would be expected in a Babylonian account of such a celebrated temple, the description in Herodotus (i.181 ff) agrees. He states that it was a temple square in form,

two furlongs (1,213 ft.) each way, in the midst of which was built a solid tower a furlong square (nearly 607 ft.). This, however, must have been the platform, which, with the six stages and the chapel on the top, would make up the total of eight stages of which Herodotus speaks. The ascent by which the top was reached he describes as running “outside round about all the towers” — wording which suggests, though not necessarily, that it was spiral — i.e. one had to walk round the structure 7 times to reach the top. Representations on Babylonian boundary-stones suggest that this view would be correct, though a symmetrical arrangement of inclined paths might have been constructed which would have greatly improved the design. At the middle of the ascent, Herodotus says, there was a stopping-place with seats to rest upon, which rather favors this idea. At the top of the last tower there was a large cell, and in the cell a large couch was laid, well covered; and by it a golden table. There was no image there, nor did any human being spend the night there, except only a woman of the natives of the place chosen by the god, “as say the Chaldeans who are the priests of this god.” These men told Herodotus that the god often came to the cell, and rested upon the couch, “but,” he adds, “I do not believe them.” After mentioning parallels to this at Egyptian Thebes and Patam in Lycia, he goes on to speak of another cell below (that referred to in G. Smith’s tablet) wherein was a great image of Zeus (Bel-Merodach) sitting, with a footstool and a large table, all of gold, and weighing no less than 800 talents. Outside of this cell was an altar to the god, made of gold; and also another altar, whereon full-grown animals were sacrificed, the golden altar being for sucklings only. The Chaldeans also told him that there was, in the precincts of the building, a statue 12 cubits high, and of solid gold. Darius Hystaspis desired to take possession of this valuable object, but did not venture. His son Xerxes, however, was not so considerate of the feelings of the people and the priesthood, for he also killed the priest when he forbade him to meddle with it.

12. THE BUILDERS OF THE TOWER:

The Bible record does not state who the people were who journeyed in the East and built the city and the Tower. The indefinite “they” might be taken to mean whatever people were there at the time the record was written, and probably presupposes that the reader would certainly know. As the Tower of Babel bears, in the native inscriptions, a Sumero-Akkadian name, it may be supposed that the builders referred to belonged to that race.

13. TRADITIONS CONCERNING ITS DESTRUCTION:

It is noteworthy that nothing is said in Genesis concerning the stoppage of the erection, though they ceased to build the city. Bochart records a Jewish tradition which makes the tower to have been split through to its foundation by fire which fell from heaven — suggested probably by the condition of the tower at “the second Babylon,” i.e. the Birs Nimroud. Another tradition, recorded by Eusebius (Prep. Evang., ix; Chronicon, 13; Syncel. Chron., 44) makes it to have been blown down by the winds; “but when it approached the heavens, the winds assisted the gods, and overturned the work upon its contrivers: and the gods introduced a diversity of tongues among men, who, until that time, had all spoken the same language.”

14. THE MEANING OF “BABEL”:

The place where they built the Tower was called Babylon, on account of the confusion of languages. Here we have again the statement as in Genesis that the meaning of Babel is “confusion.” This, as is well known, is based upon the purely Hebrew etymological law, which makes [balal], “to confuse,” or “mingle,” assume a reduplicate form; but as far as the cuneiform inscriptions, which are now very numerous, give us information, Babel, from baldlu, “to mingle” (the root in question), was an impossibility. But on the Babylonian side, that the rendering of the name as Bab-ili (-ilani), “gate of god” (“of the gods”) was a folk-etymology, is undoubted, notwithstanding that the Sumero-Akkadian form Ka-dingira, with the same meaning, is far from rare. It is noteworthy, however, that one of the forms used by Nebuchadrezzar is Babilam, with the mimmation or “emming,” which is a characteristic of the Babylonian language; moreover, a place-name Babalam also occurs, which may be a still earlier, and perhaps the original, form. Notwithstanding that one would like to see in Babalam, “the place of bringing together,” and in Babilam, “the bringer together,” the termination -am would seem to be an insurmountable difficulty.

15. THE ULTIMATE DESTRUCTION OF THE TOWER:

That the building of the city would have been stopped when the confusion of tongues took place is natural — the departure of the greater part of the inhabitants made this inevitable. When the population increased again, the building of the city was continued, with the result that Babylon ultimately became the greatest city of then known world. The Tower,

notwithstanding what had been said as to its destruction, remained, and when, as happened from time to time, its condition became ruinous, some energetic Babylonian king would restore it. Alexander and Philip of Macedon began clearing away the rubbish to rebuild the great temple of Bclus (Bel-Merodach) connected with it and there is hardly any doubt that the Tower would have been restored likewise, but the untimely death of the former, and the deficient mental caliber of the latter for the ruling of a great empire, put an end to the work. The Tower therefore remained unrepaired — "The tower was exceedingly tall. The third part of it sank down into the ground, a second third was burned down, and the remaining third was standing until the time of the destruction of Babylon" (Rabbi Yehanan, Sanhedhrin, 109, 1).

16. NO IDEA OF REACHING HEAVEN:

Concerning the reputed intention of the builders of the Tower, to carry it as high as the heavens, that, notwithstanding the Talmud and other writings, may be dismissed at once. The intention was to build a very high tower, and that is all that is implied by the words employed. That the Babylonians would have liked their tower to reach heaven may be conceded, and the idea may be taken as symbolical of Babylon's pride, the more especially as they regarded it as "the house of the foundation of heaven and earth." Though at present brought lower than the other temple-towers of Babylonia, its renown remains as one of the great glories of that renowned capital. Dedicated as it was to the gods whom they worshipped, and chiefly to the glory of Merodach, the representative of Babylonian monotheism, the Babylonians' descendants, the native Christians, have no reason to remember this erection of their forefathers with shame, but rather with pride. The rallyingpoint of nations, Babylon, while it existed, was always a great commercial center, and many are the languages which have resounded in the Tower's vicinity. The confusion of tongues led to the Jewish fiction that the air of Babylon and Borsippa caused forgetfulness, and was therefore injurious to students of the Law, causing them to forget it as the builders of the Tower had of old forgotten their speech (Rashi, Sanhedhrin, 109, 1). This, however, did not prevent the rabbis of Babylon from being more celebrated than those of the Holy Land, and even of Jerusalem itself.

See also ASTRONOMY.

T. G. Pinches

BABI

<ba'-bi> (Codex Alexandrinus, [Βαβί, Babi]; Codex Vaticanus, [Βαίήρ, Baier] = Bebai (^{<1981>}Ezra 8:11). The descendants of Babi returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:37).

BABYLON IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

Babylon [Βαβυλῶν, Babulon], is used in New Testament in at least two different senses:

1. MESOPOTAMIAN BABYLON:

In ^{<4011>}Matthew 1:11,12,17; ^{<4078>}Acts 7:43 the old Mesop city is plainly meant. These all refer to the captivity in Babylon and do not demand any further discussion.

2. SYMBOLIC SENSE:

All the references to Babylon in Revelation are evidently symbolic. Some of the most important passages are Rev. 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2,10,21. In Rev. 17:5 Babylon is designated as [*musterion*]. This undoubtedly indicates that the name is to be understood figuratively. A few interpreters have believed that Jerusalem was the city that was designated as Babylon, but most scholars hold that Rome was the city that was meant. That interpretation goes back at least to the time of Tertullian (Adv. Marc., iii. 13). This interpretation was adopted by Jerome and Augustine and has been commonly accepted by the church. There are some striking facts which point to Rome as the city that is designated as Babylon.

(1) The characteristics ascribed to this Babylon apply to Rome rather than to any other city of that age:

- (a) as ruling over the kings of the earth (^{<6178>}Revelation 17:18);
- (b) as sitting on seven mountains (^{<6179>}Revelation 17:9);
- (c) as the center of the world's merchandise (^{<6183>}Revelation 18:3,11-13);
- (d) as the corrupter of the nations (^{<6172>}Revelation 17:2; 18:3; 19:2);
- (e) as the persecutor of the saints (^{<6176>}Revelation 17:6).

(2) Rome is designated as Babylon in the Sibylline Oracles (5 143), and this is perhaps an early Jewish portion of the book. The comparison of Rome to Babylon is common in Jewish apocalyptic literature (see 2 Esdras and the Apocrypha Baruch).

(3) Rome was regarded by both Jews and Christians as being antagonistic to the kingdom of God, and its downfall was confidently expected. This conception is in accord with the predicted downfall of Babylon (~~cf~~⁴⁸ Revelation 14:8; 18:2,10-21). As Babylon had been the oppressor of Israel, it was natural that this new power, which was oppressing the people of God, should be designated as Babylon.

3. IN 1 PETER:

In 5:13 Babylon is designated as the place from which 1 Peter was written. Down to the time of the Reformation this was generally understood to mean Rome, and two cursives added “en Roma.” Since the Reformation, many scholars have followed Erasmus and Calvin and have urged that the Mesopotamian Babylon is meant. Three theories should be noted:

(1) That the Egyptian Babylon, or Old Cairo; is meant. Strabo (XVII, 807) who wrote as late as 18 AD, says the Egyptian Babylon was a strong fortress founded by certain refugees from the Mesopotamian Babylon. But during the 1st century this was not much more than a military station, and it is quite improbable that Peter would have gone there. There is no tradition that connects Peter in any way with Egypt.

(2) That the statement is to be taken literally and that the Mesopotamian Babylon is meant. Many good scholars hold to this view, and among these are Weiss and Thayer, but there is no evidence that Peter was ever in Babylon, or that there was even a church there during the 1st century. Mark and Silvanus are associated with Peter in the letter and there is no tradition that connects either of them with Babylon. According to Josephus (Antiquities, XVIII, ix, 5-9), the Jews at this time had largely been driven out of Babylon and were confined to neighboring towns, and it seems improbable that Peter would have made that his missionary field.

(3) That Rome was the city that was designated as Babylon. The Apocalypse would indicate that the churches would understand the symbolic reference, and it seems to have been so understood until the time

of the Reformation. The denial of this position was in line with the effort to refute Peter's supposed connection with the Roman church. Ancient tradition, however, makes it seem quite probable that Peter did make a visit to Rome (see Lightfoot, Clement, II, 493 ff).

Internal evidence helps to substantiate theory that Rome was the place from which the letter was written. Mark sends greetings (1 Pet 15:13), and we know he had been summoned to Rome by the apostle Paul (2 Tim 4:11). The whole passage, "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you," seems to be figurative, and that being true, it is natural that Babylon should have been used instead of Rome. The character of the letter as a whole would point to Rome as the place of writing. Ramsay thinks this book is impregnated with Roman thought beyond any other book in the Bible (see *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 286).

A.W. Fortune

BABYLON IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

See BABEL, BABYLON.

BABYLONIA

<bab-i-lo'-ni-a>

Babylonia is a plain which is made up of the alluvial deposits of the mountainous regions in the North, where the Tigris and Euphrates have their source. The land is bounded on the North by Assyria and Mesopotamia; on the East by Elam, separated by the mountains of Elam; on the South by the sea marshes, and the country Kaldu (Chaldaeae); and on the West by the Syrian desert. Some of the cities of the lower country were seaport towns in the early period, but now are far inland. This land-making process continues even at the present time at the rate of about 70 ft. a year.

This plain, in the days when Babylonia flourished, sustained a dense population. It was covered with a network of canals, skillfully planned and regulated, which brought prosperity to the land, because of the wonderful fertility of the soil. The neglect of these canals and doubtless, also, the change of climate, have resulted in altered conditions in the country. It has become a cheerless waste. During some months of the year, when the inundations take place, large portions of the land are partially covered with swamps and marshes. At other times it looks like a desolate plain.

1. MOUNDS:

Throughout the land there are seen, at the present time, ruin-hills or mounds of accumulation of debris, which mark the site of ancient cities. Some of these cities were destroyed in a very early era, and were never rebuilt. Others were occupied for millenniums, and their history extends far into the Christian era. The antiquities generally found in the upper stratum of the mounds which were occupied up to so late a period, show that they were generally inhabited by the Jews, who lived there after the Babylonians had disappeared.

2. EXPLORATIONS:

The excavations conducted at various sites have resulted in the discovery, besides antiquities of almost every character, of hundreds of thousands of inscriptions on clay and stone, but principally on the former material. At Tello more than 60,000 tablets were found, belonging largely to the administrative archives of the temple of the third millennium BC. At Nippur about 50,000 inscriptions were found, many of these also belonging to temple archives. But about 20,000 tablets and fragments found in that city came from the library of the school of the priests, which had been written in the third millennium BC. At Sippar, fully 30,000 tablets were found, many being of the same general character, also representing a library. At Delehem and Djokha, temple archives of the same period as those found at Tello have come to light in great numbers, through the illicit diggings of Arabs. Babylon, Borsippa, Kish, Erech and many other cities have yielded to the explorer and the Arab diggers inscribed documents of every period of Babylonian history, and embracing almost every kind of literature, so that the museums and libraries of America and Europe have stored up unread inscriptions numbering hundreds of thousands. Many also are in the possession of private individuals. After the work of excavating Babylonia has been completed and the inscriptions deciphered, many of the pre-Christian centuries in Babylonian history will be better known than some of those of our Christian era. The ancient history of the Babylonians will be reconstructed by the help of these original sources. Lengthy family genealogies will be known, as indeed in some instances is now the case, as well as the Babylonian contemporaries of Ezekiel, Abraham and all the other Biblical characters.

3. NAMES:

The Greek name of Babylonia which is in use at the present time is derived from the name of the city of Babylon, the capital and chief city of the land from the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon, about 2000 BC (*see BABYLON*). The name of the land in the very earliest period which is represented by antiquities, and even inscribed objects, is not known. But in a comparatively early age the northern part is called Uri, and the southern part, Engi or En-gira. The second part of the latter name is perhaps the same as in Su-gir, which is thought to be the origin of the Old Testament Shinar. Su-gir and Su-mer are names of the same country. And inasmuch as Mer and Gir were names of the same west Semitic deity, who played an important role in the early history of Babylonia, it is not improbable that the element Su is also to be identified with the ancient name of Mesopotamia. Su is also in Su-bartu, the name of the country to the North. This name is also written Su-Gir.

Subsequent to 2000 BC the ideograms read in Sumerian, Uri and Engi, were pronounced in SemBab, Accad and Sumer. The former received its name from the capital of the kingdom Accad, one of the cities mentioned in ~~Gen~~Genesis 10:10. The title, “king of Accad and Sumer” was used by rulers as late as the 1st millennium BC.

The name by which the land is known in the second millennium BC is Kar-Duniash, the exact derivation of which is in doubt. Kar means “garden, land” in Semitic and Sumerian; and Duniash being preceded by the determinative for deity, has been regarded as a name of a Cassite god. A more recently advanced explanation is that Duniash is equivalent to Bel-malati, which means “lord of lands.” The meaning of the name, as stated, must be regarded as undetermined.

In the time of the late Assyrian empire a nation in the extreme southern part of the land, called by the Greeks Chaldea, which is derived from the name Kaldu, came into existence. In the Assyrian historical inscriptions the land is usually called Bit-Yakin. This people seems to have issued from Aramaic Under Biblical. Merodach-baladan they ruled Babylonia for a time. The Neo-Bab Dynasty, founded by Nabopolassar, is supposed to be Chaldean in origin, in consequence of which the whole land in the Greek period was called Chaldea.

4. SEMITES:

Two distinct races are found occupying the land when we obtain the first glimpses of its history. The northern part is occupied by the Semites, who are closely allied to the Amorites, Arameans and Arabs; and the southern part by a non-Sem people called Sumerians. Their cultures had been originally distinct, but when they first become known to us there has taken place such an amalgamation that it is only by the knowledge of other Semitic cultures that it is possible to make even a partial differentiation of what was Sem-Bab and what was Sumerian. The Semites, it would almost seem, entered the land after the Sumerians had established themselves, but this can only be regarded as a conjecture.

5. SUMERIANS:

Although the earliest Sumerian settlement belongs to a remote period, few traces of the pre-historic Sumerian have been found. The archaeological remains indicate that this non-Sem race is not indigenous to the land, and that when they came into the country they had already attained to a fair degree of culture. But there is no evidence, as yet, in what part of the ancient world the elements of their culture were evolved, although various attempts have been made by scholars to locate their original home.

6. HOME OF THE SEMITES:

The home of the Semites has been placed in different parts of the ancient world. A number of scholars look to Arabia and others to Africa for their original habitation, although their theories generally are not based upon much archaeological evidence. Unquestionably, the previous, if not the original home of the Semitic Babylonians, is to be found in the land of the Amorites, that is in Syria. In the earliest known period of Babylonian history, which apparently belongs to the age not very far removed from the time when the Semites entered Babylonia, Amurru was an important factor in the affairs of the nations, and it was a land which the world conquerors of Babylonia, both Sumerian and Semitic, endeavored to subjugate. This points to the fact that the culture of Amurru was then already old. Egyptian inscriptions fully substantiate this. We look to the land of the Amorites as the home of the Semitic Babylonians, because of the important part played by the chief god of that land Amurru or Uru, in the Babylonian religion and nomenclature. In fact nearly all of the original names of the Semitic Babylonian sun-deities are derived from the names and epithets of the great

Sun-god of the Amorites and Arameans (see Amurru, 108 ff). These and many other considerations point to Amurru, or the land of the Amorites, as the previous home of the Semites who migrated into Babylonia and who eventually became masters of the land.

7. IMMIGRATION:

The original settlements in Babylonia, as stated above, belong to a prehistoric time, but throughout the history of the land fresh Semitic migrations have been recognized. In the Isin and First Dynasty of Babylonia, Amorites or Canaanites seem to flood the country. In the second millennium a foreign people known as Cassites ruled Babylonia for nearly six centuries. The nomenclature of the period shows that many Hittites and Mittanaeans as well as Cassites lived in Babylonia. In the first millennium the thousands of names that appear in the contract literature indicate a veritable Babel of races: Egyptians, Elamites, Persians, Medes, Tabalites, Hittites, Cassites, Ammorites, Edomites, notably Hebrews, are among the peoples that occupied the land. The deportation of the Israelites by the Assyrian kings and of the Jews by the Babylonian kings, find confirmation besides the historical inscriptions in the names of Hebrews living in Babylonia in the corresponding periods.

8. LANGUAGE:

The languages of Babylonia are Semitic and Sumerian. The latter is an agglutinative tongue like the Turkish, and belongs to that great unclassifiable group of languages, called for the sake of convenience, Turanian. It has not been shown, as yet, to be allied to any other known language. The Semitic language known as the Babylonian, with which the Assyrian is practically identical, is of the common Semitic stock. After the Semites entered the land, their language was greatly influenced by the Sumerian tongue. The Semites being originally dependent upon the Sumerian scribes, with whom the script had originated, considered in connection with the fact that the highly developed culture of the Sumerians greatly influenced that of the Semites, brought about the peculiar amalgamation known as Babylonian. The language is, however, distinctively Semitic, but it has a very large percentage of Sumerian loan-words. Not knowing the cognate tongues of the Sumerian, and having a poor understanding of the pronunciation of that language, it is impossible

to ascertain, on the other hand, how much the Sumerian language was influenced by the Semites.

In the late period another Semitic tongue was used extensively in the land. It was not because of the position occupied by the Arameans in the political history of western Asia, that their language became the lingua franca of the first millennium BC. It must have been on account of the widespread migrations of the people. In the time of Sennacherib it seems to have been used as the diplomatic language in Assyria as well as among the Hebrews, as the episode in ^{<1283>}2 Kings 18:26 would show. Then we recall the story of Belshazzar, and the edicts of the late period referred to in the Old Testament, which were in Aramaic (^{<1507>}Ezra 4:7, etc.). In Assyria and Babylonia, many contract tablets have been found with Aramaic reference notes written upon them, showing that this was the language of those who held the documents. The Hebrews after the exile used Aramaic. This would seem to point to Babylonia as the place where they learned the language. The Babylonian language and the cuneiform script continued to be used until the 3rd or 2nd century BC, and perhaps even later, but it seems that the Aramaic had generally supplanted it, except as the literary and legal language. In short the tongue of the common people or the spoken language in all probability in the late period was Aramaic.

9. SCRIPT:

The cuneiform writing upon clay was used both by the Sumerians and the Semites. Whether this script had its origin in the land, or in the earlier home of the Sumerians, remains a question. It is now known that the Elamites had their own system of writing as early as that of the earliest found in Babylonia; and perhaps it will be found that other ancient peoples, who are at the present unknown to us, also used the cuneiform script. A writing similar to the Babylonian was in use at an early time in Cappadocia. The Hittites and other peoples of that region also employed it. The origin of the use of clay as a writing material, therefore, is shrouded in mystery, but as stated above, the system used by the Semites in Babylonia was developed from the Sumerian.

The script is not alphabetic, but ideographic and phonetic, in that respect similar to the Chinese. There are over 500 characters, each one of which has from one to many values. The combination of two or more characters also has many values. The compilation of the values of the different signs

used in various periods by both the Sumerians and Assyrians numbers at the present about 25,000, and the number will probably reach 30,000.

10. ARCHITECTURE:

The architecture of Babylonia is influenced by the fact that the building material, in this alluvial plain, had to be of brick, which was largely sun-dried, although in certain prosperous eras there is much evidence of kiln-dried bricks having been used. The baked brick used in the earliest period was the smallest ever employed, being about the size of the ordinary brick used at the present time. The size of the bricks in the era prior to the third millennium varied from this to about 6 x 10 x 3 inches at Nippur, Sargon and his son Naram-Sin used a brick, the largest found, about 20 inches square, and about 4 inches in thickness. Following the operations of these kings at Nippur is the work of Ur-Engur, who used a brick about 14 inches square and nearly 4 inches in thickness. This size had been used at Tello prior to Sargon's time, and was thereafter generally employed. It remained the standard size of brick throughout the succeeding centuries of Babylonian history. Adobes, of which the greater portion of the buildings were constructed, were usually double the thickness of kiln-dried bricks. The pillar made of bricks, as well as the pilaster constructed of the same material, seems to have come into use at a very early age, as is shown by the excavations at Tello.

A large number of Babylonian builders had the brick makers employ brick stamps which gave their names and frequently their titles, besides the name of the temple for which the bricks were intended. These enable the excavator to determine who the builders or restorers were of the buildings uncovered. Naturally, in a building like the temple of Enlil at Nippur, inscribed bricks of many builders covering a period of over 2,000 years were found. These by the help of building inscriptions, which have been found, enable scholars to rewrite considerable of the history of certain Babylonian temples. The walls of the city were also built of clay bricks, principally adobes. The walls usually were of very great thickness.

Clay was also employed extensively in the manufacture of images, weights, drains, playthings, such as animals, baby rattles, etc., and of inscriptions of every kind. Pottery, with the exception of the blue glaze employed in the late period, was usually plain, although some traces of painted pottery have been found. Although every particle of stone found in Babylonia was

carried into the country, either by man or by inundations, still in certain periods it was used freely for statues, steles, votive objects, and in all periods for door sockets, weights and seal cylinders. Building operations in stone are scarcely known in Babylonia until perhaps the time of the greatest of all ancient builders, Nebuchadrezzar II, who laid a pavement in the causeway of Babylon, Aa-ibur-sabu, with blocks of stone from a mountain quarry.

See BABYLON.

11. ART:

The sculpture of the Sumerians, although in most instances the hardest of materials was used, is one of the great achievements of their civilization. Enough examples have been found to trace the development of their art from comparatively rude reliefs of the archaic period to the finished sculpture of Gudea's time, third millennium BC, when it reached a high degree of excellence. The work of the sculpture of this age shows spirit and originality in many respects unique. In the earliest period the Babylonians attempted the round, giving frequently the main figures in full face. The perfection of detail, in their efforts to render true to life, makes their modeling very superior in the history of art. The Sumerian seems to have been able to overcome difficulties of technique which later sculptors systematically avoided.

Practically every Babylonian had his own personal seal. He used it as the signature is used at the present time or rather as the little stamp upon which is engraved the name of the individual at the present time, in the Orient, to make an impression upon the letter which was written for him by a public scribe. Thousands of these ancient seals have been found. They were cut out of all kinds of stone and metal. The style in the early period was usually cylindrical, with a hole passing lengthwise through them. In the late period the signet was commonly used. Many of these gems were exquisitely cut by lapidists of rare ability. Some of the very best work of this art belongs to the third millennium BC. The boldness in outline, and the action displayed are often remarkable. The most delicate saws, drills and other tools must have been employed by the early lapidist. Some of his early work is scarcely surpassed in the present age.

The gold and silver smiths of the early age have left us some beautiful examples of their art and skill. A notable one is the silver vase of Entemena

of Lagash, mounted on a bronze pedestal, which stands on four feet. There is a votive inscription engraved about its neck. The bowl is divided into two compartments. On the upper are engraved seven heifers, and on the lower four eagles with extended wings, in some respects related to the totem or the coat of arms of Lagash. While attention to detail is too pronounced, yet the whole is well rendered and indicates remarkable skill, no less striking than the well-known work of their Egyptian contemporaries. Bronze was also used extensively for works of art and utensils. Some remarkable specimens of this craft have been found at Tello.

In studying the magnificent remains of their art, one is thoroughly impressed with the skill displayed, and with the fact that there must have been a long period of development prior to the age to which these works belong, before such creations could have been possible. Although much of the craftsman's work is crude, there is considerable in the sculpture and engraving that is well worthy of study. And in studying these remains one is also impressed with the fact that they were produced in an alluvial plain.

12. LITERATURE:

The literature in a narrow sense is almost entirely confined to the epics, which are of a religious character, and the psalms, hymns, incantations, omens, etc. These are the chief remains of their culture.

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

In a general sense almost every kind of literature is found among the hundreds of thousands of clay tablets unearthed in Babylonia. The inscribed votive objects are of all kinds and descriptions. The stone vase taken in booty was dedicated to the deity of the conqueror. The beautiful piece of lapis lazuli, agate, cornelian, etc., obtained, was inscribed and devoted in the same way. Slabs, tablets and cones of all shapes and sizes, were inscribed with the king's name and titles, giving the different cities over which he ruled and referring especially to the work that he had accomplished for his deity. From the decipherment of these votive objects much valuable data are gathered for the reconstruction of the ancient history of the land.

The same is true of what are known as building inscriptions, in which accounts of the operations of the kings in restoring and enlarging temples, shrines, walls and other city works are given. Canal digging and dredging,

and such works by which the people benefited, are frequently mentioned in these inscriptions.

Epistolary literature, for example, the royal letters of Hammurabi, the diplomatic correspondence found in Egypt (*see TELL EL-AMARNA*) or the royal letters from the Library of Ashurbanipal (*see ASHURBANIPAL*), as well as the private correspondence of the people, furnishes valuable historical and philological data.

The thousands of tablets found in the school libraries of Sippar and Nippur, as well as of the library of Ashurbanipal, among which are all kinds of inscriptions used in the schools of the priests and scribes, have furnished a great deal of material for the Assyrian dictionary, and have thrown much light upon the grammar of the language. The legal literature is of the greatest importance for an understanding of the social conditions of the people. It is also valuable for comparative purposes in studying the codes of other peoples.

See CODE OF HAMMURABI.

The commercial or legal transactions, dated in all periods, from the earliest times until the latest, also throw important light upon the social conditions of the people. Many thousands of these documents have been found, by the help of which the very life that pulsed in the streets of Babylonian cities is restored.

The administrative documents from the temple archives also have their value, in that they furnish important data as regards the maintenance of the temples and other institutions; and incidentally much light on the nationality and religion of the people, whose names appear in great numbers upon them. The records are receipts of taxes or rents from districts close by the temples, and of commercial transactions conducted with this revenue. A large portion of these archives consists of the salary payments of storehouse officials and priests. There seems to have been a host of tradesmen and functionaries in connection with the temple. Besides the priest, elder, seer, seeress, sorcerer, sorceress, singer, etc., there were the farmer, weaver, miller, carpenter, smith, butcher, baker, porter, overseer, scribe, measurer, watchman, etc. These documents give us an insight into Babylonian system of bookkeeping, and show how carefully the administrative affairs of the temple were conducted. In fact the temple

was provided for and maintained along lines quite similar to many of our modern institutions.

13. LIBRARIES:

The discovery of the Library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh speaks volumes for the culture of Assyria, but that culture was largely borrowed from the Babylonians. Much that this library contained had been secured from Babylonian libraries by the scribes employed by Ashurbanipal. In every important center there doubtless existed schools and libraries in connection with the temples. At Nippur, in 1890, Dr. J.P. Peters found such a library, but unfortunately, although he termed it such, his Assyriologists did not recognize that one of the greatest discoveries of antiquity had been made. It remained for Dr. J. H. Haynes, a decade later, to discover another portion of this library, which he regarded as such, because of the large number of tablets which he uncovered. Pere Scheil, prior to Dr. Haynes' discovery, had the good fortune while at Sippar to discover a part of the school and library of that important center. Since Professor Scheil's excavations, Arabs have unearthed many inscriptions of this library, which have found their way to museums and into the hands of private individuals.

The plan of the Nippur Library, unearthed by Dr. Haynes, has been published by Mr. C. Fisher, the architect of the Nippur expedition (see Clay, *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, 183). Professor Scheil, in publishing his results, has also given a plan of the school he discovered, and a full description of its arrangements, as well as the pedagogical methods that had been employed in that institution of learning. This has also been attempted by others, but in a less scientific manner. One of the striking features of these libraries is the use of the large reference cylinders, quadrangular, pentagonal and hexagonal in shape. There was a hole cut lengthwise through them for the purpose of mounting them like revolving stands. These libraries, doubtless, contained all the works the Babylonians possessed on law, science, literature and religion. There are lexical lists, paradigm tablets, lists of names, of places, countries, temples, rivers, officers, stones, gods, etc. Sufficient tablets have been deciphered to determine their general character. Also hundreds of exercise tablets have been found, showing the progress made by pupils in writing, in mathematics, in grammar, and in other branches of learning. Some tablets appear to have been written after dictation. Doubtless, the excavators found the waste heaps of the school, where these tablets had been thrown

for the purpose of working them over again as raw material, for new exercises. The school libraries must have been large. Considering for instance that the ideographic and phonetic values of the cuneiform signs in use numbered perhaps 30,000, even the syllabaries which were required to contain these different values must have been many in number, and especially as tablets, unlike books made of paper, have only two sides to them. And when we take into consideration all the different kinds of literature which have been found, we must realize that these libraries were immense, and numbered many thousands of tablets.

14. PERSONAL NAMES:

In modern times the meaning of names given children is rarely considered; in fact, in many instances the name has suffered so much through changes that it is difficult to ascertain its original meaning. Then also, at present, in order to avoid confusion the child is given two or more names. It was not so with the ancient Babylonian. Originally the giving of a name was connected with some special circumstance, and though this was not always the case throughout the history of Babylonia, the correct form of the name was always preserved.

The name may have been an expression of their religious faith. It may have told of the joy experienced at the birth of an heir. It may even betray the suffering that was involved at the birth of the child, or the life that the parents had lived. In short, the names afford us an intimate glimpse into the everyday life of the people.

The average Babylonian name is theophorous, and indicates one of the deities worshipped by the family, and often the city. For example, it is suggestive that persons with names compounded with Enlil and Ninib hailed from Nippur. Knowing the deities of the surrounding people we have also important evidence in determining the origin of peoples in Babylonia having foreign names. For example, if a name is composed of the Hittite deity Teshup, or the Amorite deity Amurru, or the Aramean god Dagan, or the Egyptian god Esi (Isis), foreign influence is naturally looked for from the countries represented. Quite frequently the names of foreign deities are compounded with Babylonian elements, often resulting from mixed marriages.

Theophorous names are composed of two, three, four and even five elements. Those having two or three elements predominate. Two-element

names have a diety plus a verbal form or a subst.; or vice versa: for example, Nabu-na'id (Nabonidus), "Nebo is exalted," or Shulman-asharedu (Shaimaneser), "Shalman is foremost." Many different combinations are found in three-element names which are composed of the name of the deity, a subst., a verbal form, a pronominal suffix, or some other form of speech, in any of the three positions. Explanations of a few of the familiar Biblical. names follow: Sin-akhe-erba (Sennacherib), "Sin has increased the brothers"; Marduk-apal-iddin (Mero-dach-baladan), "Marduk has given a son"; Ashurakh-iddin (Esarhaddon), "Ashur has given a brother"; Ashur-bani-apal, "Ashur is creating a son"; Nabu-kudurri-usur (Nebuchadrezzar), "O Nebo, protect the boundary"; Amel-Marduk (Evil Merodach), "Man of Marrink"; Bel-shar-usur (Belshazzar), "O Bel, protect the king." Some Babylonian names mentioned in the Bible are really of foreign origin, for example, Amraphel and Sargon. Amraphel originally is west Semitic and is written Hammurabi (pronounced Chammu-rabi, the first letter being the Semitic cheth). Sargon was perhaps originally Aramean, and is composed of the elements shar and the god Gan. When written in cuneiform it was written Shargani, and later Sharrukin, being translated "the true king." Many names in use were not theophorous; for example, such personal names as Ululd, "the month Ulul"; names of animals, as Kalba, "dog," gentilic names, as Akkadai, "the Akkadian," names of crafts, as Pacharu, "potter," etc.

The literature abounds in hypochoristica. One element of a name was used for the sake of shortness, to which usually a hypochoristica suffix was added, like Marduka (Mordecai). That is, the ending a or ai was added to one of the elements of a longer name.

15. HISTORY OF KINGDOMS:

The written history of Babylonia at the present begins from about 4200 BC. But instead of finding things crude and aboriginal in this, the earliest period, the remains discovered show that the people had attained to a high level of culture. Back of that which is known there must lie a long period of development. This is attested in many ways; for instance, the earliest writing found is so far removed from the original hieroglyphs that it is only possible to ascertain what the original pictures were by knowing the values which the signs possessed. The same conclusion is ascertained by a study of the art and literature. Naturally, as mentioned above, it is not impossible that this development took place in a previous home of the inhabitants.

The history of early Babylonia is at present a conflict of the kings and patesis (priest-kings) of the different city-kingdoms, for supremacy over each other, as well as over the surrounding peoples. The principal states that figure in the early history are: Kish, Lagash, Nippur, Akkad, Umma, Erech, Ur and Opis. At the present time more is known of Lagash, because the excavations conducted at that site were more extensive than at others. This makes much of our knowledge of the history of the land center about that city. And yet it should be stated that the hegemony of Lagash lasted for a long period, and the kingdom will ultimately occupy a prominent position when the final history of the land is written. Nippur, where considerable work was also done, was not the seat of rulers, but the sacred city of the god Enlil, to whom the kings of other cities generally did obeisance. Following is a list of known rulers of the different city-kingdoms.

16. KISH:

El-Ohemir, identified as the ancient city of Kish, not far from Babylon, is one of the oldest Semitic centers of the land. No systematic excavations have been conducted at this site, but besides the inscriptions which the Arabs have unearthed, several of the rulers are known to us through votive inscriptions discovered at Nippur and elsewhere. The rulers of Kish are: Utug p. (patesi), circa 4200 BC; Mesilim k. (king), circa 4000 BC; Lugal-tarsi k.; Enbi-Ishtar k.; Manishtusu k., circa 2650 BC; Urnmush k., circa 2600; Manana k.; Sumu-ditana k. and Tanium k.

17. LAGASH:

The excavations by the French under Deuteronomy Sarsez and Cross at Tello, the ancient city Lagash, have yielded more inscriptions of ancient Babylonian rulers than those at any other site. Lagash was destroyed about 2000 BC, and only partially rebuilt in the post-Bab period. The known rulers are: Lugal-shag-Engur patesi, circa 4000 BC, contemporary with Mesilim k. of Kish; ***Badu k.; ***En-khegal k.; Ur-Nina k.; Akurgal p.; Eannatum p. and k.; Enannatum I p.; Entemena p.; Enannatum II p.; Enetarzi p.; Enlitarzi p.; Lugal-anda p.; Uru-kagina k., contemporary with Lugal-zaggisi, k. of Uruk; Engilsa p., contemporary with Manishtusu k. of Kish; Lugul-ushumgal p., contemporary with Sargon of Accad; Ur-Babbar p., contemporary with Naram-Sin of Accad; Ur-E p.; Lugal-bur p.; Basha-Kama p.; Ur-Mama p.; Ug-me p.; Ur-Bau p.; Gudea p.; Nammakhini p.;

Ur-gar p.; Ka-azag p.; Galu-Bau p.; Galu-Gula p.; Ur-Ninsun p.: Ur-Ningirsu p.; contemporary with Ur-Engur k. of Ur-abba p.; ***Galu-ka zal p.; ***Galuandul p.; ***Ut-Lama I p.; ***Alla, ***Ur-Lama II p.; contemporary with Dungi k. of Ur; Arad-Nannar p. Unfortunately, with the exception of about onethird of these rulers, the exact order is yet to be ascertained. (Note: Asterisk denotes unidentified forms.)

18. ADAB:

The mounds of Bismaya which have been identified as Adab were partially excavated by Dr. Edgar J. Banks, for the University of Chicago. Its remains indicate that it is one of the oldest cities discovered. A ruler named Esar, circa 4200 BC, is known from a number of inscriptions, as well as a magnificent statue of the king, discovered by Dr. Banks.

19. NIPPUR:

The large group of mounds covering an area, the circumference of which is three miles, called in ancient times Nippur, but now Noufar, was excavated as mentioned above by Dr. Peters and Dr. Haynes for the University of Pennsylvania. While a great number of Babylonian kings and patesis are represented by inscriptions discovered at Nippur, practically all had their seats of government at other places, it being the sacred city.

20. ERECH:

The mounds at the present called Warka, but representing ancient Erech (~~Gen~~Genesis 10:10), covering an area whose circumference is 6 miles, have been tentatively examined by Loftus and other explorers. Many inscriptions have also been unearthed by the Arabs at this site. The rulers of this city known to us are: Ilu-(m)a-ilu, Lugal-zaggisi k., contemporary with Urukagina of Lagash; Lugal-kigubnidudu k.; Lugal-kisalsi k.; Sin-gashid k., about 2200 BC, and Sin-gamil k.

21. LARSA:

Senkerek known in the Old Testament as Ellasar (~~Gen~~Genesis 14:1), and in the inscriptions as Larsa, has been explored by Loftus and others. The known rulers of the city are: Gungunu k., contemporary of Ur-Ninib k. of Isin; Sumu-ilu; Nur-Adad; Sin-iddinam; Eri-Aku (the Biblical "Arioch")

circa 2000 BC, son of Kudur-Mabug k. of Elam, and Rim-Sin (or Rim-Aku), his brother.

22. SHURUPPAK:

The present Fara, which in ancient times was called Shuruppak, was partially excavated by the Germans under Koldewey, Andraea, and Noeldeke. It is also a very ancient city. It yielded little to the spade of the excavator. It is close by Abu-Hatab, and known as the place where the scenes of the Babylonian Deluge story occurred. Two rulers known from the inscriptions found there are Dada and Iddada, belonging to a comparatively early period.

23. KISURRA:

The site now known as Abu-Hatab is the ancient Kisurra. It was partially excavated by the Germans. It flourished as a city in the third millennium BC. The two rulers of this city that are known are Iddinlu p., and Itur-Shamash p. (?).

24. UMMMA:

The site now called Jokha lying to the Northwest of Lagash is an ancient Sumerian city known as Umma. The site has been explored by Dr. Peters and others, but more recently surveyed by Andraea and Noeldeke. It proved to be a city destroyed in the early period. Arabs have lately found thousands of documents belonging to the ancient archives of the city. Some of the rulers known are: Ush p., Enakalli and Urumma p., contemporaries of Enannatum I of Lagash; Ill p., appointed by Entemena p., of Lagash; Kur-Shesh p., time of Manishtusu; ***Galu-Babbar p.; Ur-nesu p., contemporary of Dungi k., of Ur.

25. ACCAD:

The city mentioned in ~~Gen~~Genesis 10:10 as Accad, one of Nimrod's cities, has not been explored, but is well known by the inscriptions of Sargon and his son Naram-Sin as well as omen-texts of later eras. Sargon was a usurper. He was born in concealment, and sent adrift in an ark of bulrushes like Moses. He was rescued and brought up by Akki, a farmer. He assumed the title "king of the city" (Shar-ali), or "king of Uri" (Shat Uri). Later he conquered the entire country, and became the "king of Accad and Sumer."

In his latter years he extended his conquests to Elam, Amurru and Subartu, and earned for himself the title “king of the Four Quarters,” which his son Naram-Sin inherited. The latter followed up the successes of his father and marched into Magan, in the Sinaitic peninsula. Naram-Sin, as well as his father, was a great builder. Evidences of their operations are seen in many cities. Naram-Sin was succeeded by Bingani, who apparently lost the title “king of the Four Quarters,” being only called “king of the City, or Uri.”

26. OPIS:

The exact site of the city of Opis is still in doubt, but the city is represented by the ruler Zuzu k., who was defeated by Eannatum p., of Lagash.

27. BASIME:

The city Basime also remains unidentified, but is represented by Ibalum p., a contemporary of Manishtusu k., of Kish, and son of Ilurabi, apparently another patesi of that city.

28. DREHEM:

A site not far from Nippur, called Dolehem or Drehem, which was explored by Dr. Peters, has recently yielded thousands of tablets from the Temple archives dated in the reigns of kings in the Ur Dynasty.

29. URUMMA:

The extensive group of mounds lying on the west side of the Euphrates, called Mugayyar, and generally known as Ur of the Chaldees, is the ancient Uruk. It was explored by Taylor and others, and proved to have been an important capital from the middle of the third millennium BC. The dynasty which had made the city its capital is known through inscriptions discovered there and at Tello, Nippur, Drehem and Djokha. Thousands of inscriptions dated in what is commonly called the Ur Dynasty have been published. The dynasty was founded by Ur-Engur, who is conspicuous for his building operations at Nippur and other cities. A dynastic tablet of a much later period, the provenience of which is in doubt, gives the rulers of this dynasty founded about 2400 BC, and the number of years that they reigned.

URUMMA DYNASTY

Ur-Engur, 18 years

Dungi (son), 58 years

Bur-Sin (son), 9 years

Gimil-Sin (son), 7 years

Ibi-Sin (son), 25 years

Five kings, 117 years

The same tablet gives also the following list of the rulers of Isin. Ishbi-Urra, the founder, lived about 2283 BC.

ISIS DYNASTY

Ishbi-Urra, 32 years

Gimil-ilishu (son), 10 years

Idin-Dagan (son), 21 years

Ishme-Dagan (son), 20 years

Libit-Ishtar (son), 11 years

Ur-Ninib, 28 years

Bur-Sin II (son), 28 years

Iter-iqisha (son), 5 years

Urra-imitti (brother), 7 years

Sin-iqisha, 6 months

Enlil-bani, 24 years

Zambia, 3 years

— 5 years

Ea, 4 years

Sin-magir, 11 years

Damiq-ilishu (son), 23 years

Sixteen kings, 225 years and 6 months

30. FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON:

About the time the Nisin Dynasty came to a close, and while the Larsa Dynasty was ruling, the First Dynasty of Babylon was established. Following is a list of 11 rulers of this dynasty who ruled 300 years:

I. FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON

Sumu-abum, 14 years

Sumu-la-el, 36 years

Sabium (son), 14 years

Abil-Sin (son), 18 years

Sin-muballit (son), 20 years

Hammu-rabi (son), 43 years

Samsu-iluna (son), 38 years

Abi-eshuh (son), 28 years

Ammi-Ditana (son), 37 years

Ammi-Zaduga (son), 21 years

Samsu-Ditana (son), 32 years

The First Dynasty of Babylon came into prominence in the reign of Sin-muballit who captured Nisin. Eri-Aku of the Larsa Dynasty shortly afterward took the city. When Hammurabi came to the throne he was subject to Eri-Aku (Bib. Arioch) of Larsa, the son of the Elamite king, Kudur-Mabug. The latter informs us that he was suzerain of Amurru (Palestine and Syria), which makes intelligible the statement in Genesis 14, that the kings of Canaan were subject to the king of Elam, whose name was Chedorlaomer (Kudur-Lagam ar). In his 31st year, Hammurabi, who is the Amraphel of ~~Gen~~ Genesis 14:1, succeeded in throwing off the Elamite yoke, and not only established his independence but also became the complete master of Babylonia by driving out the Elamites.

31. SEALAND DYNASTY:

In the region of the Persian Gulf, south of Babylonia, ruled a dynasty partly contemporaneously with the First Dynasty, extending over the reigns of about five of the last kings, and over several of the Cassite Dynasty, known as the Sealand Dynasty. The historian records for the latter the following list of 11 kings who ruled 368 years:

II. SEALAND DYNASTY

Ilima-ilu, 60 years

Itti-ili-nibi, 55 years

Damqi-ilishu, 36 years

Ishkibal, 15 years

Shushshi (brother), 27 years

Gulkishar, 55 years

Pesh-gal-daramash (son), 50 years

Adara-kalama (son), 28 years

Ekur-ul-anna, 26 years

Melamma-kurkura, 7 years

Ea-gamil, 9 years

32. CASSITE DYNASTY:

The First Dynasty of Babylon came to an end through an invasion of the Hittites. They plundered Babylon and perhaps ruled that city for a number of years. A new dynasty was then established about 1750 BC by a foreign people known as Cassites. There were 36 kings in this dynasty ruling 576 years and 9 months. Unfortunately the tablet containing the list is fragmentary.

III. CASSITE DYNASTY

Gandash, 16 years

Agum I (s), 22 years

Kashtiliash I, usurper, 22 years; born of Ulamburiash and son of Burna-buriash

Du(?) shi (s), 8 years

Abirattash (b ?)

Tazzigurmash (s)

Agum II (s)

— — — — ; — — — — — Long gap

***Kara-indash I, contemporary with Ashur-rimnishesu, k. of Assyria

***Kadashman-Enlil I (s ?)

***Kuri-Galzu I

Burna-buriash II, contemporary of Buzur-Ashur, k. of Assyria

***Kara-Indash II, son-in-law of Ashur-uballit, k. of Assyria

***Nazi-Bugash (usurper)

Kuri-Galzu II (s. of Burna-buriash), 23 years; contemporary of Ashur-uballit, and Enlilnirari, kings of Assyria

Nazi-Maruttash (s), 26 years; contemporary of Adad-nirari I, p. of Assyria.

Kadashman-Turgu (s), 17 years

Kadashman-Enlil II, 7 years

Kudur-Enlil (s), 9 years

Shagarakti-Shuriash (s), 13 years

Kashtiliash II (s), 8 years

Enlil-nadin-shum, 1 1/2 years

Kadashman-Kharbe II, 1 1/2 years

Adad-shum-iddin, 6 years

Adad-shum-usur, 30 years

Meli-Shipak (s?), 15 years

Marduk-apil-iddin (s), 13 years

Zamama-shum-iddin, 1 year

Bel-mu — , 3 years

33. CASSITE RULE:

The region from which these Cassites came has not yet been determined, although it seems to be the district Northeast of Assyria. Gandash, the first king, seems to have enjoyed the all-embracing title, “King of the Four Quarters of the World.” Little is known of the other rulers until Agum II, who claims the rule of the Cassites, Accad, Babel, Padan, Alman and Guti. In his inscriptions he records the conquest of Khani in Asia Minor, and the fact that he brought back to Babylon the statues of Marduk and Zarpanit, which had been carried off by the Hittites. The Cassite rule, while extending over many centuries, was not very prosperous. At Nippur the excavations showed active operations on the part of a few kings in restoring the temple and doing ob eissance to Enlil. The rulers seemed to have conformed to the religion of the land, for few foreign elements have been recognized as having been introduced into it during this era. The many Cassite names found in the inscriptions would indicate an influx from a Cassite quarter of no small proportion. And yet it should be noted that, in the same era, Hittite and Mittanean influence, as is shown by the nomenclature, is as great as the Cassite. It was during this period that Assyria rose to power and influence, and was soon to become the master of the Mesopotamian region.

34. ISIN DYNASTY:

IV. ISIN OR PASHE DYNASTY

11 Kings; began to rule about 1172 BC

Marduk, 17 years

Wanting, 6 years

Nebuchadrezzar I, contemporary of Ashur-resh-ishi, k. of Assyria

Enlil-nadin-apal

Marduk-nadin-akhi, contemporary of Tiglath-pileser I, k. of Assyria

Marduk-shapik-zer-mati, contemporary of Ashur-bel-kala, k. of Assyria

Adad-apal-iddin, 22 years

Marduk-akh-erba, 1 1/2

Marduk-zer, 12 years

Nabu-shum-libur, 8(?) years

35. NEBUCHADEZZAR I:

The most famous king of this dynasty, in fact of this era, was Nebuchadrezzar I, who re-established firmly the rule of Babylon. He carried on a successful expedition into Elam as well as into Amurru where he fought against the Hittite. He also conquered the Lulubites. But in contest for supremacy with Assyria Ashur-reshishi triumphed, and he was forced to retreat ingloriously to Babylon. His successors failed to withstand the Assyrians, especially under Tiglath-pileser I, and were allowed to rule only by sufferance. The Babylonians had lost their prestige; the Assyrians had become the dominant people of the land. Few rulers of the dynasty which followed are known except by name. The dynasties with one exception were of short duration.

36. SEALAND DYNASTY:

V. SEALAND DYNASTY

3 Kings

Simrnash-Shipak, 18 years; about 1042 BC

Ea-mukin-shum, 6 months

Kashshu-nadin-akhi, 3 years

37. BIT-BAZI DYNASTY:

VI. BIT-BAZI DYNASTY

3 Kings

Eulmash-shakin-shum, 17 years; about 1020 BC

Ninib-kudur-usur, 3 years

Shilanihn-Shuqamuna, 3 months

38. OTHER RULERS:

VII. AN ELAMITIC KING, WHOSE NAME IS NOT KNOWN

VIII. 13(?) KINGS WHO RULED 36 YEARS

IX. A DYNASTY OF 5(?) KINGS

X. BABYLONIAN DYNASTY

39. BABYLONIAN DYNASTY:

Following is a partial list of the 22 kings who ruled until the destruction of Babylon by Sennacherib, when the Assyrian kings assumed direct control. Ashurbanipal, however, introduced a new policy and viceroys were appointed.

Shamash-mudammīq

Nabu-shar-ishkun I

Nabu-apal-iddin

Marduk-nadin-shum

Marduk-balatsu-iqbi

Bau-akh-iddin

Nabu-shum-ishkun II

Nabonassar

Nabu-nadin-zer; 747-734 BC

Nabu-shum-ishkun III; 733-732 BC

Nabu-mukin-zer; 731-729 BC

Pul (Tiglath-pileser III); 729-727 BC

Ulula (Shalmaneser v); 727-722 BC

Merodach-baladan I; 722-710 BC.

Sargon; 710-705 BC

Sennacherib; 704-702 BC

Marduk-zakir-shum (1 month)

Merodach-baladan II (9 months)

Bel-ibni; 702-700 BC

Ashur-nadin-shum; 700-694 BC

Nergal-ushezib; 694-693 BC

Mushczib-Marduk; 692-689 BC

Sennacherib; 689-681 BC

Esarhaddon; 681-668 BC

Ashurbanipal; 668-626 BC

Shamash-shum-ukin; 668-648 BC

Kandalanu; 648-626 BC

Ashur-etil-ilani-ukin; 626-

Nabopolassar; 626-

During the time of Sennacherib, Merodach-baladan the Chaldean became a great obstacle to Assyria's maintaining its supremacy over Babylonia. Three times he gained possession of Babylon, and twice had himself proclaimed king. For thirty years he plotted against Assyria. What is learned from the inscriptions concerning him furnishes an interesting commentary on the sending of the embassy, in 704 BC, to Hezekiah (²⁰¹²2 Kings 20:12; ²³⁰¹Isaiah 39:1) in order to induce him to revolt against Assyria, which he knew would help his own cause. Finally Sennacherib, in 690, after he had experienced much trouble by the repeated uprisings of the Babylonians, and the aspirations of Merodach-baladan, endeavored to obliterate Babylon from the map. His son and successor Esarhaddon, however, tried to make Babylon again happy and prosperous. One of his

first acts was to send back to Babylon the statue of Bel-Merodach. He rebuilt the city, and also restored other Babylonian temples, for instance, that of Enlil at Nippur. The Babylonians solemnly declared him king. Ashurbanipal, his son and successor, followed his policy. The evidence of his operations at Nippur is everywhere seen in the shape of stamped, kiln-dried bricks.

Before Esarhaddon died, he had planned that Babylonia should become independent and be ruled by his son, Shamash-shum-ukin, while Assyria he handed down to Ashurbanipal. But when the latter came to the throne, Assyria permitted the former only to be appointed viceroy of Babylon. It seems also that even some portions of Babylonia were ruled directly by Ashurbanipal.

After fifteen years Shamash-shum-ukin rebelled and attempted to establish his independence, but Sennacherib besieged Babylon and took it, when Shamash-shum-ukin destroyed himself. Kandalanu was then appointed viceroy, and ruled over part of the country. Nabopolassar was the last viceroy appointed by Assyria. At last the time had arrived for the Babylonians to come again unto their own. Nabopolassar who perhaps was a Chaldean by origin, made an alliance with the Umman Manda. This he strengthened by the marriage of his son Nebuchadrezzar to the daughter of Astyages, the king. Nineveh finally fell before the Umman Manda hordes, and was razed to the ground. This people took possession of Northern Assyria. The Armenian vassal states, and Southern Assyria, as well as the title to Palestine, Syria and Egypt, fell to Babylonia.

40. NEO-BABYLONIAN RULERS:

RULERS OF NEO-BABYLONIAN EMPIRE

Nabopolassar; 625-604 BC

Nebuchadrezzar II (s); 604-568 BC

Evil-Merodach (s); 561-560 BC

Neriglissar (brother-in-law); 559-556 BC

Labosoarchad (s); 556 BC

Nabonidus; 555-539 BC

Cyrus conquered Babylonia in 539 BC

Nabopolassar having established himself king of Babylon became the founder of the neo-Babylonian empire. He was succeeded by his son, Nebuchadrezzar II, who like Hammurabi and Sargon is among the greatest known characters in Babylonian history. He is the Biblical Nebuchadrezzar who carried the Jews into captivity. There are a number of lengthy records of Nebuchadrezzar concerning the buildings he erected, as well as of other public acts, but unfortunately only a fragment of a historical inscription referring to him has been found. The building inscriptions portray him as the great builder he is represented to be in the Old Testament (*see BABYLON*). He transformed Babylon into the mistress of the civilized world.

Evil-Merodach, his son and successor, is also mentioned in the Old Testament. Two short reigns followed when the ruling dynasty was overthrown and Nabonidus was placed upon the throne. The king, who delighted in exploring and restoring ancient temples, placed his son at the head of the army. Nabonidus desiring to centralize the religion of Babylonia, brought to Babylon many of the images of deities from other cities. This greatly displeased the people, and excited a strong feeling against him. The priesthood was alienated, and the military party was displeased with him, for in his antiquarian pursuits he left the defense of the empire to others. So when Cyrus, king of Anshan and ruler of Persia, entered the country, he had little difficulty in defeating the Babylonians in a battle at Opis. Sippar immediately surrendered to the invader, and the gates of Babylon were thrown open to his army under Gobryas, his general. Nabonidus was imprisoned. Three months later Cyrus entered Babylon; Belshazzar, who doubtless had set up his throne after his father had been deposed, was slain a week later on the night of the eleventh of Marchesvan. This scene may have occurred in the palace built by Nebuchadrezzar. This event, told by the chronicler, is a remarkable verification of the interesting story related of Belshazzar in Dnl. The title used by the kings who follow the Babylonian Dynasty is “King of Babylon and King of Countries.”

41. PERSIAN RULERS OF BABYLONIA:

PERSIAN RULERS OF BABYLONIA

Cyrus; 538-529 BC

Cambyses; 529-522 BC

Barzia

Nebuchadrezzar III

Darius I; 521-485 BC

Xerxes; 485-464 BC

Artaxerxes I; 464-424 BC

Xerxes II; 424-423 BC

Darius II; 423-404 BC

Artaxerxes II; 405-358 BC

Artaxerxes III (Ochos); 358-338 BC

Arses; 338-335 BC

Darius III; 335-331 BC

Alexander the Great conquered Babylonia 331 BC.

Several of the Persian rulers figured prominently in the Old Testament narratives. Cyrus in a cylinder inscription, which is preserved in a fragmentary form, endeavors to justify himself in the eyes of the people. He claims that the god Marduk raised him up to take the place of Nabonidus, and to defend the religion of the people. He tries to show how considerate he was by returning to their respective cities the gods that had been removed from their shrines; and especially by liberating foreign peoples held in bondage. While he does not mention what exiles were allowed to return to their native homes, the Old Testament informs us that the Jews were among those delivered. And the returning of the images to their respective places is also an interesting commentary on ^{<5000>}Ezra 1:7, in which we are told that the Jews were allowed to take with them their sacred vessels. The spirit manifested in the proclamation for the rebuilding

of the temple (~~<1500B>~~ Ezra 1:1,4) seems also to have been in accordance with his policy on ascending the Babylonian throne. A year before his death he associated with himself Cambyzes his son, another character mentioned in the Old Testament. He gave him the title “King of Babylon,” but retained for himself “King of Countries.” A usurper Smerdis, the Magian, called Barzia in the inscriptions, assumed the throne of Babylonia, but Darius Hystaspes, who was an Aryan and Zoroastrian in religion, finally killed Smerdis and made himself king of Babylon. But before he was acknowledged king he had to reconquer the Babylonians. By so doing the ancient tradition that Bel of Babylon conferred the legitimate right to rule that part of the world ceased to be acknowledged. Under Nidinta-Bel, who assumed the name Nebuchadrezzar III, the Babylonians regained their independence, but it was of short duration, lasting less than a year.

LITERATURE.

History: Rogers, History of Babylonian and Assyrian, 1002; Winckler, History of Babylonian and Assyrian, 1907; King, Sumer and Accad, 1910. Religion: Jastrow, Religion of Babylonian and Assyrian, 1898; Rogers, Religion of Babylonian and Assyrian, Especially in Its Relation to Israel, 1908; Sayce, The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonian, 1903. Literature: Assyrian and Babylonian Literature, in “The World’s Great Books”; edited by R. F. Harper. Relation to the Old Testament: Price, The Monuments and the Old Testament, 1007; Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Records of Assyrian and Babylonian, 1902; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, 1908; Clay, Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites, 1909.

See also “Literature” in ASSYRIA.

A. T. Clay

BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, THE RELIGION OF

1. DEFINITION.

The religion of Babylonia and Assyria is that system of belief in higher things with which the peoples of the Tigris and Euphrates valley strove to put themselves into relations, in order to live their lives. The discoveries of the past century have supplied us with a mass of information concerning this faith from which we have been able to secure a greater knowledge of it

than of any other ancient oriental religion, except that of Israel. Yet the information which is thus come into our hands is embarrassing because of its very richness, and it will doubtless be a long time before it is possible to speak with certainty concerning many of the problems which now confront us. Progress in the interpretation of the literature is however so rapid that we may now give a much more intelligible account of this religion than could have been secured even so recently as five years ago.

For purposes of convenience, the religion of Babylonia and Assyria may be grouped into three great periods.

1. First Period:

The first of these periods extends from the earliest times, about 3500 BC, down to the union of the Babylonian states under Hammurabi, about 2000 BC.

2. Second Period:

The second period extends to the rise of the Chaldean empire under Nabopolassar, 625 BC, and

3. Third Period:

The third period embraces the brief history of this Chaldean or neo-Babylonian empire under Cyrus, 538 BC.

The Assyrian religion belongs to the second period, though it extends even into the third period, for Nineveh did not fall until 607 BC.

2. THE SOURCES.

The primary sources of our knowledge of this religion are to be found in the distinctively religious texts, such as hymns, prayers, priestly rituals and liturgies, and in the vast mass of magical and incantation literature. The major part of this religious literature which has come down to us dates from the reign of Ashurbanipal (668-625 BC) though much of it is quite clearly either copied from or based upon much older material. If, however, we relied for our picture of the Babylonian and Assyrian religion exclusively upon these religious texts, we should secure a distorted and in some places an indefinite view. We must add to these in order to perfect the picture practically the whole of the literature of these two peoples.

The inscriptions upon which the kings handed down to posterity an account of their great deeds contain lists of gods whom they invoked, and these must be taken into consideration. The laws also have in large measure a religious basis, and the business inscriptions frequently invoke deities at the end. The records of the astronomers, the state dispatches of kings, the reports of general officers from the field, the handbooks of medicine, all these and many other divisions of a vast literature contribute each its share of religious material. Furthermore, as the religion was not only the faith of the king, but also the faith of the state itself, the progress of the commonwealth to greater power oftentimes carried some local god into a new relationship to other gods, or the decadence of the commonwealth deprived a god of some of his powers or attributes, so that even the distinctively political inscriptions have importance in helping us to reconstruct the ancient literature.

3. THE HISTORY.

The origin of the Babylonian religion is hid from our eyes in those ancient days of which we know little and can never hope to know much. In the earliest documents which have come down to us written in the Sumerian language, there are found Semitic words or constructions or both. It seems now to be definitely determined that a Sumerian people whose origin is unknown inhabited Babylonia before the coming of the Semites, whose original home was in Arabia. Of the Sumerian faith before a union was formed with the Semites, we know very little indeed. But we may perhaps safely say that among that ancient people, beneath the belief in gods there lay deep in their consciousness the belief in animism. They thought that every object, animate or inanimate, had a *zi* or spirit. The word seems originally to have meant life. Life manifests itself to us as motion; everything which moves has life. The power of motion separates the animate from the inanimate. All that moves possesses life, the motionless is lifeless or dead.

Besides this belief in animism, the early Sumerians seem to have believed in ghosts that were related to the world of the dead as the *zi* was related to the world of the living. The *lil* or ghost was a night demon of baleful influence upon men, and only to be cast out by many incantations. The *lil* was attended by a serving-maid (*ardat lili*, "maid of night") which in the later Semitic development was transformed into the feminine *lilitu*. It is most curious and interesting that this ghost demon of the Sumerians lived

on through all the history of the Babylonian religion, and is mentioned even in one of the Old Testament prophets (~~2344~~ Isaiah 34:14; Hebrew Lillith, translated “night monster”). The origin of the Semitic religion brought by the ancient Semitic people and united with this Sumerian faith is also lost in the past.

It seems to be quite clear that the gods and the religious ideas which these Semites brought with them from the desert had very little if any importance for the religion which they afterward professed in Babylonia. Some of the names of their gods and images of these they very probably brought with them, but the important thing, it must always be remembered, about the gods is not the names but the attributes which were ascribed to them, and these must have been completely changed during the long history which follows their first contact with the Sumerians. From the Sumerians there flowed a great stream of religious ideas, subject indeed to modifications from time to time down the succeeding centuries. In our study of the pantheon we shall see from time to time how the gods changed their places and how the ideas concerning them were modified by political and other movements. In the very earliest times, besides these ideas of spirits and ghosts, we find also numbers of local gods. Every center of human habitation had its special patron deity and this deity is always associated with some great natural phenomenon. It was natural that the sun and moon should be made prominent among these gods, but other natural objects and forces were personified and deified, streams, stones and many others.

Our chief source of information concerning the gods of the first period of religious development before the days of Hammurabi is found in the historical inscriptions of the early kings and rulers. Many of these describe offerings of temples and treasures made to the gods, and all of them are religious in tone and filled with ascriptions of praise to the gods. From these early texts Professor Jastrow has extricated the names of the following deities, gods and goddesses. I reproduce his list as the best yet made, but keep in mind that some of the readings are doubtful and some were certainly otherwise read by the Babylonians or Sumerians, though we do not now know how they ought to be read. The progress of Assyrian research is continually providing corrected readings for words hitherto known to us only in ideograms. It is quite to be expected that many of these strange, not to say grotesque, names will some day prove to be quite simple, and easy to utter: En-lil (Ellil, Bel) Belit, Nin-khar-sag, Nin-gir-su, wh o also appears as Dun-gur, Bau, Ga-tum-dug, Nin-dindug, Ea, Nin-a-

gal, Gal-dim-zu-ab, Nin-ki, Damgal-nun-na, Nergal, Shamash, A or Malkatu, the wife of Shamash, Nannar, or Sin, Nin-Urum, Innanna, Nana, Anunit, Nina, Ishtar, Anu, Nindar-a, Gal-alim, Nin-shakh, Dun-shagga, Lugalbanda, with a consort Nin-sun, Dumu-zi-zu-ab, Dumu-zi, Lugal-Erim, Nin-e-gal and Ningal, Nin-gish-zi-da, Dun-pa-uddu, Nin-mar, Pasag, Nidaba, Ku(?) -anna, Shid, Nin-agid-kha-du, Ninshul-li, En-gubarra, Im-mi-khu(?), Ur-du-zi, Kadi, Nu-ku-sir-da, Ma-ma, Za-ma-ma, Za-za-ru, Impa-ud-du, Ur-e-nun-ta-ud-du-a, Khi-gir-nunna, Khi-shagga, Gur-mu, Zar-mu, Dagan, Damu, Lama, Nesu, Nun-gal, An-makh, Nin-si-na, Nin-asu. In this list great gods and goddesses and all kinds of minor deities are gathered together, and the list looks and sounds hopeless. But these are local deities, and some of them are mere duplications. Nearly every place in early times would have a sun-god or a moon-god or both, and in the political development of the country the moon-god of the conquering city displaced or absorbed the moon-god of the conquered. When we have eliminated these gods, who have practically disappeared, there remains a comparatively small number of gods who outrank all the others.

In the room of some of these gods that disappeared, others, especially in Assyria, found places. There was, however, a strong tendency to diminish the number of the gods. They are in early days mentioned by the score, but as time goes on many of these vanish away and only the few remain. As Jastrow has pointed out, Shalmaneser II (859-825 BC) had only eleven gods in his pantheon: Ashur, Anu, Bel, Ea, Sin, Shamash, Ninib, Nergal, Nusku, Belit and Ishtar. Sennacherib (704-681 BC) usually mentions only eight; namely, Ashur, Sin, Shamash, Bel (that is, Marduk), Nabu, Nergal, Ishtar of Nineveh and Ishtar of Arbela. But we must not lay much emphasis upon the smallness of this number, for in his building inscriptions at the end he invokes twenty-five deities, and even though some of these are duplicates of other gods, as Jastrow correctly explains, nevertheless the entire list is considerably increased over the eight above mentioned. In the late Babylonian period the worship seems chiefly devoted to Marduk, Nabu, Sin, Shamash and Ishtar. Often there seem little faint indications of a further step forward. Some of the hymns addressed to Shamash seem almost upon the verge of exalting him in such a way as to exclude the other deities, but the step is never taken. The Babylonians, with all their wonderful gifts, were never able to conceive of one god, of one god alone, of one god whose very existence makes logically impossible the existence

of any other deity. Monotheism transcends the spiritual grasp of the Babylonian mind.

Amid all this company of gods, amid all these speculations and combinations, we must keep our minds clear, and fasten our eyes upon the one significant fact that stands out above all others. It is that the Babylonians were not able to rise above polytheism; that beyond them, far beyond them, lay that great series of thoughts about God that ascribe to him aloneness, to which we may add the great spiritual ideas which today may roughly be grouped under ethical monotheism. Here and there great thinkers in Babylonia grasped after higher ideas, and were able only to attain to a sort of pantheism of a speculative kind. A personal god, righteous and holy, who loved righteousness. and hated sin, this was not given to them to conceive.

The character of the gods changed indeed as the people who revered them changed. The Babylonians who built vast temples and composed many inscriptions emphasizing the works of peace rather than of war, naturally conceived their deities in a manner different from the Assyrians whose powers were chiefly devoted to conquests in war, but neither the Babylonians nor the Assyrians arose to any such heights as distinguish the Hebrew book of Psalms. As the influence of the Babylonians and Assyrians waned, their gods declined in power, and none of them survived the onrush of Greek civilization in the period of Alexander.

4. THE PANTHEON.

The chief gods of the Babylonian and Assyrian pantheon may now be characterized in turn.

1. Enlil, Ellil:

In the earliest times known to us the greatest of the gods is the god of Nippur whose name in the Sumerian texts is Enlil or Ellil. In the Semitic pantheon of later times he was identified with the god Bel, and it is as Belhe has been chiefly known. During the whole of the first epoch of Babylonian history up to the period of Hammurabi, he is the Lord of the World and the King of the Land. He was originally the hero of the Flood story, but in the form in which it has come down to us Marduk of Babylon has deprived him of these honors. In Nippur was his chief temple, called E-kur or "mountain house." It was built and rebuilt by the kings of Babylonia

again and again from the days of Sargon I (3800 BC) onward, and no less than twenty kings are known to us who pride themselves on their work of rebuilding this one temple. He is saluted as “the Great Lord, the command of whose mouth cannot be altered and whose grace is steadfast.” He would seem, judging from the name of his temple and from some of his attributes, to have been originally a god of the mountains where he must have had his original dwelling-place.

2. *Anu:*

The name of the god Anu was interpreted as meaning heaven, corresponding to the Sumerian word ana, “heaven,” and he came thus to be regarded as the god of heaven as over against Enlil who was the god of earth, and Ea who was the god of the waters. Anu appears first among the great gods in an inscription of Lugalsaggi, and in somewhat later times he made his way to the top of the earliest triad which consists of Ann, Enlil and Ea. His chief seat of worship was Uruk, but in the Assyrian period he was associated with the god Adad in a temple in the city of Asshur. In the myths and epics he fills an important role as the disposer of all events, but he cannot be thought of as quite equal in rank with Enlil in spite of his position in the heavens. Antu or Anatu is mentioned as the wife of Ann, but hers is a colorless figure, and she may probably be regarded as little else than a grammatical invention owing to the desire of the Semites to associate the feminine with the masculine in their languages.

3. *Ea:*

The reading of the name of the god Ea still remains uncertain. It may perhaps have been Ae, as the Greek Aes would seem to indicate. His chief city of worship was Eridu, which in the earliest period was situated on the Persian Gulf, near the mouths of the Euphrates and the Tigris. His temple was there called E-absu, which means “house of the deeps,” interpreted also as “house of wisdom.” He must have been a god of great importance in early times, but was left behind by the growing influence of Ellil and in a later period retained honor chiefly because he was assumed to be the father of the god Marduk, and so was revered by the people of the city of Babylon. As the lord of wisdom he filled a great role in exorcisms down to the very last, and was believed to be the god who was most ready to respond to human need in direful circumstances. Ea’s wife is called Damkina.

4. Sin:

Sin was the city god of Urn (Ur of the Chaldeans in the Old Testament). He was originally a local god who came early to a lofty position in the canon because he seems always to have been identified with the moon, and in Babylon the moon was always of more importance than the sun because of its use in the calendar. His temple was called E-kishshirgal, i.e. "house of light." His worship was widespread, for at a very early date he had a shrine at Harran in Mesopotamia. His wife is called Ningal, the Great Lady, the Queen, and his name probably appears in Mt. Sinai. He is addressed in hymns of great beauty and was regarded as a most kindly god.

5. Shamash:

The Sun-god, Shamash, ranks next after Sin in the second or later triad, and there can be no doubt that he was from the beginning associated with the sun in the heavens. His seats of worship were Larsa in southern Babylonia and Sippar in northern Babylonia in both of which his temple was called E-bab-bar, "shining house." He also is honored in magnificent hymns in which he is saluted as the enemy and the avenger of evil, but as the benignant furtherer of all good, especially of that which concerns the races of men. All legislation is ascribed to him as the supreme judge in heaven. To him the Babylonians also ascribe similar powers in war to those which the Egyptians accorded to Re. From some of the texts one might have supposed that he would have come to the top of the triad, but this appears not to have been the case, and his influence extended rather in the direction of influencing minor local deities who were judged to be characterized by attributes similar to those ascribed to him in the greater hymns.

6. Ishtar:

The origin and the meaning of the name of the goddess Ishtar are still disputed, but of her rank there can be no doubt. In the very earliest inscriptions known to us she does not seem to have been associated with the planet Venus as she is in later times. She seems rather to have been a goddess of fruitfulness and of love, and in her temple at Uruk temple-prostitution was a feature. In the mythological literature she occupies a high place as the goddess of war and of the chase. Because of this later identification she became the chief goddess of the warlike Assyrians. Little by little she absorbed all the other goddesses and her name became the

general word for goddess. Her chief seats of worship were Uruk in southern Babylonia, where she was worshipped in earliest times under the name of Nana, and Akkad in northern Babylonia, where she was called Anunitu, and Nineveh and Arbela in Assyria. Some of the hymns addressed to her are among the noblest products of Babylonian and Assyrian religion and reach a considerable ethical position. This development of a sexual goddess into a goddess who severely judged the sins of men is one of the strangest phenomena in the history of this religion.

7. Marduk:

Marduk (in the Old Testament Merodach) is the city-god of Babylon where his temple was called E-sagila (“lofty house”) and its tower E-teme nanki (“house of the foundation of heaven and earth”). His wife is Sarpanitu, and, as we have already seen, his father was Ea, and in later days Nabu was considered his son. The city of Babylon in the earliest period was insignificant in importance compared with Nippur and Eridu, and this city-god could not therefore lay claim to a position comparable with the gods of these cities, but after Hammurabi had made Babylon the chief city of all Babylonia its god rapidly increased in importance until he absorbed the attributes of the earlier gods and displaced them in the great myths. The speculative philosophers of the neo-Babylonian period went so far as to identify all the earlier gods with him, elevating his worship into a sort of henotheism. His proper name in the later periods was gradually displaced by the appellative Belu “lord,” so that finally he was commonly spoken of as Bel, and his consort was called Belit. He shares with Ishtar and Shamash the honor of having some of the finest hymns, which have come down to us, sung to his name.

8. Nabu:

Nabu (in the Old Testament Nebo) was the city-god of Bor-sippa. His name is clearly Semitic, and means “speaker” or “announcer.” In earlier times he seems to have been a more important god than Marduk and was worshipped as the god of vegetation. His temple in Borsippa bore the name E-zida (“perpetual house”) with the tower E-uriminanki (“house of the seven rulers of heaven and earth”). In later times he was identified with the planet Mercury.

9. Nergal:

Nergal, the city-god of Kutu (in the Old Testament Cuthah), was the god of the underworld and his wife Eresh-kigal was the sovereign lady of the under-world. He was also the god of plague and of fever, and in later days was associated with the planet Mars, though scholars who are attached to the astral theory (see below) think that he was identified at an earlier date with Saturn. For this view no certain proof has yet been produced.

10. Ninib:

Unfortunately the correct pronunciation of the name of the god Ninib has not yet been secured. He seems originally to have been a god of vegetation, but in the later philosophical period was associated with the planet Saturn, called Kaitaann (Kewan, Chiun, ^{<115>}Amos 5:26 the King James Version, the English Revised Version). As a god of vegetation he becomes also a god of healing and his wife Gula was the chief patroness of physicians. He comes also to be regarded as a mighty hero in war, and, in this capacity generally, he fills a great role in the Assyrian religion.

11. Ramman:

Ramman is the god of storms and thunder among the Babylonians and in the Assyrian pantheon he is usually called Adad. This form of the name is doubtless connected with the Aramaic god Hadad. In the Sumerian period his name seems to have been Ishkur. His wife is called Shala.

12. Tammuz:

The name Tammuz is derived from the Sumerian Dumuzi-zuab ("real child of the water depths"). He is a god of vegetation which is revived by the rains of the spring. Tammuz never became one of the great gods of the pantheon, but his popularity far exceeded that of the many gods who were regarded as greater than he. His worship is associated with that of Ishtar whose paramour he was, and the beautiful story of the descent of Ishtar to Hades was written to describe Ishtar's pursuit of him to the depths of the under-world seeking to bring him up again. His disappearance in the under-world is associated with the disappearance of vegetation under the midsummer heat which revives again when the rain comes and the god appears once more on the earth. The cult of Tammuz survived the decay of Babylonian and Assyrian civilization and made its way into the western

world. It was similar in some respects to that of Osiris in Egypt, but was not so beautiful or so humane.

13. Asshur:

The supreme god of Assyria, Asshur, was originally the local god of the city which bears the same name. During the whole of Assyrian history his chief role is as the god of war, but the speculative philosophers of Assyria absorbed into him many of the characteristics of Ellil and Marduk, going even so far as to ascribe to him the chief place in the conflict with the sea monster Tiamat in the creation epoch.

5. HYMNS AND PRAYERS.

The religious literature of the Babylonians and Assyrians culminated in a great series of hymns to the gods. These have come down to us from almost all periods of the religious history of the people. Some of them go back to the days of the old city-kingdoms and others were composed during the reign of Nabonidus when the fall of Babylon at the hands of Cyrus was imminent. The greatest number of those that have come down to us are dedicated to Shamash, the Sun-god, but many of the finest, as we have already seen, were composed in honor of Sin, the Moon-god. None of these reached monotheism. All are polytheistic, with perhaps tendencies in the direction of pantheism or henotheism. This incapacity to reach monotheism may have been partially due to the influence of the local city whose tendency was always to hold tightly to the honor of the local god. Babylonia might struggle never so hard to lift Marduk to high and still higher position, but in spite of all its efforts he remains to the very end of the days only one god among many. And even the greatest of the Babylonian kings, Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus, continued to pay honor to Shamash in Sippar, whose temple they continually rebuilt and adorned with ever greater magnificence. Better than any description of the hymns is a specimen adequately to show their quality. Here are some lines taken from an ancient Sumerian hymn to the Moon-god which had been copied and preserved with an Assyrian translation in the library of Ashurbanipal:

O Lord, chief of the gods, who alone art exalted on earth and in heaven,

Father Nannar, Lord, Anshar, chief of the gods,

Father Nannar, Lord, great Ann, chief of the gods,

Father Nannar, Lord, Sin, chief of the gods,

Father Nanbar, Lord of Ur, chief of the gods,

Father Nannar, Lord of E-gish-shir-gal, chief of the gods,

Father Nannar, Lord of the veil, brilliant one, chief of the gods,

Father Nannar, whose rule is perfect, chief of the gods,

Father Nannar, who does march in great majesty, chief of the gods,

O strong, young bull, with strong horns, perfect in muscles, with beard of lapis lazuli color, full of glory and perfection,

Self-created, full of developed fruit, beautiful to look upon, in whose being one cannot sufficiently sate himself;

Mother womb, begetter of all things, who has taken up his exalted habitation among living creatures;

O merciful, gracious father, in whose hand rests the life of the whole world,

O Lord, thy divinity is full of awe, like the far-off heaven and the broad ocean.

O creator of the land, founder of sanctuaries, proclaimer of their names,

O father, begetter of gods and men, who dost build dwellings and establish offerings,

Who dost call to lordship, dost bestow the scepter, determinest destinies for far-off days.

Much of this is full of fine religious feeling, and the exaltation of Sin sounds as though the poet could scarcely acknowledge any other god, but the proof that other gods were invoked in the same terms and by the same kings is plentiful.

Some of these hymns are connected with magical and incantation literature, for they serve to introduce passages which are intended to drive away evil demons. A very few of them on the other hand rise to very lofty conceptions in which the god is praised as a judge of righteousness. A few lines from the greatest of all the hymns addressed to Shamash, the Sun-god, will make this plain:

COLUMN 2

Who plans evil — his horn thou dost destroy,

40 Whoever in fixing boundaries annuls rights. The unjust judge thou restrainest with force.

Whoever accepts a bribe, who does not judge justly — on him thou imposest sin.

But he who does not accept a bribe, who has a care for the oppressed,

To him Shamash is gracious, his life he prolongs.

45 The judge who renders a just decision

Shall end in a palace, the place of princes shall be his dwelling.

COLUMN 3

The seed of those who act unjustly shall not flourish.

What their mouth declares in thy presence

Thou shalt burn it up, what they purpose wilt thou annul.

15 Thou knowest their transgressions: the declaration of the wicked thou dost cast aside.

Everyone, wherever he may be, is in thy care. Thou directest their judgments, the imprisoned dost thou liberate.

Thou hearest, O Shamash, petition, prayer, and appeal.

Humility, prostration, petitioning, and reverence.

20 With loud voice the unfortunate one cries to thee.

The weak, the exhausted, the oppressed, the lowly,

Mother, wife, maid appeal to thee.

He who is removed from his family, he that dwelleth far from his city.

There is in this hymn no suggestion of magic or sorcery. We cannot but feel how close this poet came to an appreciation of the Sun-god as a judge

of men on an ethical basis. How near he was to passing through the vale into a larger religious life!

The prayers are on the whole upon a lower plane, though some of them, notably those of Nebuchadrezzar, reach lofty conceptions. The following may serve as a sufficient example:

O eternal ruler, lord of all being, grant that the name of the king that thou lovest, whose name thou hast proclaimed, may flourish as seems pleasing to thee. Lead him in the right way. I am the prince that obeys thee, the creature of thy hand. Thou hast created me, and hast entrusted to me dominion over mankind. According to thy mercy, O Lord, which thou bestowest upon all, may thy supreme rule be merciful! The worship of thy divinity implant in my heart! Grant me what seems good to thee, for thou art he that hast fashioned my life.

6. MAGIC:

Next in importance to the gods in the Babylonian religion are the demons who had the power to afflict men with manifold diseases of body or mind. A large part of the religion seems to have been given up to an agonized struggle against these demons, and the gods were everywhere approached by prayer to assist men against these demons. An immense mass of incantations, supposed to have the power of driving the demons out, has come down to us. The use of these incantations lay chiefly in the hands of the priests who attached great importance to specific words or sets of words. The test of time was supposed to have shown that certain words were efficacious in certain instances. If in any case the result was not secured, it could only be ascribed to the use of the wrong formula; hence there grew up a great desire to preserve exactly the words which in some cases had brought healing. Later these incantations were gathered into groups or rituals classified according to purpose or use. Of the rituals which have come down to us, the following are the most important:

1. Maqlu:

Maqlu, i.e. "burning," so called because there are in it many symbolic burnings of images or witches. This series is used in the delivering of sufferers from witches or sorcerers.

2. *Shurpu*:

Shurpu is another word for burning, and this series also deals much in symbolic burnings and for the same purposes as the former. In these incantations we make the acquaintance of a large number of strange demons such as the rabisu, a demon that springs unawares on its victims; the labartu, which attacks women and children; and the lilu and the lilitu, to which reference has been made before, and the utuku, a strong demon.

These incantations are for the most part a wretched jargon without meaning, and a sad commentary on the low position occupied by the religion which has attained such noble heights as that represented in the hymns and prayers. It is strange that the higher forms of religion were not able to drive out the lower, but these incantations continued to be carefully copied and used down to the very end of the Babylonian commonwealth.

7. THE LAST THINGS.

In Babylonia, the great question of all the ages — "If a man die shall he live again?" — was asked and an attempt made to answer it. The answer was usually sad and depressing. After death the souls of men were supposed to continue in existence. It can hardly be called life. The place to which they have gone is called the "land of no return." There they lived in dark rooms amid the dust and the bats covered with a garment of feathers, and under the dominion of Nergal and Ereshkigal. When the soul arrived among the dead he had to pass judgment before the judges of the dead, the Annunaki, but little has been preserved for us concerning the manner of this judgment. There seems to have been at times an idea that it might be possible for the dead to return again to life, for in this underworld there was the water of life, which was used when the god Tammuz returned again to earth. The Babylonians seem not to have attached so much importance to this after-existence as did the Egyptians, but they did practice burial and not cremation, and placed often with the dead articles which might be used in his future existence. In earlier times the dead were buried in their own houses, and among the rich this custom seems to have prevailed until the very latest times. For others the custom of burying in an acropolis was adopted, and near the city of Kutha was an acropolis which was especially famous. In the future world there seem to have been distinctions made among the dead. Those who fell in battle seem to have had special favor. They received fresh water to drink, while those who had

no posterity to put offerings at their graves suffered sore and many deprivations. It is to be hoped that later discoveries of religious texts may shed more light upon this phase of the religion which is still obscure.

8. MYTHS AND EPICS:

In ancient religions the myth fills a very important place, serving many of the functions of dogma in modern religions. These myths have come down to us associated usually with epics, or made a part of ancient stories which belong to the library of Ashurbanipal. Most of them have been copied from earlier Babylonian originals, which go back in origin to the wonderful period of intellectual and political development which began with Hammurabi. The most interesting of those which have been preserved for us are the story of Adapa and the story of Gilgames. This same divine being Adapa, son of Ea, was employed in Ea's temple at Eridu supplying the ritual bread and water. One day, while fishing in the sea, the south wind swept sharply upon him, overturned his boat, and he fell into the sea, the "house of the fishes." Angered by his misfortune, he broke the wings of the south wind, and for seven days it was unable to bring the comfort of the sea coolness over the hot land. And Anu said:

"Why has the south wind for seven days not blown over the land?"

His messenger Ilabrat answered him:

"My Lord, Adapa, the son of Ea, hath broken the wing of The south wind."

Then Anu ordered the culprit brought before him, and before he departed to this ordeal Ea gave him instructions. He is to go up to the gatekeepers of heaven, Tammuz and Gish-zida, clad in mourning garb to excite their sympathy. When they ask why he is thus attired he is to tell them that his mourning is for two gods of earth who have disappeared (that is, themselves), and then they will intercede for him. Furthermore, he is cautioned not to eat the food or drink the water that will be set before him, for Ea fears that food and water of death will be set before him to destroy him. But exactly the opposite happened. Tammuz and Gish-zida prevailed in pleading, and Anu said: "Bring for him food of life that he may eat it." They brought him food of life, but he did not eat. They brought him water of life, but he did not drink. They brought him a garment; he put it on. They brought him oil; he anointed himself with it.

Adapa had obeyed Ea literally, and by so doing had missed the priceless boon of immortality. Some of the motives in this beautiful myth are similar to those found in Gen. Food of life seems to belong to the same category as the tree of life in Gen. The Babylonian doctrine was that man, though of Divine origin, did not share in the Divine attribute of immortality. In the Genesis story Adam lost immortality because he desired to become like God. Adapa, on the other hand, was already endowed with knowledge and wisdom and failed of immortality, not because he was disobedient like Adam, but because he was obedient to Ea his creator. The legend would seem to be the Babylonian attempt to explain death.

The greatest of all the Babylonian epics is the story of Gilgames, for in it the greatest of the myths seem to pour into one great stream of epic. It was written upon twelve big tablets in the library of Ashurbanipal, some of which have been badly broken. It was, however, copied from earlier tablets which go back to the First Dynasty of Babylon. The whole story is interesting and important, but its greatest significance lies in the eleventh tablet which contains a description of the great flood and is curiously parallel to the Flood story in the Book of Gen.

9. THE ASTRAL THEORY OF THE UNIVERSE:

We have now passed in review the main features of the Babylonian and Assyrian religion. We have come all the way from a primitive animism to a higher organized polytheism with much theological speculation ending in a hope for existence after death, and we must now ask whether there is any great organizing idea which will bring all this religion and speculation into one great comprehensive system. A theory has been propounded which owes its exposition generally to Professor Hugo Winckler of the University of Berlin, who in a series of volumes and pamphlets has attempted to prove that the whole of the serious thinking and writing in the realm of religion among both the Babylonians and Assyrians rests down upon a *Weltanschauung*, a theory of the universe. This theory of Winckler's has found acceptance and propagation at the hands of Dr. Alfred Jeremias, and portions of it have been accepted by other scholars. The doctrine is extremely complicated and even those who accept it in part decline it in other parts and the exposition of it is difficult. In the form which it takes in the writings of Winckler and Jeremias, it has been still further complicated quite recently by sundry alterations which make it still more difficult. Most of these can only be regarded as efforts to shield

theory from criticisms which have been successful in pointing out its weakness.

According to Winckler and Jeremias, the Babylonians conceived of the cosmos as divided primarily into a heavenly and an earthly world, each of which is further subdivided into three parts. The heavenly world consists of

- (1) the northern ocean;
- (2) the zodiac;
- (3) the heavenly ocean;

while the earthly world consists of

- (1) the heaven, i.e. the air above the earth;
- (2) the earth itself;
- (3) the waters beneath the earth.

These great subdivisions were ruled by the gods Anu in the heaven above, Bel in the earth and air, and Ea in the waters beneath. More important than these is the zodiac, the twelve heavenly figures which span the heavens and through which the moon passes every month, the sun once a year, and the five great planets which are visible to the naked eye have their courses. These moving stars serve as the interpreters of the Divine will while the fixed stars, so says Jeremias, are related thereto as the commentary written on the margin of the Book of Rev. The rulers of the zodiac are Sin, Shamash and Ishtar, and according to the law of correspondence, the Divine power manifested in them is identical with the power of Anu, Bel and Ea. The zodiac represents the world-cycle in the year, and also in the world-year, one of these gods may represent the total Divine power which reveals itself in the cycle. By the side of these three, Sin, Shamash and Ishtar, which represent respectively the moon, sun and Venus, there are arranged Marduk which is Jupiter, Nabu which is Mercury, Ninib which is Mars, and Nergal which is Saturn, these being the planets known to the ancients. Now upon these foundations, according to Winckler, and his school, the ancient priests of Babylonia built a closely knit and carefully thought-out world-system of an astral character, and this world-system forms the kernel of the ancient and oriental conception of the universe. This conception of the universe as a double-sided principle is of tremendous importance. First, the heavenly world with its three divisions

corresponds exactly to the earthly world with its three divisions. Everything on earth corresponds to its counterpart in heaven. The heavens are a mirror of earth, and in them the gods reveal their will and purpose. Everything which has happened is only an earthly copy of the heavenly original. It is still written in the heavens above and still to be read there. All the myths and all the legends, not only of Babylonia, but of all the rest of the ancient world, are to be interpreted in accordance with this theory; nothing even in history is to be understood otherwise. "An oriental history without consideration of the world era is unthinkable. The stars rule the changes of the times" (Jeremias). The consequences of this theory are so overpowering that it is difficult to deal with it in fairness to its authors and in justice to the enormous labor and knowledge which they have put upon it.

It is impossible within the reasonable limits which are here imposed to discuss theory in detail, and for our purpose it will be sufficient to say that to the great majority of modern scholars who have carefully considered it in its details it seems to lack evidence sufficient to support so enormous a structure. That an astrological structure similar at least to this actually did arise in the Hellenistic period is not here disputed. The sole dispute is as to the antiquity of it. Now it does not appear that Winckler and Jeremias have been able to produce proof, first, that the Babylonians had enough knowledge of astronomy before the 7th century BC to have constructed such a system; and in the second place, there is no evidence that all the Babylonian gods had an astral character in the earlier period. On the contrary, there seems, as we have already attempted to show in the discussion of the pantheon, to be good reason to believe that many of the deities had no relation whatever to the stars in early times, but were rather gods of vegetation or of water or of other natural forces visible in earthly manifestations. The theory indeed may be said to have broken down by its own weight, for Winckler and Jeremias attempted to show that this theory of the universe spread to Israel, to the Greeks and to the Romans, and that it affords the only satisfactory explanation of the religion and of the history of the entire ancient world. An attempt has been made similar to previous abortive efforts to unlock all the doors of the ancient past with one key (see an interesting example cited in Rogers, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 224-25). Instead of gaining adherence in recent times, theory would appear to have lost, and even those who have given a tentative adherence to its claims, cautiously qualify the extent of their submission.

10. THE RELATIONS WITH THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL:

No question concerning the religion of Babylonia and Assyria is of so great interest and importance to students of the Bible as the question of the relation between this religion and the faith of Yahweh, as professed by Israel. It seems now to be clearly demonstrated that the religion of Israel has borrowed various literary materials from its more ancient neighbor. The stories of creation and of the flood, both of them, as far as the literary contents are concerned, certainly rest upon Babylonian originals. This dependence has, however, been exaggerated by some scholars into an attempt to demonstrate that Israel took these materials bodily, whereas the close shifting and comparison to which they have been subjected in the past few years would seem to demonstrate beyond peradventure that Israel stamped whatever she borrowed with her own genius and wove an entirely new fabric. Israel used these ancient narratives as a vehicle for a higher and purer religious faith. The material was borrowed, the spirit belonged to Israel, and the spirit was Divine. Words and literary materials were secured from Babylonia, but the religious and spiritual came from Israel and from Israel's God. The word Sabbath is Babylonian indeed, but the great social and religious institution which it represents in Israel is not Babylonian but distinctively Hebrew. The Divine name Yahweh appears among other peoples, passes over into Babylonia and afterward is used by Israel, but the spiritual God who bears the name in Israel is no Babylonian or Kenite deity. The Babylonians, during all their history and in all their speculations, never conceived a god like unto Him. He belongs to the Hebrews alone.

The gods of Babylonia are connected, as we have seen, with primitive animism or they are merely local deities. The God of Israel, on the other hand, is a God revealed in history. He brought Israel out of Egypt. He is continually made known to His people through the prophets as a God revealed in history. His religion is not developed out of Babylonian polytheism which existed as polytheism in the earliest periods and endured as polytheism unto the end. The religion of Israel, on the other hand, though some of its material origins are humble, moved steadily onward and upward until the great monotheistic idea found universal acceptance in Israel. The religions of Philistia and Phoenicia, Moab, and of Edom, were subject to the same play of influences from Babylonia and Egypt, but no larger faith developed out of them. In Israel alone ethical monotheism arose, and ethical monotheism has no roots in Babylonia. The study of the religion of Babylonia is indeed of the highest importance for the

understanding of Israel's faith, but it is of less importance than some modern scholars have attempted to demonstrate.

LITERATURE.

L. W. King. *Babylonian Religion and Mythology*, London. 1899; M. Jastrow. Jr., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, Boston, 1898 (completely revised by the author and translated into German under the title *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Giessen, appearing in parts, and soon to be completed. This is the standard book on the subject); Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, Especially in Its Relation to Israel*, New York, 1908; Hermann Schneider. *Kultur und Denken der Babylonier und Juden*, Leipzig, 1910; R. P. Dhorme, *Lamentations religion assyrio-babylonienne*, Paris. 1910. Detailed literature on the separate phases of the religion will be found in these books.

Robert W. Rogers

BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY

See CAPTIVITY.

BABYLONIANS

<bab-i-lo'-ni-anz>: The inhabitants of *BABYLONIA* (which see). They were among the colonists planted in Samaria by the Assyrians (*<1549>* Ezra 4:9). "The likeness of the Babylonians in Chaldea" (*<15215>* Ezekiel 23:15) refers to the pictures which were common on the walls of Babylonian palaces, and the reports of them being heard in Jerusalem, or copies of them seen there, awakened the nation's desire for these unknown lovers, which Judah had ample occasion to repent of (*<15217>* Ezekiel 23:17,23; compare 2 Kings 24).

BABYLONISH GARMENT

<bab-i-lo'-nish gar'ment>: In the King James Version, *<16121>* Joshua 7:21, for *BABYLONISH MANTLE*, which see.

BABYLONISH MANTLE

<man'-tl> (the King James Version Babylonish Garment): One of the articles taken by Achan from the spoil of Jericho (*<16121>* Joshua 7:21). In the

Hebrew “a mantle of Shinar.” Entirely gratuitous is the suggested correction of Shinar to [se`ar], making “a hairy mantle.” The Greek has [*psilen poikilen*], which Josephus apparently understood to mean “a royal garment all woven out of gold” (Ant., V, i, 10). The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) calls it a “scarlet pallium,” and some of the rabbinical traditions make it a purple robe. Such classical writers as Pliny and Martial speak of the weaving of embroidered stuffs as a famous industry of Babylonia. Many tablets that have been deciphered indicate that the industry was indeed widely extended, that its costly products were of great variety and that some of them were exported to distant markets; in fine, that the account in Joshua is characterized by great verisimilitude.

Willis J. Beecher

BACA

<ba'-ka> akβ;[bakha']: In the King James Version in ~~<980>~~ Psalm 84:6, where the Revised Version (British and American) has “the valley of Weeping,” with a marginal variant which is best put in the form, “the valley of the balsam-trees.” The word is elsewhere used only in the duplicated account of one of David’s battles (~~<1063>~~ 2 Samuel 5:23,24; ~~<1344>~~ 1 Chronicles 14:14,15). There the translation is “the mulberry trees,” with “the balsam-trees” in the margin in the Revised Version (British and American). Conjecturally the word is, by variant spelling, of the stem which denotes weeping; the tree is called “weeper” from some habit of the trickling of its gum or of the moisture on it; the valley of weeping is not a geographical locality, but a picturesque expression for the experiences of those whose strength is in Yahweh, and who through His grace find their sorrows changed into blessings.

Willis J. Beecher

BACCHIDES

<bak-i-dez>: [βακχίδης, Bakchides): Bacchides, ruler over Mesopotamia and a faithful friend of both Antiochus Epiphanes and Demetrius Soter, established at the request of the latter the rulership over Judea for Aleimus, who, desiring to become high priest, had made false accusations against Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 7:8 ff; Ant, XII, x, 2). Bacchides is sent the second time to Judea after the Syrian general Nicanor was killed near

Adasa and Judas Maccabee had gained control of the government (1 Macc 9:1 ff; Ant, XII, x). Bacchides after an unsuccessful battle near Bethbasi was forced to make peace with Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 9:58 ff; Ant, XIII, i). In 1 Macc 10:12 and 2 Macc 8:30 reference is made to the strongholds Bacchides built during his second campaign against Jerusalem (1 Macc 9:50). Compare *ALCIMUS; BETHBASI; JONATHAN MACCABEE; JUDAS MACCABEE; ADASA; NICANOR*.

A.L. Breslich

BACCHURUS

<ba-ka'-rus>: [Βακχοῦρος, Bakchouros]: One of the “holy singers” who put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:24). Omitted in Ezra 10.

BACCHUS

<bak'-us> [Διόνυσος, Dionusos]; later [Βάκχος, Bakchos], the Feast of Bacchus; [Διονύσια, Dionusia]: The god of wine. His worship had extended over the whole Greek and Roman world centuries before the Christian era, and had degenerated into an orgy of drunkenness and unnamable immoralities, possibly under the influence of oriental Baal worship, such as the Hebrew prophets condemned. It has been surmised that Dionysus was originally not a Greek, but an oriental deity. His worship had been introduced into Egypt, perhaps by the Ptolemies, and Ptolemy Philopator (222-204 BC) had branded the Jews there with his emblem, the sign of the ivy. When Antiochus Epiphanes made his assault upon Jerusalem in the year 168 BC, he determined to extirpate the worship of Yahweh, which he recognized as the strength of the Jewish resistance, and to replace it by Greek religion. All worship of Yahweh and the observance of Jewish rites, such as the Sabbath and circumcision, were prohibited. Heathen worship was set up all over Judea, and in the temple at Jerusalem on the altar of burnt offering an altar to Jupiter was erected, “the abomination that maketh desolate” (^{<2713>} Daniel 11:31), and a swine was sacrificed upon it (*see ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION*). The immoral practices associated with heathen worship in those days established themselves in the temple. When this feast of Bacchus (Dionysus) with all its revelry came round, the Jews were compelled to go in procession in honor of Bacchus (Dionysus), wearing wreaths of ivy, the emblem of the god (2 Macc 6:7). Some years later, when the worship of Yahweh had

been restored, Nicanor the general of Demetrius I, in conducting the war against Judas Maccabaeus, threatened the priests that, unless they delivered Judas up as a prisoner, “he would raze the temple of God even with the ground, break down the altar, and erect there a temple unto Bacchus (Dionysus) for all to see” (2 Macc 14:33).

See DIONYSIA.

LITERATURE.

Cheyne, article “Bacchus,” EB; Kent, History of the Jewish People, I, 328-29; Josephus, Ant, XII, v, 4.

T. Rees

BACENOR

<ba-se'-nor> [Βακήνωρ, Bakenor]: An officer in the army of Judas Maccabee engaged in war against Gorgias, governor of Idumaea (2 Macc 12:35). Compare Ant, XII, viii, 6.

BACHRITE

<bak'-rit>.

See BECHER.

BACK, BACK PARTS

(1) rj " a" [ʾachar], “back side” as in the King James Version): “He led the flock to the back of the wilderness” (<B90>Exodus 3:1), i.e. “to the pasture-lands on the other side of the desert from the Midianite encampments.”

(2) rwDa; [ʾachor], “hinder part,” “the West”): Used of God in an anthropomorphic sense (“Thou shalt see my back,” <B33>Exodus 33:23) to signify “the after-glow of the Divine radiance,” the faint reflection of God’s essential glory. See also <B387>Isaiah 38:17 and compare <B149>1 Kings 14:9 and <B126>Nehemiah 9:26.

(3) [ὀπισθεν, opisthen], “back side”): “A book written within and on the back” (<B10>Revelation 5:1), “but the back of a book is not the same as the

reverse side of a roll. John was struck, not only with the fact that the roll was sealed, but also with the amount of writing it contained” (HDB, I, 231). Compare ^{<4120>}Ezekiel 2:10.

M.O. Evans

BACKBITE

<bak'-bit> **l gr**:[raghal]; [**δολόω** doloo]: To slander the absent, like a dog biting behind the back, where one cannot see; to go about as a talebearer. “He that backbiteth [Revised Version, slandereth] not with his tongue” (^{<1915>}Psalm 15:3).

Backbiters <bak'-bit-êrz> (Greek [**κατάλαλοι**, katalaloi]: Men who speak against. Vulgate, “detractors” (^{<4010>}Romans 1:30).

Backbiting <bak'-bit-ing>: **rts**,[cether]: Adj. “a backbiting tongue”; literally, “a tongue of secrecy” (^{<1923>}Proverbs 25:23). [**καταλαλιά**, katalalia]: substantive “a speaking against” (2 Cor 12:20; Wisdom 1:11); “evil speaking” (1 Pet 2:1). [**γλῶσσα τρίτη**, glossa trite]: “a backbiting tongue” (the King James Version of Ecclesiasticus 28:14,15); more literally translated in the Revised Version (British and American) “a third person’s tongue.”

T. Rees

BACKSIDE

<bak'sid'>:

See BACK.

BACKSLIDE

<bak'-slid'> **hbwm**[meshubhah]; ^{<28107>}Hosea 11:7; 14:4 and often in Hosea and Jer, **bbw** [shobhabh]; **bbw** [shobhebhh], in Jer, 4 times: all meaning “turning back or away,” “apostate,” “rebellious.” **rrs**:[carar], in ^{<3046>}Hosea 4:16 = “stubborn,” “rebellious”; the Revised Version (British and American) “stubborn”: In all places the word is used of Israel forsaking Yahweh, and with a reference to the covenant relation between Yahweh and the nation, conceived as a marriage tie which Israel had violated.

Yahweh was Israel's husband, and by her idolatries with other gods she had proved unfaithful (²⁴¹⁸Jeremiah 3:8,14; 14:7; ²⁸⁴⁴Hosea 14:4). It may be questioned whether Israel was guilty so much of apostasy and defection, as of failure to grow with the growing revelation of God. The prophets saw that their contemporaries fell far short of their own ideal, but they did not realize how far their predecessors also had fallen short of the rising prophetic standard in ideal and action.

See APOSTASY.

Backslider <bak'-slid-er> בל עגלס [cugh lebh]: "The backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways" (²⁰⁴⁴Proverbs 14:14). But the Revised Version (British and American) "backslider" conveys the wrong impression of an apostate. The Hebrew expression here implies simply non-adherence to the right, "The bad man reaps the fruits of his act" (Toy, Prov, in loc.).

T. Rees

BADGER

<baj'er>: **vj " T** to **vj " T**;[tachash]: The word [tachash] occurs in the descriptions of the tabernacle in Exodus 25; 26; 35; 36 and 39, in the directions for moving the tabernacle as given in Numbers 4, and in only one other passage, ²⁶⁶⁰Ezekiel 16:10, where Jerusalem is spoken of as a maiden clothed and adorned by her Lord. In nearly all these passages the word [tachash] occurs with [ʿor], "skin," rendered: the King James Version "badgers' skins," the Revised Version (British and American) "sealskin," the Revised Version, margin "porpoise-skin," Septuagint [*dermata huakinthina*]. In all the passages cited in Exodus and Numbers these skins are mentioned as being used for coverings of the tabernacle; in ²⁶⁶⁰Ezekiel 16:10, for shoes or sandals. The Septuagint rendering would mean purple or blue skins, which however is not favored by Talmudic writers or by modern grammarians, who incline to believe that [tachash] is the name of an animal. The rendering, "badger," is favored by the Talmudic writers and by the possible etymological connection of the word with the Latin *taxis* and the German *Dachs*. The main objection seems to be that badgers' skins would probably not have been easily available to the Israelites. The badger, *Meles taxus*, while fairly abundant in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, does not seem to occur in Sinai or Egypt.

A seal, *Monachus albiventer* (Arabic fukmeh), the porpoise, *Phocoena communis*, and the common dolphin, *Delphinus delphis*, are all found in the Mediterranean. The dugong, *Halicore dugong*, inhabits the Indian Ocean and adjoining waters from the Red Sea to Australia. The Arabic tukhas or dukhas is near to [tachash] and is applied to the dolphin, which is also called delfin. It may be used also for the porpoise or even the seal, and is said by Tristram and others to be applied to the dugong. The statement of Gesenius (Boston, 1850, under the word “tachash”) that the Arabs of Sinai wear sandals of dugong skin is confirmed by recent travelers, and is of interest with reference to ~~צִיָּאֵן~~ Ezekiel 16:10, “.... shod thee with badgers’ skin” (King James Version). The dugong is a marine animal from 5 to 9 ft. in length, frequenting the shore and feeding upon seaweed. It belongs to the order Sirenia. While outwardly resembling Cetacea (whales and porpoises), the Sirenia are really more allied to the Ungulata, or hoofed animals. The dugong of the Indian Ocean and the manatee of the Atlantic and of certain rivers of Africa and South America, are the only living representatives of the Sirenia. A third species, the sea-cow of Behring Sea, became extinct in the 18th century. The seal and porpoise of the Revised Version (British and American), the dolphin, and the dugong are all of about the same size and all inhabit the seas bordering on Egypt and Sinai, so that all are possible candidates for identification with the [tachash]. Of the four, recent opinion seems most to favor the dugong.

Mr. S. M. Perlmann has suggested (Zoologist, set. 4, XII, 256, 1908) that the okapi is the animal indicated by [tachash].

Gesenius (Leipzig, 1905) cites Bondi (*Aegyptiaca*, i. ff) who adduces the Egyptian root t-ch-s and makes the expression [tachash] mean “soft-dressed skin.” This suits the context in every passage and is very promising explanation.

Alfred Ely-Day

BAEAN

<be'-an> [ἡοὶ Βαίαν, *huioi Baian*]; the King James Version Bean; 1 Macc 5:4: A tribe mentioned only because of its malignant hatred of the Jews. Its aggressive hostility against their religion and the rebuilding of their sanctuary duplicated the conspiracy of Sanballat and his confederates against the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple in the days of

Nehemiah (compare ^{<1047>} Nehemiah 4:7,8). Utterly exterminated by Judas Maccabeus who burned alive, in towers, many of the imprisoned people.

See MAON.

BAG

Bags of various kinds are mentioned in the English Bible, but often in a way to obscure rather than the original.

(1) “Bag” is used for a Hebrew word which means a shepherd’s “bag,” rendered “wallet” in the Revised Version (British and American). This “bag” of the shepherd or “haversack” of the traveler was of a size sufficient for one or more days’ provisions. It was made of the skin of animals, ordinarily undressed, as most of the other “bags” of ancient times were, and was carried slung across the shoulder. This is the “scrip for the journey” [πήρα pera] mentioned in ^{<000>} Matthew 10:10 and its parallel (the King James Version). (“Scrip” is Old English, now obsolete.) A unique word appears in ^{<0170>} 1 Samuel 17:40,49 which had to be explained even to Hebrew readers by the gloss, “the shepherd’s bag,” but which is likewise rendered “wallet” by the American Standard Revised Version.

(2) “Bag” translates also a word [βαλλάντιον ballantion] which stands for the more finished leather pouch, or satchel which served as a “purse” (see Christ’s words, ^{<2004>} Luke 10:4 King James Version: “Carry neither purse, nor scrip,” and 12:33 King James Version: “Provide yourselves bags which wax not old”). The word rendered “purse” in ^{<009>} Matthew 10:9: “Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses”; ^{<0078>} Mark 6:8: “No money in their purse,” is a different word entirely [ζώνη, zone], the true rendering of which is “girdle” (Revised Version, margin). The oriental “girdle,” though sometimes of crude leather, or woven camel’s hair (*see GIRDLE*), was often of fine material and elegant workmanship, and was either made hollow so to carry money, or when of silk or cloth, worn in folds, when the money was carried in the folds.

(3) The small “merchant’s bag” often knotted in a handkerchief for carrying the weights, such as is mentioned in ^{<R53>} Deuteronomy 25:13: “Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small,” was another variety. This too was used as “purse,” as in the case of the proposed common purse of the wicked mentioned in ^{<0114>} Proverbs 1:14:

“We will all have one purse,” and sometimes carried in the girdle (compare ^{<2416>}Isaiah 46:6).

(4) Then there was the “bag” ^{rwx} [tseror], rendered “bundle” in ^{<1425>}Genesis 42:35) which was the favorite receptacle for valuables, jewels, as well as money, used figuratively with fine effect in ^{<1253>}1 Samuel 25:29: “The soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life” — “life’s jewel-case” (see ^{<1210>}2 Kings 12:10 where the money of the temple was said to be put up “tied up” in bags). This was a “bag” that could be tied with a string: “Behold, every man’s bundle of money was in his sack,” and (compare ^{<1071>}Proverbs 7:20) “He hath taken a bag of money with him” (compare ^{<3006>}Haggai 1:6: “earneth wages to put it into a bag with holes”).

A seal was sometimes put on the knot, which occasions the figure of speech used in Job (14:16,17), “Dost thou not watch over my sin? My transgression is sealed up in a bag,” i.e. it is securely kept and reckoned against me (compare also ^{<0807>}1 Samuel 9:7; 21:5 where the Hebrew ^{yl j} ; [keli], is rendered by “vessels” and stands for receptacles for carrying food, not necessarily bags).

(5) Another Hebrew word ^{frj} ;[chariT]; Arabic charitat, is used, on the one hand, for a “bag” large enough to hold a talent of silver (see ^{<1183>}2 Kings 5:23, “bound two talents of silver in two bags”), and on the other, for a dainty lady’s satchel, such as is found in ^{<2182>}Isaiah 3:22 (wrongly rendered “crispings pins” in the King James Version). This is the most adequate Hebrew word for a large bag.

(6) The “bag” which Judas carried (see ^{<8115>}John 12:6 the King James Version, “He was a thief and had the bag”; compare ^{<8139>}John 13:29) was in reality the small “box” (Revised Version, margin) originally used for holding the mouthpieces of wind instruments (Kennedy, in the 1-volume HDB). The Hebrew ^{zGr a} [’argaz], found only here) of ^{<0808>}1 Samuel 6:8, rendered “coffer” in English Versions of the Bible and translated [^{γλοσσόκομον}, glossokomon], by Josephus, appears to stand for a small “chest” used to hold the gold figures sent by the Philistines as a guilt offering. It is from a word that means “to wag,” “to move to and fro”; compare the similar word in Arabic meaning a bag filled with stones hung at the side of the camel to “preserve” equilibrium (Gesenius). But the same word Josephus uses is found in modern Greek and means “purse” or “bag”

(Hatch). Later to “carry the bag” came to mean to be treasurer.

George B. Eager

BAGGAGE

<bag'aj>:

(1) **yl K**[keli], “the impedimenta of an army”): “David left his baggage in the hand of the keeper of the baggage” (~~<1972>~~ 1 Samuel 17:22); “at Michmash he layeth up his baggage” (~~<2308>~~ Isaiah 10:28). The American Standard Revised Version gives baggage for “stuff” at ~~<1912>~~ 1 Samuel 10:22; 25:13; 30:24.

(2) [**ἄποσκευή**, aposkeue]: “Beside the baggage” (Judith 7:2), “a great ado and much baggage” (1 Macc 9:35,39), “the women and the children and also the baggage” (the King James Version “and other baggage”; 2 Macc 12:21).

(3) [**ἄποσκευάζομαι**, aposkeuazomai], “to make ready for leaving,” “to pack up baggage”): “We took up (made ready, Revised Version margin) our baggage” (~~<4215>~~ Acts 21:15, the King James Version “carriages”), i.e. what they could carry — English: “luggage”; but others understand the term of the loading of the baggage animals.

M. O. Evans

BAGO

<ba'-go> (Codex Alexandrinus, [**Βαγό**, Bago; Codex Alexandrinus, [**Βαναί**, Banai] = Bigvai [~~<1814>~~ Ezra 8:14]): The descendants of Bago returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:40).

BAGOAS

<ba-go'as> [**Βαγώας**, Bagoas]: The eunuch in charge of the household of Holofernes whom the latter engaged to bring Judith to his palace (Judith 12:11 ff; 13:1,3; 14:14). Compare *JUDITH*.

BAGOI

<baġ'-o-i> (Codex Alexandrinus, [Βαγοί Bagoi]; Codex Vaticanus, [Βοσαί Bosai] = Bigvai [^{<1924>}Ezra 2:14; ^{<1679>}Nehemiah 7:19]): The descendants of B. returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:14).

BAHARUMITE; BARHUMITE

<ba-ha'-rum-it>; <bar-hu'-mit> (^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 11:33; ^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:31): A native of *BAHURIM* (which see).

BAHURIM

<ba-hu'-rim> **μυρj B"** [bachurim]; [Βαουρείμ, Baoureim] usually, but there are variants): A place in the territory of Benjamin which lay on an old road from Jerusalem to Jericho followed by David in his flight from Absalom (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 15:32 through 16:5 ff). It ran over the Mount of Olives and down the slopes to the East. The Talmud identifies it with Ale, math, the modern Almit, about a mile beyond `Anata, going from Jerusalem. If this identification is correct, Wady Farah may be the brook of water (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 17:20). Here Paltiel was parted from his wife Michal by Abner (^{<1016>}2 Samuel 3:16). It was the home of Shimei, who ran along a ridge of the hill cursing and throwing stones at the fugitive king (^{<1016>}2 Samuel 16:5; ^{<1018>}1 Kings 2:8). In Bahurim Jonathan and Ahimaaz, the messengers of David, were concealed in a well by a loyal woman (^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:18 ff). Azmaveth, one of David's heroes, was a native of Bahurim. In ^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:31 we should read, as in ^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 11:33, Barahumite.

W. Ewing

BAITERUS

<ba-i'-ter-us> [Βαιτηρούς, Baiterous]; the King James Version Meterus): The descendants of Baiterus returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:17). Omitted in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7.

BAJITH

<ba'-jith>.

See BAYITH.

BAKBAKKAR

<bak-bak'-ar> rQ" B" qB" [baqbaqqar], "investigator": A Levite (^{<13915>}1 Chronicles 9:15).

BAKBUK

<bak'-buk> qWqBqB" [baqbuq], "bottle" perhaps onomatopoeical, referring to the clucking noise created by the pouring out of the contents of a bottle = Acub, 1 Esdras 5:31): The descendants of Bakbuk returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (^{<1925>}Ezra 2:51; ^{<1973>}Nehemiah 7:53).

BAKBUKIAH

<bak-bu-ki'-a> hyqBqB" [baqbuqyah], "the Lord pours out"):

(1) A Levite who "dwelt in Jerusalem" after the return from Babylon (^{<1917>}Nehemiah 11:17).

(2) A Levite who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (^{<1929>}Nehemiah 12:9).

(3) A Levite and porter keeping "the watch at the store-houses of the gates" (^{<1925>}Nehemiah 12:25).

BAKEMEATS

<bak'-mets>: Only in ^{<1917>}Genesis 40:17 the King James Version and the English Revised Version. "All manner of baked food for Pharaoh" the American Standard Revised Version. Any kind of meat baked or cooked.

See BREAD; FOOD.

BAKING

<bak'-ing>.

See BREAD.

BAKING PAN

See *BREAD*; *PAN*.

BALAAM

<ba'-lam> בלעם [bil'am], "devourer"): The son of Beor, from a city in Mesopotamia called Pethor, a man possessing the gift of prophecy, whose remarkable history may be found in ^{<0202>}Numbers 22:2 through 24:25; compare Num 31:8,16; ^{<0204>}Deuteronomy 23:4; ^{<0632>}Joshua 13:22; 24:9; ^{<0632>}Nehemiah 13:2; ^{<0305>}Micah 6:5; ^{<0215>}2 Peter 2:15; ^{<0011>}Jude 1:11; ^{<0214>}Revelation 2:14.

1. HISTORY:

When the children of Israel pitched their tents in the plains of Moab, the Moabites entered into some sort of an alliance with the Midianites. At the instigation of Balak, at that time king of the Moabites, the elders of the two nations were sent to Balaam to induce him, by means of a bribe, to pronounce a curse on the advancing hosts of the Israelites. But, in compliance with God's command Balaam, refused to go with the elders. Quite different was the result of a second request enhanced by the higher rank of the messengers and by the more alluring promises on the part of Balak. Not only did God permit Balaam to go with the men, but he actually commanded him to do so, cautioning him, however, to act according to further instructions. While on his way to Balak, this injunction was strongly impressed on the mind of Balaam by the strange behavior of his ass and by his encounter with the Angel of the Lord.

Accompanied by Balak who had gone out to meet the prophet, Balaam came to Kiriath-huzoth. On the next morning he was brought up "into the high places of Baal" commanding a partial view of the camp of the Israelites. But instead of a curse he pronounced a blessing. From there he was taken to the top of Peor, yet this change of places and external views did not alter the tendency of Balaam's parables; in fact, his spirit even soared to greater heights and from his lips fell glowing words of praise and admiration, of benediction and glorious prophecy. This, of course, fully convinced Balak that all further endeavors to persuade the seer to comply with his wishes would be in vain, and the two parted.

Nothing else is said of Balaam, until we reach Numbers 31. Here in 31:8 we are told of his violent death at the hands of the Israelites, and in 31:16 we learn of his shameful counsel which brought disgrace and disaster into the ranks of the chosen people.

2. PROBLEMS:

Now, there are a number of interesting problems connected with this remarkable story. We shall try to solve at least some of the more important ones.

(1) Was Balaam a prophet of Jeh? For an answer we must look to Numbers 22 through 24. Nowhere is he called a prophet. He is introduced as the son of Beor and as a man reputed to be of great personal power (compare ^{<0216>}Numbers 22:6b). The cause of this is to be found in the fact that he had intercourse of some kind with God (compare ^{<0219>}Numbers 22:9,20; 22:22-35; 23:4; 23:16). Furthermore, it is interesting to note how Balaam was enabled to deliver his parables. First it is said: “And Yahweh put a word in Balaam’s mouth” (^{<0215>}Numbers 23:5; compare 23:16), a procedure seemingly rather mechanical, while nothing of the kind is mentioned in Numbers 24. Instead we meet with the remarkable sentence: “And when Balaam saw that it pleased Yahweh to bless Israel, he went not, as at the other times, to meet with enchantments” (^{<0201>}Numbers 24:1), and then: “the Spirit of God came upon him” (24:2b). All this is very noteworthy and highly instructive, especially if we compare with it 24:3 the Revised Version, margin and ^{<0204>}Numbers 24:4: “The man whose eye is opened saith; he saith, who heareth the words of God, who seeth the vision of the Almighty,” etc. The inference is plain enough: Balaam knew the Lord, the Yahweh of the Israelites, but his knowledge was dimmed and corrupted by heathen conceptions. He knew enough of God to obey Him, yet for a long time he hoped to win Him over to his own selfish plan (compare 23:4). Through liberal sacrifices he expected to influence God’s actions. Bearing this in mind, we see the import of ^{<0201>}Numbers 24:1. After fruitless efforts to cajole God into an attitude favorable to his hidden purpose, he for a time became a prophet of the Lord, yielding to the ennobling influences of His spirit. Here was a chance for his better nature to assert itself permanently and to triumph over the dark forces of paganism. Did he improve this opportunity? He did not (compare ^{<0218>}Numbers 31:8,16).

(2) Is the Balaam of Numbers 22 through 24 identical with the person of the same name mentioned in Numbers 31? Quite a number of scholars deny it, or, to be more accurate, there are according to their theory two accounts of Balaam: the one in Numbers 22 through 24 being favorable to his character, and the other in Numbers 31 being quite the reverse. It is claimed the two accounts could only be made to agree by modifying or eliminating ^{<0205>}Numbers 24:25. Now, we believe that ^{<0316>}Numbers 31:16 actually does modify the report of Balaam's return contained in ^{<0205>}Numbers 24:25. The children of Israel slew Balaam with the sword (^{<0308>}Numbers 31:8). Why? Because of his counsel of Num 31:16. We maintain that the author of ^{<0205>}Numbers 24:25 had this fact in mind when he wrote ^{<0205>}Numbers 25:1: "And the people began to play the harlot," etc. Thus, he closely connects the report of Balaam's return with the narrative contained in ^{<0316>}Numbers 9:5. Therefore, we regard ^{<0308>}Numbers 31:8,16 as supplementary to Numbers 22 through 24. But here is another question:

(3) Is the narrative in Numbers 22 through 24 the result of combining different traditions? In a general way, we may answer this question in the affirmative, and only in a general way we can distinguish between two main sources of tradition. But we maintain that they are not contradictory to each other, but supplementary.

(4) What about the talking of the ass and the marvelous prophecies of Balaam? We would suggest the following explanation. By influencing the soul of Balaam, God caused him to interpret correctly the inarticulate sounds of the animal. God's acting on the soul and through it on the intellect and on the hearts of men — this truth must be also applied to Balaam's wonderful prophetic words. They are called [meshaliym] or sayings of a prophet, a diviner.

In the first of these "parables" (^{<0207>}Numbers 23:7-10) he briefly states his reasons for pronouncing a blessing; in the second parable (^{<0218>}Numbers 23:18-24) he again emphasizes the fact that he cannot do otherwise than bless the Israelites, and then he proceeds to pronounce the blessing at some greater length. In the 3rd (^{<0218>}Numbers 24:3-9) he describes the glorious state of the people, its development and irresistible power. In the last four parables (^{<0215>}Numbers 24:15-24) he partly reveals the future of Israel and other nations: they are all to be destroyed, Israel's fate being included in the allusion to Eber. Now, at last, Balaam is back again in his own sphere

denouncing others and predicting awful disasters. (On the “star out of Jacob,” ^{<Q347>}Numbers 24:17, *see ASTRONOMY*, ii, 9; *STAR OF THE MAGI*.)

3. BALAAM'S CHARACTER:

This may furnish us a clue to his character. It, indeed, remains “instructively composite.” A soothsayer who might have become a prophet of the Lord; a man who loved the wages of unrighteousness, and yet a man who in one supreme moment of his life surrendered himself to God’s holy Spirit; a person cumbered with superstition, covetousness and even wickedness, and yet capable of performing the highest service in the kingdom of God: such is the character of Balaam, the remarkable Old Testament type and, in a sense, the prototype of Judas Iscariot.

4. BALAAM AS A TYPE:

In ^{<Q15>}2 Peter 2:15 Balaam’s example is used as a means to illustrate the pernicious influence of insincere Christian teachers. The author might have alluded to Balaam in the passage immediately preceding ^{<Q15>}2 Peter 2:15 because of his abominable counsel. This is done in ^{<Q14>}Revelation 2:14. Here, of course, Balaam is the type of a teacher of the church who attempts to advance the cause of God by advocating an unholy alliance with the ungodly and worldly, and so conforming the life of the church to the spirit of the flesh.

LITERATURE.

Butler’s Sermons, “Balaam”; ICC, “Numbers.”

William Baur

BALAC

^{<ba'-lak>}.

See BALAK.

BALADAN

^{<bal'-a-dan>} ^{ˆdaβ} [bal’adhan], “He (i.e. Merodach) has given a son”: Baladan is said in ^{<Q12>}2 Kings 20:12 and ^{<Q10>}Isaiah 39:1 to have been

the father of Berodach (Merodach)-Baladan, king of Babylon. Some have thought that the Biblical writer was wrong here, inasmuch as it is said in the inscriptions of Sargon (Annals, 228, 315; Pt., 122), that Merodach-Baladan was the son of Yakin. It is evident, however, from the analogy of Jehu, who is called by the Assyrian kings the son of Omri, that Yakin is to be looked upon as the founder of the dynasty or kingdom, rather than as the father of Merodach-Baladan. The Bith Yakin, over which Merodach-Baladan is said to have been king, corresponds exactly to the phrase Bith Khumria, or House of Omri, over which Jehu is said to have ruled. There is no reason, then, for supposing that there is an error in either case. There is, however, good reason for believing that the Merodach-Baladan of the Book of Kings was the son of another king of the same name. That only the latter part of the father's name is here mentioned may be compared with the Shalman of ^{<2804>}Hosea 10:14 for the more fully-written Shalmaneser of ^{<1278>}2 Kings 17:3; and with the Jareb of ^{<2863>}Hosea 5:13 and 10:6, probably for Sennacherib. Such abbreviation of proper names was usual among the Assyrians and Babylonians. See Tallquist, *Namenbuch*, xiv-xix.

R. Dick Wilson

BALAH

^{<ba'la>} **hl** **B**_i[balah]; [**Βολά**, Bola]: A place, unidentified, in the territory of Simeon (^{<6808>}Joshua 19:3), called Bilhah in ^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:29. It may be identical with Baalah in Judah (^{<6659>}Joshua 15:29).

BALAK

^{<ba'-ak>} **ql** **B**_i[balaq], "devastator" or "one who lays waste": Mentioned in connection with the story of Balaam/Balak (Numbers 22 through 24; compare ^{<6349>}Joshua 24:9; ^{<67125>}Judges 11:25; ^{<3065>}Micah 6:5; ^{<6124>}Revelation 2:14). He was the king of Moab who hired Balaam to pronounce a curse on the Israelites.

See BALAAM.

BALAMON

<bal'-a-mon> [Βαλαμών, Balamon]; the King James Version, Balamo): In the field between Balamon and Dothaim Manasses, the husband of Judith, was buried (Judith 8:3). Compare Baal-hamon (Song 8:11).

BALANCE

<bal'-ans> The English word “balance” is from the Latin bilanx = “having two scales” (bi = “two” and lanx = “plate,” or “scale”). It is used to render three Hebrew words:

(1) **מִזְנֵי** [mo'znayim] (^{<898>}Leviticus 19:36; ^{<898>}Job 6:2; ^{<939>}Psalms 62:9; ^{<100>}Proverbs 11:1; ^{<240>}Isaiah 40:12,15; ^{<240>}Jeremiah 32:10, etc.);

(2) **קָנֶה** [qaneh] (^{<246>}Isaiah 46:6), and

(3) **סֵלַע** [selec] (^{<2061>}Proverbs 16:11). It is found in the sing., e.g. “a just balance” (^{<2061>}Proverbs 16:11); “a pair of balances” (^{<605>}Revelation 6:5, etc.), as well as in the plur., e.g. “just balances” (^{<898>}Leviticus 19:36), “weighed in the balances” (^{<2067>}Daniel 5:27, etc.).

1. BALANCES AMONG THE ANCIENT HEBREWS; THE PARTS, ETC.:

(1) The “balances” of the ancient Hebrews differed little, if at all, from those used by the Egyptians (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt (1878), II, 246 f). They consisted, probably, of a horizontal bar, either pivoted on a perpendicular rod (see Erman, Aegypten, I, 615 for similar Egyptian balances), or suspended from a cord and held in the hand, the more primitive form. At the ends of the bar were pans, or hooks, from which the things to be weighed were suspended, sometimes in bags.

A good description of the more developed and final form is this: A beam with its fulcrum in the middle and its arms precisely equal. From the ends of the arms were suspended two scales, the one to receive the object to be weighed, the other the counterpoise, or weight.

(2) The weights were of stone at first and are so named in ^{<653>}Deuteronomy 25:13 King James Version, margin. A pair of scales (the King James Version “a pair of balances”) is used in ^{<605>}Revelation 6:5 by a

figure of speech for the balance as a whole; only once is the beam so used, in ^{<2416>}Isaiah 46:6, literally, “weigh silver in the beam.” Abraham, we are told (^{<0236>}Genesis 23:16), “weighed the silver.”

2. PROBABLY OF BABYLONIAN ORIGIN:

The basis and fountain-head of all systems of weights and measurements is to be traced, it is now thought, to Babylonia; but the primitive instruments and systems were subject to many modifications as they entered other regions and passed into the derivative systems. The Roman “balance” is the same as our steelyard (vulgarly called “stillyards”). Compare the Chinese, Danish, etc.

3. THE SYSTEM OF WEIGHING LIABLE TO FRAUD:

Though the “balances” in ancient times were rudely constructed, the weighing could be done quite accurately, as may be seen in the use of equally primitive balances in the East today. But the system was liable to fraud. A “false balance” might be literally one so constructed that the arms were of unequal length, when the longer arm would be intended, of course, for the article to be weighed. The system was liable, however, to various other subtle abuses then as now; hence the importance in God’s sight of “true weights” and a “just balance” is enforced again and again (see ^{<0826>}Leviticus 19:36; ^{<0106>}Proverbs 11:1; 16:11; 20:23; ^{<0085>}Amos 8:5; ^{<3611>}Micah 6:11, etc.).

4. “WICKED BALANCES” CONDEMNED:

“A false balance is an abomination to Yahweh” (^{<0106>}Proverbs 11:1; compare 20:23), and “a just balance and scales are Yahweh’s” (^{<0161>}Proverbs 16:11). Hosea (12:7) condemns “the balances of deceit” in the hand of the wicked; Amos (8:5 the King James Version) cries out upon “falsifying the balances by deceit,” and Micah (6:11) denounces “wicked balances.” Indeed, the righteousness of a just balance and true weights, and the iniquity of false ones are everywhere emphasized by the lawmakers, prophets and moral teachers of Israel, and the preacher or teacher who would expose and denounce such things in God’s name today need be at no loss for texts and precedents.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

LITERATURE.

Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt; Erman, Egypt; Lepsius, Denkmaler; and articles on “Balance.” etc., in Smith, DB, EB, Jewish Encyclopedia, HDB, etc.

George B. Eager

BALANCINGS

<bal'-ans-ins>: “The balancings of the clouds” (<185716> Job 37:16), the manner in which they are poised and supported in the air, alike with their mysterious spreadings and motions, challenge the strongest intellect to explain.

BALASAMUS

<ba-las'-a-mus>.

See BAALSAMUS.

BALD LOCUST

<bald lo'kust>.

See LOCUST.

BALDNESS

<bald'-ness> **hj r" q**;_[qorchah]: The reference in the Bible to baldness is not to the natural loss of hair, but to baldness produced by shaving the head. This was practiced as a mark of mourning for the dead (<18216> Leviticus 21:5; <23818> Isaiah 15:2; 22:12); as the result of any disaster (<31080> Amos 8:10; <31001> Micah 1:16). The custom arose from the fact that the hair was regarded as a special ornament. It was the custom of the people of the land, and the Israelites were strictly forbidden to practice it (<18216> Leviticus 21:5; Deut 14:1). These are striking passages with reference to the knowledge the Israelites had concerning the future life. This is saying to them what Paul said to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 4:13). To call one a “bald head” was an epithet of contempt, and was sometimes applied to persons who were not naturally bald. It was the epithet applied by certain infidel young men to Elisha

(^{<1273>}2 Kings 2:23,24). In a figurative sense it is used to express the barrenness of the country (^{<2475>}Jeremiah 47:5).

See HAIR; SHAVE.

Jacob W. Kapp

BALL

<bol> (rWD [dur]): A rare Hebrew word used in this sense only in ^{<3228>}Isaiah 22:18, and correctly rendered in the American Standard Revised Version “He will surely wind thee round and round, and toss thee like a ball into a large country.” Deuteronomy Or, Bottcher, Jastrow, following Talmud, regard the noun as [kaddur], but perhaps incorrectly.

See also GAMES.

BALM

<bam> (yrk'[tseri], yrk'[tsori]; Septuagint [ῥητίνη, rhetine]): The name of an odoriferous resin said to be brought from Gilead by Ishmaelite Arabs on their way to Egypt (^{<0375>}Genesis 37:25). It is translated “balm” in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but is called “mastic,” the Revised Version, margin. In ^{<0481>}Genesis 43:11 it is one of the gifts sent by Jacob to Joseph, and in ^{<3277>}Ezekiel 27:17 it is named as one of the exports from Judea to Tyre. The prophet Jeremiah refers figuratively to its medicinal properties as an application to wounds and as a sedative (8:22; 46:11; 51:8). The name is derived from a root signifying “to leak,” and is applied to it as being an exudation. There is a sticky, honeylike gum resin prepared at the present day at Jericho, extracted from the Balanites Aegyptiaca grown in the Ghor, and sold to travelers in small tin boxes as “Balm of Gilead,” but it is improbable that this is the real tscori and it has no medicinal value. The material to which the classic authors applied the name is that known as Mecca balsam, which is still imported into Egypt from Arabia, as it was in early times. This is the exudation from the Balsamodendron opobalsamum, a native of southern Arabia and Abyssinia. The tree is small, ragged-looking and with a yellowish bark like that of a plane tree, and the exudation is said to be gathered from its smaller branches. At the present day it grows nowhere in Palestine. Dr. Post and other botanists have sought for it on the Ghor and

in Gilead, and have not found it, and there is no trace of it in the neighborhood of Jericho, which Pliny says is its only habitat. Strabo describes it as growing by the Sea of Galilee, as well as at Jericho, but both these and other ancient writers give inconsistent and incorrect descriptions of the tree evidently at second hand. We learn from Theophrastus that many of the spices of the farther East reached the Mediterranean shore through Palestine, being brought by Arab caravans which would traverse the indefinitely bounded tract East of Jordan to which the name Gilead is given, and it was probably thus that the balm received its local name. Mecca balsam is an orange-yellow, treacly fluid, mildly irritating to the skin, possibly a weak local stimulant and antiseptic, but of very little remedial value.

Alex. Macalister

BALM OF GILEAD

The people of Jericho today prepare for the benefit of pilgrims a “Balm of Gilead” from the [zaqqum] (Balanites Aegyptiaca), but this has no serious claims to be the balm of antiquity. If we are to look beyond the borders of modern Palestine we may credit the tradition which claims that Mecca balsam, a product of *Balsamodendron Gileadense* and *B. opobalsamum*, was the true “balm,” and Post (HDB, I, 236) produces evidence to show that these plants were once grown in the Jordan valley. Yet another suggestion, made by Lagarde, is that the [tsori] = [στούραξ, sturax], and if so then “balm” would be the inspissated juice of the Storax-tree (*Stytax officinalis*), a common inhabitant of Gilead.

See also BALM.

E. W. G. Masterman

BALNUUS

<bal-nu'-us> (Codex Alexandrinus, [Βαλνοῦς, Balnouos]; Codex Vaticanus, [Βαλνοῦς, Balnous] = Binnui (<SIB> Ezra 10:30)): Balnuus put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:31).

BALSAM

<bol'-sam> (μῆ[basam], μῆ[besem]; ἡδύσματα, hedusmata]; [θυμιάματα, thumiamata]): Is usually “spices” but in the Revised Version, margin (Song 5:1,13; 6:2) is rendered as “balsam.” It was an ingredient in the anointing oil of the priests (^{<12516>}Exodus 25:6; 35:28). The Queen of Sheba brought it as a present to Solomon (^{<1100>}1 Kings 10:2) in large quantity (^{<1100>}1 Kings 10:10) and of a finer quality (^{<499>}2 Chronicles 9:9) than that brought as a regular tribute by other visitors (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:25). In the later monarchy Hezekiah had a treasure of this perfume (^{<4627>}2 Chronicles 32:27) which he displayed to his Babylonian visitors (^{<2300>}Isaiah 39:2); and after the captivity the priests kept a store of it in the temple (^{<1300>}1 Chronicles 9:30). According to Ezekiel the Syrians imported it from Sheba (27:22). There is a tradition preserved in Josephus (Ant., VIII, vi, 6) that the Queen of Sheba brought roots of the plant to Solomon, who grew them in a garden of spices at Jericho, probably derived from the references to such a garden in Song 5:1,13; 6:2. This may be the source of the statements of Strabo, Trogus and Pliny quoted above (*see BALM*). It was probably the same substance as the BALM described above, but from the reference in ^{<12307>}Exodus 30:7; 35:8, it may have been used as a generic name for fragrant resins. The root from which the word is derived signifies “to be fragrant,” and fragrant balsams or resins are known in modern Arabic as bahasan. The trees called in ^{<10023>}2 Samuel 5:23,24 (Revised Version, margin) “balsam-trees” were certainly not those which yielded this substance, for there are none in the Shephelah but there are both mulberry trees and terebinths in the district between Rephaim and Gezer. When used as a perfume the name basam seems to have been adopted, but as a medicinal remedy it is called [tsori].

Alex. Macalister

BALTASAR

<bal-ta'-sar> ([Βαλτασάρ, Baltasar]; the King James Version Balthasar):

(1) The Greek of Hebrew, **rX" av" f] Bē** [belTeshā'tsarsar], or **rX" v" af] Bē** [belTe'shatsarsar], perhaps corresponding to [BalaT-sar-ucur], “protect the life of the king,” the Babylonian cognomen of Daniel. Compare Belteshazzar (^{<2000>}Daniel 1:7; 2:26; 4:8 ff, et al.).

(2) Baltasar is also the Greek of the Hebrew **רX" avl Be** [belsha'ttsar], or **רX" v" al Be** [bel'shatstsar], the name of the last king of Babylon (corresponding to the Babylonian Bel-sar-ucur; Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, III, 396; Syriac Blithazzar; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Baltassar). Compare Baruch 1 11 and Belshazzar (^{<208>}Daniel 5:1 ff; 7:1; 8:1).

(3) The name of one of the Magi who according to the legend visited Jesus at Bethlehem: Melchior from Nubia, Balthasar from Godolia, Caspar from Tharsis.

A. L. Breslich

BAMAH

<ba'-ma>, **<ba'-ma>** (**hmB**;[bamah], "high place"): The word appears in ^{<319>}Ezekiel 20:29 where reference is made to former "high-place worship," the prophet speaking with contempt of such manner of worship. Ewald suggests a play of words, **aB**;[ba'], "come" and **hm**;[mah], "what," "what ([mah]) is the high place ([ba-mah]) whereunto ye come ([ba'])?" It is possible that reference is made to a prominent high place like the one at Gibeon (compare ^{<1104>}1 Kings 3:4; ^{<13169>}1 Chronicles 16:39; 21:29; 2 Chronicles 13) for which the name "Bamah" was retained after the reform mentioned by the prophet.

BAMOTH; BAMOTH-BAAL

<ba'-moth>, **<ba'-moth-ba'-al>** (**I [B" twOB**;[bamoth-ba'al], "high places of Baal"): Bamoth is referred to in ^{<0219>}Numbers 21:19,20, as a station in the journeyings of Israel North of the Arnon. It is probably the same place as the Bamoth-baal of ^{<0241>}Numbers 22:41 (Revised Version margin), whither Balak, king of Moab, conducted Balaam to view and to curse Israel. Bamoth-baal is named in ^{<06317>}Joshua 13:17 as one of the cities given to Reuben. Mesha, on the Moabite Stone, speaks of having "rebuilt" Beth-bamoth.

BAN

(A, [Bάν, Ban]; B, [Bαινών, Bainan]; 1 Esdras 5:37 = Tobiah (^{<1510>}Ezra 2:60; ^{<1072>}Nehemiah 7:62); some manuscripts of the Septuagint read [Bουά, Boua]): The descendants of Ban were not able to trace their ancestry to show “how they were of Israel.”

BANAIAS

^{<ban-a-i’-as>} ([Bανάιας, Banaias]; 1 Esdras 9:35 = Benaiah (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:43)): Banaias put away his “strange wife.”

BAND

The English word has two generic meanings, each shading off into several specific meanings:

- (1) that which holds together, binds or encircles: a bond;
- (2) a company of men. The second sense may philologically and logically have been derived from the first, men being held together by social ties.

Both meanings appear in Old Testament and New Testament representing various Hebrew and Greek words.

(1) A band

(a) (rWsaef^{ecur}): a flaxen rope (^{<0754>}Judges 15:14); a band of iron and brass (^{<2045>}Daniel 4:15,23); metaphorically used of a false woman’s hands (^{<2072>}Ecclesiastes 7:26).

(b) (l bj^{,[chebhel]}): “The bands of the wicked have robbed me” (the King James Version of ^{<1968>}Psalms 119:61), where “bands” = “troops” by mistr; the Revised Version (British and American) “The cords of the wicked have wrapped me round”; plural [chobhlim] = “bands” = the name of the prophet’s symbolic staff representing the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (^{<3007>}Zechariah 11:7,14).

(c) (tbff^{abthoth}): “I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love” (^{<2804>}Hosea 11:4; compare ^{<2025>}Ezekiel 3:25; 4:8; ^{<1890>}Job 39:10).

(d) (**hpc**;[saphah]): the edge of the round opening in the robe of the ephod with a band (the Revised Version (British and American) “binding”) round about the hole of it (only in ^{<1243>}Exodus 39:23).

(e) (**twḲxʾ j** [chartsubboth]): bands (the Revised Version (British and American) “bonds”) of wickedness (^{<2816>}Isaiah 58:6); bands (= pains) in death (^{<1704>}Psalms 73:4); the Revised Version, margin (“pangs,” Cheyne, “torments”).

(f) (**hfw** [moTah]): the cross bar of oxen’s yoke, holding them together (^{<1893>}Leviticus 26:13; ^{<3407>}Ezekiel 34:27 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “bars”).

(g) (**rs** [mocer]): a fetter: “Who hath loosed the bonds of the swift ass?” (^{<1895>}Job 39:5; ^{<1918>}Psalms 2:3; 107:14; ^{<2302>}Isaiah 28:22; 52:2; ^{<2421>}Jeremiah 2:20; all in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). The same Hebrew word (in ^{<1896>}Psalms 116:16; ^{<2415>}Jeremiah 5:5; 27:2; 30:8; Nah 1:13) is translated “bonds” in the King James Version, and in the English Revised Version of ^{<1896>}Psalms 116:16, and Nah 1:13, but “bands” in the English Revised Version of ^{<2415>}Jeremiah 5:5; 27:2; 30:8; the American Standard Revised Version has “bonds” throughout. *See BOND.*

(h) (**twḲv** [moshekhoth]): “Canst thou loose the bands of Orion?” (only in ^{<1883>}Job 38:31).

(i) ([**δεσμός**, desmos], [**σύνδεσμος**, sundesmos]): a fetter: that which binds together: of the chains of a lunatic or prisoner (^{<1889>}Luke 8:29; ^{<4106>}Acts 16:26; 22:30 the King James Version), metaphorically of the mystic union of Christ and the church (^{<5109>}Colossians 2:19). These words are often translated by “bond” in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American).

(j) ([**ζευκτηρία**, zeukteria]): the rudder’s bands (only in ^{<4241>}Acts 27:40).

(2) A company of men

(a) (**dwdg** [gedhudh]): a band of soldiers (^{<1002>}2 Samuel 4:2; ^{<11124>}1 Kings 11:24, the King James Version; ^{<1163>}2 Kings 6:23; 13:20,21; 24:2; ^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 7:4; 12:18,21; ^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 22:1). So the Revised Version (British and American) (except in ^{<11124>}1 Kings 11:24, “troop”).

(b) (varqo' sh): “head” = “division”: “The Chaldeans made three bands” (^{<1817>}Job 1:17); ^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 12:23 the Revised Version (British and American) translates “heads.”

(c) (l yj " [chayil]): “a band of men” the Revised Version (British and American) the “host” (only in ^{<9106>}1 Samuel 10:26).

(d) (μυρῆαι) [aghappim]: “the wings of an army,” only in Ezekiel, armies of the King of Judah (12:14; 17:21); of Gomer and of Togarmah (38:6); of Gog (the Revised Version (British and American) “hordes”) (38:9,22; 39:4).

(e) (hnhjnh" [machaneh]): “camp”: only in ^{<1837>}Genesis 32:7,10; the Revised Version (British and American) “companies.”

(f) (ἄρεοι [chotsets]): of locusts dividing into companies or swarms (^{<1817>}Proverbs 30:27).

(g) ([σπεῖρα, speira]): usually a “cohort” (see the Revised Version, margin) of Roman soldiers; the tenth part of a legion, about 600 men: (^{<1277>}Matthew 27:27; ^{<4156>}Mark 15:16; ^{<4100>}Acts 10:1; 21:31; 27:1). A smaller detachment of soldiers (^{<6100>}John 18:3,12; compare 2 Macc 8:23; Judith 1:4:11).

(h) ([ποιεῖν συστροφὴν, poiein sustrophēn]): “to make a conspiracy”: “The Jews banded together” (^{<4232>}Acts 23:12).

T. Rees

(3) The Augustan Band ([σπεῖρα Σεβαστή, speira Sebaste]) to which Julius, the Roman centurion who had charge of Paul as a prisoner on his voyage to Rome, belonged, was a cohort apparently stationed at Caesarea at the time (^{<4200>}Acts 27:1). Schurer (GJV, I3, 461 f) is of opinion that it was one of five cohorts mentioned by Josephus, recruited in Samaria and called Sebastenes from the Greek name of the city of Samaria (Sebaste). This particular cohort had in all likelihood for its full name [*Cohors Augusta Sebastenorum*], Augusta being an honorific title of which examples are found in the case of auxiliary troops. Sir William Ramsay, following Mommsen (Paul the Traveler, 315, 348), thinks it denotes a body of legionary centurions, selected from legions serving abroad, who were employed by the emperor on confidential business between the provinces

and Rome, the title Augustan being conferred upon them as a mark of favor and distinction. The grounds on which the views of Mommsen and Ramsay rest are questioned by Professor Zahn (Introduction to the New Testament, I, 551 ff), and more evidence is needed to establish them.

See ARMY (ROMAN).

(4) The Italian Band ([σπεῖρα Ἰταλική, speira Italike]) was a cohort composed of volunteer Roman citizens born in Italy and stationed at Caesarea at this time (~~<400>~~ Acts 10:1). Schurer maintains that there could have been no Roman cohort there at this time, although he accepts the testimony of inscriptions to the presence of an Italian cohort at a later time. He accordingly rejects the story of Cornelius, holding that the author of the Acts has given in this narrative conditions belonging to a later time (GJV, I3, 462 f). In reply to Schurer, Blass asks why one of the five cohorts mentioned by Josephus may not have been composed of Roman citizens living at Caesarea or Sebaste, and bearing this name (Blass, Acta Apostolorum, 124). From a recently discovered inscription, Sir W. M. Ramsay has ascertained that there was an Italian cohort stationed in Syria in 69 AD, which heightens the probability of one actually being found in Caesarea at 41-44 AD, and he shows that even if his cohort was at the time on duty elsewhere a centurion like Cornelius might well have been at Caesarea at the time mentioned (Expositor, 5th series, IV, V, with Schurer's rejoinder). The subject of detached service in the provinces of the Roman Empire is admittedly obscure, but nothing emerges in this discussion to cast doubt upon the historical character of Luke's narrative.

See ARMY (ROMAN).

T. Nicol.

BANDS, BEAUTY AND

See BEAUTY AND BANDS.

BANDS OF RUDDER

See RUDDER.

BANI

<ba'-ni> (ynB_i[bani], “posterity”):

- (1) A Gadite, one of David’s mighty men (~~<1236>~~ 2 Samuel 23:36).
- (2) A Levite whose son was appointed for service in the tabernacle at David’s time (~~<1316>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:46).
- (3) A Judahite whose son lived in Jerusalem after the captivity (~~<1390>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:4).
- (4) The descendants of Bani (called Binnui, ~~<1475>~~ Nehemiah 7:15) returned with Zerubbabel (~~<1520>~~ Ezra 2:10) and had taken “strange wives” (~~<1509>~~ Ezra 10:29).
- (5) Bani who had taken a “strange wife” (~~<1508>~~ Ezra 10:38) mentioned with his brothers, the sons of Bani who also had taken “strange wives” (~~<1504>~~ Ezra 10:34).
- (6) Son of Bani, a Levite and builder (~~<1487>~~ Nehemiah 3:17).
- (7) Bani, who instructed the people at Ezra’s time (~~<1487>~~ Nehemiah 8:7).
- (8) Three Levites mentioned in connection with the temple worship at Ezra’s time (~~<1404>~~ Nehemiah 9:4,5).
- (9) A Levite who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (~~<1403>~~ Nehemiah 10:13).
- (10) A leader of the people who also signed the covenant (~~<1404>~~ Nehemiah 10:14).
- (11) One whose son Uzzi was overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem (~~<1412>~~ Nehemiah 11:22).

See *BINNUI*.

A. L. Breslich

BANIAS (1)

<ba-ni'-as> (B, [Βανίας, Banias]; A, [Βανί, Bani]; the King James Version Banid (1 Esdras 8:36)): An ancestor of Salimoth. The descendants of Banias returned with Ezra to Jerusalem. The name is omitted (<1980> Ezra 8:10), perhaps due to the oversight of a copyist or a mistaken reading of ybB [bene], “sons of,” for ynB;[bani].

BANIAS (2)

See CAESAREA PHILIPPI.

BANID

<ba'-nid> (1 Esdras 8:36): In the Revised Version (British and American) BANIAS, which see.

BANISHMENT

<ban'-ish-ment>.

See PUNISHMENTS.

BANK

<bank>:

(1) (hpc;[saphah], “lip,” “edge”): “By the bank of the Jordan” (<1213> 2 Kings 2:13); “Upon the bank of the river were very many trees” (<2570> Ezekiel 47:7,12).

(2) (hd;[gadhad], “cuttings”): Always of banks overflowed (<1815> Joshua 3:15; 4:18; <2187> Isaiah 8:7), as also

(3) (hydG[gidhyah], <1325> 1 Chronicles 12:15).

(4) (hl | \$ [solelah], “mound,” “rampart”): “Cast up a bank against the city” (<1015> 2 Samuel 20:15, the English Revised Version “mount,” the American Standard Revised Version “mound”; compare <1292> 2 Kings 19:32; <2573> Isaiah 37:33). “Banks of sweet herbs” (Song 5:13); “the marginal rendering is the right one, ‘towers of perfumes,’ i.e. plants with fragrant

leaves and flowers trained on trellis-work” (Speaker’s Commentary in the place cited.).

(5) ([~~χάραξ~~, charax], “a stake,” “entrenchment”): “Thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee” (~~293~~ Luke 19:43 the King James Version “trench”). It is probably a military term and stands for a “palisade” (so the Revised Version, margin), i.e. probably an embankment of stakes strengthened with branches and earth, with a ditch behind it, used by the besiegers as a protection against arrows or attacking parties (Latin vallum), such, no doubt, as was employed by Titus in the siege of Jerusalem, 70 AD (Josephus, BJ, V, vi, 2).

(6) *BANK, BANKING* (which see).

M. O. Evans

BANK; BANKING

1. INTRODUCTORY:

“Banking” in the full modern sense, of taking money on deposit and lending it out on interest, is of comparatively recent origin. A few “banks of deposit” were founded in Italy in the Middle Ages, but the earliest “banks of issue,” of the modern sort, were those of Amsterdam (1609) and Hamburg (1619), beginning in the 17th century. The law of Moses forbade Israelites to charge each other interest (~~10225~~ Exodus 22:25; ~~15255~~ Leviticus 25:35,37; ~~15239~~ Deuteronomy 23:19), but let them lend on interest to Gentiles (~~15230~~ Deuteronomy 23:20), though this law was often evaded or disregarded (~~14150~~ Nehemiah 5:10,12). Banks and banking, however, are found in operation in the Greek cities; “moneychangers,” sitting at their tables ([*trapezai*]) in the market place, both changed coins and took money on deposit, giving high interest; and banking of a sort, in its incipient stages, existed among the ancient Hebrews. But the Phoenicians are now thought to have been the inventors of the money-changing, money-lending system which is found in more or less modified and developed forms among ancient peoples and in full development and operation in the palmy days of the Roman Empire. In the Greek-Roman period, without doubt, bankers both received money on deposit, paying interest, and let it out at a higher rate, or employed it in trade, as the publicani at Rome did, in farming the revenues of a province (Plumptre).

2. BANKING AMONG THE ANCIENT HEBREWS:

(1) The Hebrew money-changer, like his modern Syrian counterpart, the [*saraf*] (see PEFS, 1904, 49 ff, where the complexity of exchange in Palestine today is graphically described), changed the large coins current into those of smaller denominations, e.g. giving denarii for tetradrachms, or silver for gold, or copper for silver.

(2) But no mean part of his business was the exchanging of foreign money, and even the money of the country of a non-Phoenician standard, for shekels and half-shekels on this standard, the latter being accepted only in payment of the temple dues (*see MONEY*). The “money-changers” of ^{<1212>}Matthew 21:12, as the Greek signifies, were men who made small change. Such men may be seen in Jerusalem now with various coins piled in slender pillars on a table (compare [*epi trapezan*], ^{<1223>}Luke 19:23), ready to be used in changing money for a premium into such forms, or denominations, as would be more current or more convenient for immediate use.

(3) “Usury” in English Versions of the Bible is simply Old English for what we today call “interest,” i.e. the sum paid for the use of money, Latin *usura*; and “interest” should take the place of it in all passages in the Old Testament and New Testament, where it has such significance.

3. BANKING IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES:

The Greek word rendered ([*tokos*]), “usury” in the New Testament (see ^{<1223>}Luke 19:23 f) means literally, “what is born of money,” “what money brings forth or produces.” “Usury” has come to mean “exorbitant interest,” but did not mean this at the time of the King James Version, 1611.

(1) In Christ’s time, and immediately following, there was great need for money-changers and money-changing, especially on the part of foreign Jews whom custom forbade to put any but Jewish coins into the temple treasury (see ^{<1244>}Mark 12:41). It was mainly for the convenience of these Jews of the Dispersion, and because it was in order to a sacred use, that the people thought it proper to allow the money-changers to set up their tables in the outer court of the temple (see ^{<1212>}Matthew 21:12 ff).

(2) The language of ^{<1257>}Matthew 25:27, ‘Thou oughtest to have put my money to the bankers,’ etc., would seem to indicate the recognition by Christ of the custom and propriety of lending out money on interest

(compare 19:23). The “exchangers” here are “bankers” (compare ^{<1927>}Matthew 25:27). The Greek ([*trapezitai*]) is from a word for “bank” or “bench” ([*trapeza*]), i.e. the “table” or “counter” on which the money used to be received and paid out. These “bankers” were clearly of a higher class than the “small-change men” of ^{<1912>}Matthew 21:12, etc. (compare “changers of money,” ^{<1914>}John 2:14, and “changers,” ^{<1915>}John 2:15, English Versions). Christ upbraids the “slothful servant” because he had not given his pound to “the bank” (or “banker,” [*epi trapezan*], literally, “on a banker’s table”), who, it is implied, would have kept it safe and paid interest for it (^{<1923>}Luke 19:23 f). It is noteworthy that the “tenminae” of ^{<1924>}Luke 19:24 are those acquired by “the good servant” from the “one” which was first lent him. So these wealthier bankers even then in a way received money on deposit for investment and paid interest on it, after the fashion of the Greeks.

4. INTERPRETATIONS, FIGURATIVE USES, ETC.:

(1) In Christ’s parable (^{<1923>}Luke 19:23 ff) “the bank” (literally, “a bank,” “table”) is taken by some to mean “the synagogue,” by others to mean “the church” (Lange, LJ, II, 1, 414); i.e. it is thought that Christ meant to teach that the organized body, “synagogue” or “church,” might use the gifts or powers of an adherent or disciple, when he himself could not exercise them (compare DCG, article “Bank”).

(2) Then some have thought that Christ was here pointing to prayer as a substitute for good works, when the disciple was unable to do such. Such views seem far-fetched and unnecessary (compare Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, 209 f).

(3) The “money-changers,” then as now, had ever to be on guard against false money, which gives point to the oft-quoted extra-scriptural saying (agraphon) of Jesus to His disciples: “Be ye expert money-changers” (Greek [*ginesthai trapezitai dokimoi*]; see Origen, in Joam, XIX), which was taken (Clem., Hom., III, 61) to mean, “Be skillful in distinguishing true doctrine from false” (HDB, 1-vol).

George B. Eager

BANNAIA

<ba-na’-ya>.

See *SABANNEUS*.

BANNAS

<ban'-as> ([*Βάννος*, Bannos]; the King James Version, Banuas): A name occurring in the list of those who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:26). Bannas and Sudias are represented by Hoodaviah in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

BANNEAS

<ban-e'-as> ([*Βανναίας*, Bannaia]; the King James Version Baanias (1 Esdras 9:26) = Benaiah (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:25)): Banneas put away his “strange wife.”

BANNER

<ban'-er> (ENSIGN, STANDARD): The English word “banner” is from banderia, Low Latin, meaning a banner (compare bandum, Latin, which meant first a “band,” an organized military troop, and then a “flag”). It has come to mean a flag, or standard, carried at the head of a military band or body, to indicate the line of march, or the rallying point, and it is now applied, in its more extended significance, to royal, national, or ecclesiastical “banners” also. We find it applied sometimes to a streamer on the end of a lance, such as is used by the Arab sheik today. “Banner” occurs in the following significant Old Testament passages: (1) in the singular, “Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain” (^{<2302>}Isaiah 13:2 the King James Version); “a banner to them that fear thee” (^{<1906>}Psalms 60:4); and (2) in the plur., “In the name of our God we will set up our banner” (^{<1305>}Psalms 20:5); “terrible as an army with banner” (Song 6:4).

1. MILITARY ENSIGNS AMONG THE HEBREWS:

The Hebrews, it would seem, like the Assyrians, the Egyptians, and other ancient nations, had military ensigns. As bearing upon this question, a very significant passage is that found in ^{<0002>}Numbers 2:2: “The children of Israel shall encamp every man by his own standard, with the ensigns of their fathers’ houses.” “Standard-bearer” in ^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:18 the King James Version, “They shall be as when a standard-bearer fainteth,” is not a case in point, but is to be rendered as in the Revised Version, margin, “as when a sick man pineth away.”

In this noted passage a distinction seems intentionally made (another view is held by some) between “the ensigns of their fathers’ houses” (literally, “signs”; compare ^{<974>}Psalm 74:4, where the reference is thought by some today to be to the standards of Antiochus’ army), and “the standards” of the four great divisions of the Hebrew tribes in the wilderness (compare the “banner” of Song 2:4 and 6:4,10).

2. A DISTINCTION WITH A DIFFERENCE:

The relation of these to the “standard” of ^{<920>}Numbers 21:8 f (Hebrew [nec], the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “standard”) is by no means clear. The word [nec], here translated “standard,” seems to have meant at first a pole set up on an eminence as a signal for mustering troops (compare “mast” ^{<2307>}Isaiah 30:17 the English Revised Version, margin). But it occurs frequently in the prophets both in this literal and original sense, and in the figurative or derived sense of a rallying point for God’s people (see ^{<2316>}Isaiah 5:26; 11:10; ^{<2402>}Jeremiah 4:21 and elsewhere). Here the rendering in English Versions of the Bible alternates between “ensign” and “banner” (see HDB, 1-vol, article “Banner”).

George B. Eager

BANNUS

^{<ban'-us>} ([^{<Bavvouʿs>} Bannous] (1 Esdras 9:34) = Bani or Binnui (^{<1509>}Ezra 10:29,30)): The sons of Bannus put away their “strange wives.”

BANQUET

^{<ban'-kwet>}.

1. THE ANCIENT HEBREW CUSTOMS:

(1) “Banquet” and “banqueting” in the King James Version always include and stand for wine-drinking, not simply “feast” or “feasting” in our sense. Thus (Song 2:4), “He brought me to the banqueting-house” is literally, “the house of wine,” and Est 7:2 has in the Hebrew “a banquet of wine.” In the New Testament we see a reflection of the same fact in ^{<1008>}1 Peter 4:3 the King James Version, “We walked in excess of wine, banquetings” (Greek “drinkings”; the Revised Version (British and American)

“carousings”). Compare ^{<306>}Amos 6:7 the King James Version, “The banquet of them that stretched themselves,” where the reference seems to be to reclining at wine-drinkings.

See MEALS.

The Hebrew of ^{<300>}Job 1:4, (^htçm wç []) “make a banquet,” may refer to a social feast of a less objectionable sort (compare 41:6 the King James Version), though the Hebrew for “to drink” ^htçm [yayin] ^ˆyy = “wine,” was used as synonymous with “banquet.”

See SYMPOSIUM.

Music, dancing and merriment usually attended all such festivities. Certainly the ancient Hebrews, like other peoples of the ancient East, were very fond of social feasting, and in Christ’s day had acquired, from contact with Greeks and Romans, luxurious and bibulous habits, that often carried them to excess in their social feasts.

2. IN CHRIST’S TEACHING AND PRACTICE:

Among the Greeks the word for “feast” [*doche*] is from [*dechomai*] “to receive” (compare our English usage, “to receive” and “reception”). This word [*doche*] is used with [*poiein*] “to make,” to signify “to make” or “give a feast.” Compare ^{<459>}Luke 5:29 where Levi “made a feast.”

(1) In view of existing customs and abuses, Christ taught His followers when they gave a banquet to invite the poor, etc. (^{<443>}Luke 14:13), rather than, as the fashion of the day called for, to bid the rich and influential. Much in the New Testament that has to do with banquets and banquetings will be obscure to us of the West if we do not keep in mind the many marked differences of custom between the East and the West.

(2) “Banquets” were usually given in the house of the host to specially invited guests (^{<445>}Luke 14:15; ^{<402>}John 2:2), but much more freedom was accorded to the uninvited than we of the West are accustomed to, as one finds to be true everywhere in the East today. The custom of reclining at meals (*see MEALS; TRICLINIUM*, etc.) was everywhere in vogue among the well-to-do in Christ’s day, even in the case of the ordinary meals, the guest leaning upon the left arm and eating with the aid of the right (compare ^{<411>}Matthew 26:20 in “reclining,” and ^{<411>}1 Corinthians 11:20, “the Lord’s supper”).

(3) “Banquets” were considered normal parts of weddings as they are now throughout the East. Jesus and His disciples were bidden to one at Cana in Galilee, and accepted the invitation (ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ John 2:2 ff), and wine-drinking was a part of the feast. The “banquet” Levi gave was in Christ’s honor (ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Luke 5:29). There were numbers present and marked gradations in the places at table (ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Matthew 23:6; ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Mark 12:39; ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Luke 14:7; 20:46). Guests were invited in advance, and then, as time-pieces were scarce, specially notified when the feast was ready, which helps to explain Christ’s words (ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Matthew 22:4), “All things are ready: come to the marriage” (compare ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Luke 14:17; Est 5:8; 6:14).

(4) Matthew tells us (23:6) that the Pharisees “love the chief place (“uppermost rooms” the King James Version) at feasts.”

In ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Matthew 22:3,4 “made a marriage feast,” is rendered by some simply “a feast,” because Greek [*gamos*], “marriage,” was used by Septuagint to translate the Hebrew for feast” in Est 1:5. But, as this is the only known example of such a use compare *gamos*, it is better to take it here in the literal sense of “marriage feast,” as would seem to be required by the words “for his son” (Messiah). The Greek is plural ([*gamous*]) to indicate the several parts or stages of the feast (Button, 23; compare English “nuptials”).

The “ruler of the feast” ([*architriklinos*], ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ John 2:8,9), was usually one of the guests, and his business was to see that wine was provided, superintend the drinking, etc. (compare ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Luke 22:27).

3. A DISTINCTION GIVING RISE TO A QUESTION:

(1) In ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Matthew 22:4, “I have made ready my dinner,” “dinner” in Greek is [*ariston*] (compare ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Luke 11:38). “Supper” (Greek [*deipnon*]) is found in ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Matthew 23:6 and often in the New Testament. Both words are found in ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Luke 14:12. The question arises, What was the distinction? Thus much may be said in answer: The [*ariston*] (English Versions “dinner”) was a meal usually taken about the middle of the forenoon, with variations of earlier or later; the [*deipnon*] (English Versions “supper”), the one taken at the close of the day, often after dark. In Ant, V, iv, 2 Josephus supposes Eglon’s guards (ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ Judges 3:24) were negligent about noon, “both because of the heat and because their attention was turned to dinner” ([*ariston*]). So the “dinner” ([*ariston*]) was sometimes as late as noon. Yet John (21:12,15) shows, on the other hand, that the [*ariston*] was on some

occasions taken shortly after dawn.

(2) Another question raised is this, Were the ancient Jews accustomed to have two or three meals a day? Vambéry, quoted by Morison, gives a saying of the Turks that is in point: “There are only two meals a day, the smaller at 10 or 11 o’clock in the morning, the second and larger after sunset.” There seems no evidence to sustain the view, maintained by Grimm and entertained by others, that the Jews of Christ’s day were accustomed to take a separate and slight meal on rising, as the later Greeks and some of the later Romans did. There is certainly no clear evidence that the Jews of that day had more than two meals a day (see DB, article “Meals”).

(3) The marriage feast of ^{<1218>}Matthew 22:3 f was an [*ariston*], somewhat like an English “wedding-breakfast”; but that in ^{<1246>}Luke 14:16 f was a [*deipnon*], which was as usual delayed till after dark (14:17). Perhaps the [*ariston*] in this case was preliminary, while the marriage with its accompanying [*deipnon*] was after dark; such things are not unheard of today (compare ^{<1231>}Matthew 26:20 and ^{<1212>}1 Corinthians 11:20, “the Lord’s [*deipnon*]”).

George B. Eager

BANUAS

<ban’-u-as> (1 Esdras 5:26): A misprint for BANNAS (Revised Version), which see.

BAPTISM (THE BAPTIST INTERPRETATION)

<bap’-tiz-m>:

This article is not a discussion of the whole subject, but is merely a presentation of the Baptist interpretation of the ordinance. The origin and history of the ordinance, as a whole, do not come within the range of the present treatment.

1. MEANING OF BAPTISM.

1. Terminology:

The verb used in the New Testament is ([βαπτίζω baptizo]). The substantives [*baptisma*] and [*baptismos*] occur, though the latter is not

used in the New Testament of the ordinance of baptism except by implication (~~ⲥⲁⲛⲁ~~ Hebrews 6:2, “the teaching of baptisms”) where the reference is to the distinction between the Christian ordinance and the Jewish ceremonial ablutions. Some documents have it also in ~~ⲥⲓⲛⲓⲁ~~ Colossians 2:12 (compare ~~ⲥⲁⲛⲁ~~ Hebrews 9:10, “divers washings”) for a reference purely to the Jewish purifications (compare the dispute about purifying in ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ John 3:25). The verb [*baptizo*] appears in this sense in ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Luke 11:38 (margin) where the Pharisee marveled that Jesus “had not first bathed himself before breakfast” (noon-day meal). The Mosaic regulations required the bath of the whole body (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Leviticus 15:16) for certain uncleannesses. Tertullian (de Baptismo, XV) says that the Jew required almost daily washing. Herodotus (ii.47) says that if an Egyptian “touches a swine in passing with his clothes, he goes to the river and dips himself ([*bapto*]) from it” (quoted by Broadus in Commentary on Matthew, 333). See also the Jewish scrupulosity illustrated in Sirach 34:25 and Judith 12:7 where [*baptizo*] occurs. The same thing appears in the correct text in ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Mark 7:4, “And when they come from the market-place, except they bathemselves, they eat not.” Here [*baptizo*] is the true text. The use of [*rhantizo*] (“sprinkle”) is due to the difficulty felt by copyists not familiar with Jewish customs. See also the omission of “couches” in the same verse. The couches were “pallets” and could easily be dipped into water. It is noteworthy that here [*rhantizo*] is used in contrast with [*baptizo*], showing that [*baptizo*] did not mean sprinkle. The term [*baptismos*] occurs in Josephus (Ant., XVIII, v, 2) in connection with John’s baptism (compare also Irenaeus 686 B about Christ’s baptism). In general, however, [*baptisma*] is the substantive found for the ordinance. The verb [*baptizo*] is in reality a frequentative or intensive of [*bapto*] (“dip”). Examples occur where that idea is still appropriate, as in ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ 2 Kings 5:14 (Septuagint) where Naaman is said to have “dipped himself seven times in the Jordan” ([*ebaptisato*]). The notion of repetition may occur also in Josephus (Ant., XV, iii, 3) in connection with the death of Aristobulus, brother of Mariamne, for Herod’s friends “dipped him as he was swimming, and plunged him under water, in the dark of the evening.” But in general the term [*baptizo*], as is common with such forms in the late Greek, is simply equivalent to [*bapto*] (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Luke 16:24) and means “dip,” “immerse,” just as [*rhantizo*], like [*rhaino*], means simply “sprinkle.”

If [*baptizo*] never occurred in connection with a disputed ordinance, there would be no controversy on the meaning of the word. There are, indeed, figurative or metaphorical uses of the word as of other words, but the

figurative is that of immersion, like our “immersed in cares,” “plunged in grief,” etc. It remains to consider whether the use of the word for a ceremony or ordinance has changed its significance in the New Testament as compared with ancient Greek

It may be remarked that no Baptist has written a lexicon of the Greek language, and yet the standard lexicons, like that of Liddell and Scott, uniformly give the meaning of [*baptizo*] as “dip,” “immerse.” They do not give “pour” or “sprinkle,” nor has anyone ever adduced an instance where this verb means “pour” or “sprinkle.” The presumption is therefore in favor of “dip” in the New Testament.

2. Proselyte Baptism:

Before we turn directly to the discussion of the ceremonial usage, a word is called for in regard to Jewish proselyte baptism. It is still a matter of dispute whether this initiatory rite was in existence at the time of John the Baptist or not. Schurer argues ably, if not conclusively, for the idea that this proselyte baptism was in use long before the first mention of it in the 2nd century. (Compare *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div ii, II, 319 ff; also Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, appendix, xii, *Baptism of Proselytes*). It matters nothing at all to the Baptist contention what is true in this regard. It would not be strange if a bath was required for a Gentile who became a Jew, when the Jews themselves required such frequent ceremonial ablutions. But what was the Jewish initiatory rite called proselyte baptism? Lightfoot (*Horae Hebraicae*, ~~417~~ Matthew 3:7) gives the law for the baptism of proselytes: “As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to Baptism, and being placed in the water they again instruct him in some weightier and in some lighter commands of the Law. Which being heard, he plunges himself and comes up, and, behold, he is an Israelite in all things.” To this quotation Marcus Dods (Presbyterian) HDB adds: “To use Pauline language, his old man is dead and buried in the water, and he rises from this cleansing grave a new man. The full significance of the rite would have been lost had immersion not been practiced.” Lightfoot says further: “Every person baptized must dip his whole body, now stripped and made naked, at one dipping. And wheresoever in the Law washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else than the washing of the whole body.” Edersheim (op. cit.) says: “Women were attended by those of their own sex, the rabbis standing at the door outside.” Jewish proselyte baptism, an initiatory

ceremonial rite, harmonizes exactly with the current meaning of [baptizo] already seen. There was no peculiar “sacred” sense that changed “dip” to “sprinkle.”

3. Greek Usage:

The Greek language has had a continuous history, and [baptizo] is used today in Greece for baptism. As is well known, not only in Greece, but all over Russia, wherever the Greek church prevails, immersion is the unbroken and universal practice. The Greeks may surely be credited with knowledge of the meaning of their own language. The substitution of pouring or sprinkling for immersion, as the Christian ordinance of baptism, was late and gradual and finally triumphed in the West because of the decree of the Council of Trent. But the Baptist position is that this substitution was unwarranted and subverts the real significance of the ordinance. The Greek church does practice trine immersion, one immersion for each person of the Trinity, an old practice (compare *ter mergitatur*, Tertullian ii.79 A), but not the Scriptural usage. A word will be needed later concerning the method by which pouring crept in beside immersion in the 2nd and later centuries. Before we turn directly to the New Testament use of [baptizo] it is well to quote from the Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods by Professor E. A. Sophocles, himself a native Greek. He says (p. 297): “There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks.” We expect therefore to find in the New Testament “dip,” as the meaning of this word in the ceremonial sense of an initiatory Christian rite. Thayer’s Lexicon likewise defines the word in this ceremonial Christian use to mean “an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin.”

Baptists could very well afford to rest the matter right here. There is no need to call for the testimony of a single Baptist scholar on this subject. The world of scholarship has rendered its decision with impartiality and force on the side of the Baptists in this matter. A few recent deliverances will suffice. Dr. Alfred Plummer (Church of England) in his new Commentary on Matthew (p. 28) says that the office of John the Baptist was “to bind them to a new life, symbolized by immersion in water.” Swete (Church of England) in his Commentary on Mark (p. 7) speaks of “the added thought of immersion, which gives vividness to the scene.” The early Greek ecclesiastical writers show that immersion was employed (compare

Barnabas, XI, 11): “We go down into the water full of sins and filth, and we come up bearing fruit in the heart.” For numerous ecclesiastical examples see Sophocles’ Lexicon.

4. New Testament Usage:

But the New Testament itself makes the whole matter perfectly plain. The uniform meaning of “dip” for [*baptizo*] and the use of the river Jordan as the place for baptizing by John the Baptist makes inevitable the notion of immersion unless there is some direct contradictory testimony. It is a matter that should be lifted above verbal quibbling or any effort to disprove the obvious facts. The simple narrative in ^{<406>}Matthew 3:6 is that “they were baptized of him in the river Jordan.” In ^{<400>}Mark 1:9,10 the baptism is sharpened a bit in the use of [*eis*] and [*ek*]. Jesus “was baptized of John in ([*eis*]) the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of ([*ek*]) the water, he saw.” So in ^{<408>}Acts 8:38 we read: “They both went down into ([*eis*]) the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came up out of ([*ek*]) the water, the Spirit caught away Philip.” If one could still be in doubt about the matter, Paul sets it at rest by the symbolism used in ^{<804>}Romans 6:4, “We were buried therefore with him through bapti sm into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.” The submergence and emergence of immersion thus, according to Paul, symbolize the death and burial to sin on the one hand and the resurrection to the new life in Christ on the other. Sanday and Headlam (Church of England) put it thus in their Commentary on Romans (p. 153): “It expresses symbolically a series of acts corresponding to the redeeming acts of Christ. Immersion = Death. Submersion = Burial (the ratification of death). Emergence = Resurrection.” In ^{<5022>}Colossians 2:12 Paul again says: “having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead.” The same image is here presented. Lightfoot (Church of England) on Colossians (p. 182) says: “Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and new life.” There is nothing in the New Testament to offset this obvious and inevitable interpretation. There are some things which are brought up, but they vanish on examination. The use of “with” after baptize in the English translation is appealed to as disproving immersion. It is enough to reply that the

Committee of the American Standard Revision, which had no Baptist member at the final revision, substituted “in” for “with.” Thus: “I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance” (~~401B~~ Matthew 3:11; compare also ~~400B~~ Mark 1:8). The use of both “with” and “in” in ~~401B~~ Luke 3:16 is a needless stickling for the use of the Greek [*en*] with the locative case. In ~~400B~~ Mark 1:8 [*en*] is absent in the best manuscripts, and yet the American Revisers correctly render “in.” In ~~400B~~ Acts 1:5 they seek to draw the distinction between the mere locative and [*en*] and the locative. As a matter of fact the locative case alone is amply sufficient in Greek without [*en*] for the notion of “in.” Thus in ~~400B~~ John 21:8 the translation is: “But the other disciples came in the little boat.” There is no [*en*] in the Greek, but “the boat” is simply in the locative case. If it be argued that we have the instrumental case (compare the instrumental case of [*en*] as in ~~400B~~ Revelation 6:8, “kill with sword”), the answer is that the way to use water as an instrument in dipping is to put the subject in the water, as the natural way to use the boat (~~400B~~ John 21:8) as an instrument is to get into it. The presence or absence of [*en*] with [*baptizo*] is wholly immaterial. In either case “dip” is the meaning of the verb. The objection that three thousand people could not have been immersed in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost is superficial. Jerusalem was abundantly supplied with pools. There were 120 disciples on hand, most of whom were probably men (compare the 70 sent out before by Jesus). It is not at all necessary to suppose that the 12 (Matthias was now one of them) apostles did all the baptizing. But even so, that would be only 250 apiece. I myself have baptized 42 candidates in a half-hour in a creek where there would be no delay. It would at most be only a matter of four or five hours for each of the twelve. Among the Telugus this record has been far exceeded. It is sometimes objected that Paul could not have immersed the jailer in the prison; but the answer is that Luke does not say so. Indeed Luke implies just the opposite: “And he took (took along in the Greek, [*para*]) them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized.” He took Paul and Silas along with him and found a place for the baptism, probably, somewhere on the prison grounds. There is absolutely nothing in the New Testament to dispute the unvarying significance of [*baptizo*].

5. *The Didache:*

Appeal has been made to the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, which may belong to the first half of the 2nd century. Here for the first time pouring is distinctly admitted as an ordinance in place of immersion. Because of this

remarkable passage it is argued by some that, though immersion was the normal and regular baptism, yet alongside of it, pouring was allowed, and that in reality it was a matter of indifference which was used even in the 1st century. But that is not the true interpretation of the facts in the case. The passage deserves to be quoted in full and is here given in the translation of Philip Schaff (Presbyterian) in his edition of the Didache (pp. 184 ff): “Now concerning baptism, baptize thus: Having first taught all these things, baptize ye into ([*eis*]) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in living water. And if thou hast not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm (water). But if thou hast neither, pour water thrice upon the head in ([*eis*]) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” There is thus no doubt that early in the 2nd century some Christians felt that baptism was so important that, when the real baptism (immersion) could not be performed because of lack of water, pouring might be used in its place. This is absolutely all that can be deduced from this passage. It is to be noted that for pouring another word ([*ekcheo*]) is used, clearly showing that [*baptizo*] does not mean “to po ur.” The very exception filed proves the Baptist contention concerning [*baptizo*]. Now in the New Testament [*baptizo*] is the word used for baptism. [*Ekcheo*] is never so used. Harnack in a letter to C. E. W. Dobbs, Madison, Ind. (published in The Independent for February 9, 1885), under date of January 16, 1885 says:

“(1) [*Baptizein*] undoubtedly signifies immersion (eintauchen).

(2) No proof can be found that it signifies anything else in the New Testament and in the most ancient Christian literature.

The suggestion regarding ‘a sacred sense’ is out of the question.” This is the whole point of the Baptists admirably stated by Adolph Harnack. There is no thought of denying that pouring early in the 2nd century came to be used in place of immersion in certain extreme cases. The meaning of [*baptizo*] is not affected a particle by this fact. The question remains as to why this use of pouring in extreme cases grew up. The answer is that it was due to a mistaken and exaggerated estimate put upon the value of baptism as essential to salvation. Those who died without baptism were felt by some to be lost. Thus arose “clinic” baptisms.

6. Baptismal Regeneration:

(For the doctrine of baptismal regeneration see Justin Martyr, First Apology, 61.) Out of this perversion of the symbolism of baptism grew both pouring as an ordinance and infant baptism. If baptism is necessary to salvation or the means of regeneration, then the sick, the dying, infants, must be baptized, or at any rate something must be done for them if the real baptism (immersion) cannot be performed because of extreme illness or want of water. The Baptist contention is to protest against the perversion of the significance of baptism as the ruin of the symbol. Baptism, as taught in the New Testament, is the picture of death and burial to sin and resurrection to new life, a picture of what has already taken place in the heart, not the means by which spiritual change is wrought. It is a privilege and duty, not a necessity. It is a picture that is lost when something else is substituted in its place.

See BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

2. THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

It is significant that even the Teaching of the Twelve apostles with its exaggerated notion of the importance of baptism does not allow baptism of infants. It says: "Having first taught all these things." Instruction precedes baptism. That is a distinct denial of infant baptism. The uniform practice in the New Testament is that baptism follows confession. The people "confessing their sins" were baptized by John (~~4:18~~ Matthew 3:6). It is frankly admitted by Paedobaptist scholars that the New Testament gives no warrant for infant baptism. Thus Jacobus (Congregationalist) in the Standard Bible Dictionary says: "We have no record in the New Testament of the baptism of infants." Scott (Presbyterian) in the 1-vol HDB says: "The New Testament contains no explicit reference to the baptism of infants or young children." Plummer (Church of England), HDB, says: "The recipients of Christian baptism were required to repent and believe." Marcus Dods (Presbyterian), DCG, says: "A rite wherein by immersion in water the participant symbolizes and signalizes his transition from an impure to a pure life, his death to a past he abandons, and his new birth to a future he desires." It would be hard to state the Baptist interpretation in better terms. Thus no room is found in the New Testament for infant baptism which would symbolize what the infant did not experience or would be understood to cause the regeneration in the child, a form of

sacramentalism repugnant to the New Testament teaching as understood by Baptists. The dominant Baptist note is the soul's personal relation to God apart from ordinance, church or priest. The infant who dies unbaptized is saved without baptism. The baptized individual, child (for children are often baptized by Baptists, children who show signs of conversion) or man, is converted before his baptism. The baptism is the symbol of the change already wrought. So clear is this to the Baptist that he bears continual protest against that perversion of this beautiful ordinance by those who treat it as a means of salvation or who make it meaningless when performed before conversion. Baptism is a preacher of the spiritual life. The Baptist contention is for a regenerated church membership, placing the kingdom before the local church. Membership in the kingdom precedes membership in the church. The passages quoted from the New Testament in support of the notion of infant baptism are wholly irrelevant, as, for instance, in ~~(412)~~ Acts 2:39 where there is no such idea as baptism of infants. So in ~~(417)~~ 1 Corinthians 7:14, where note husband and wife. The point is that the marriage relation is sanctified and the children are legitimate, though husband or wife be heathen. The marriage relation is to be maintained. It is begging the question to assume the presence of infants in the various household baptisms in Acts. In the case of the family of Cornelius they all spake with tongues and magnified God (~~(410)~~ Acts 10:46). The jailer's household "rejoiced greatly" (~~(415)~~ Acts 16:34). We do not even know that Lydia was married. Her household may have been merely her employes in her business. The New Testament presents no exceptions in this matter.

3. THE PRESENT OBLIGATION.

The Baptists make one more point concerning baptism. It is that, since Jesus himself submitted to it and enjoined it upon His disciples, the ordinance is of perpetual obligation. The arguments for the late ecclesiastical origin of ~~(418)~~ Matthew 28:19 are not convincing. If it seem strange that Jesus should mention the three persons of the Trinity in connection with the command to baptize, one should remember that the Father and the Spirit were both manifested to Him at His baptism. It was not a mere ceremonial ablution like the Jewish rites. It was the public and formal avowal of fealty to God, and the names of the Trinity properly occur. The new heart is wrought by the Holy Spirit. Reconciliation with the Father is wrought on the basis of the work of the Son, who has manifested the Father's love in His life and death for sin. The fact that in

the acts in the examples of baptism only the name of Jesus occurs does not show that this was the exact formula used. It may be a mere historical summary of the essential fact. The name of Jesus stood for the other two persons of the Trinity. On the other hand the command of Jesus may not have been regarded as a formula for baptism; while in no sense sacramental or redemptive, it is yet obligatory and of perpetual significance. It is not to be dropped as one of the Jewish excrescences on Christianity. The form itself is necessary to the significance of the rite. Hence, Baptists hold that immersion alone is to be practiced, since immersion alone was commanded by Jesus and practiced in the New Testament times. Immersion alone sets forth the death to sin, and burial in the grave the resurrection to new life in Christ. Baptism as taught in the New Testament is "a mould of doctrine," a preacher of the heart of the gospel. Baptists deny the right of disciples of Jesus to break that mould. The point of a symbol is the form in which it is cast. To change the form radically is to destroy the symbolism. Baptists insist on the maintenance of primitive New Testament baptism because it alone is baptism, it alone proclaims the death and resurrection of Jesus, the spiritual death and resurrection of the believer, the ultimate resurrection of the believer from the grave. The disciple is not above his Lord, and has no right to destroy this rich and powerful picture for the sake of personal convenience, nor because he is willing to do something else which Jesus did not enjoin and which has no association with Him. The long years of perversion do not justify this wrong to the memory of Jesus, but all the more call upon modern disciples to follow the example of Jesus who himself fulfilled righteousness by going into the waters of the Jordan and receiving immersion at the hands of John the Baptist.

LITERATURE.

The Greek Lexicons, like Suicer, Liddell and Scott, Sophocles, Thayer, Preuschen; the Biblical Dictionaries; the Critical Commentaries on the New Testament; books of antiquities like Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities; the new Sch-Herz; Binghara's Antiquities of the Christian Church; Schaff's Creeds of Christendom; Neale's History of the Holy Eastern Church; Lives of Christ, like Edersheim's LTJM, or a survey of the customs of the Jews like Schurer's HJP; books on John the Baptist like Reynolds' John the Baptist, Feather's Last of the Prophets, Robertson's John the Loyal; special treatises on Baptism like Wall's History of Infant Baptism, Stanley's Christian Institutions, Dargan's Ecclesiology, Conant's Baptizein, Mozley's Review of the Baptismal Controversy, Christian's

Immersion, Broadus' Immersion, Frost's The Moral Dignity of Baptism, Whitsitt's a Question in Baptist History, Lofton's The Baptist Reformation, Lambert's The Sacraments of the New Testament, Dale's Classic Baptism and Christian and Patristic Baptism, Kirtley's Design of Baptism, Forester's The Baptist Position, Frost's Baptist Why and Why Not, Ford's Studies in Baptism.

A. T. Robertson

BAPTISM (NON-IMMERSIONIST VIEW):

Baptism ([**Βάπτισμα**, baptisma], [**Βαπτισμός**, baptismos], [**Βαπτίζειν**, baptizein]) has been from the earliest times the initiatory rite signifying the recognition of entrance into or of presence within the Christian church. We find the earliest mention of the ceremony in the Epistle to the Galatians (3:27), written about 20 years after the death of Jesus. There and in 1 Corinthians (1:13; 12:13) Paul takes for granted that everyone who becomes a Christian (himself included) must be baptized. The rite seems also to have existed among the discipleship of Jesus before His death. We are told (~~4004~~ John 4:1,2) that, although Jesus Himself did not baptize, His disciples did, and that their baptisms were more numerous than those of John.

1. THE SCRIPTURAL NAMES FOR THE RITE.

The words commonly used in the New Testament to denote the rite are the verb [baptizo], and the nouns [baptisma] and [baptismos]; but none are employed in this sense alone. The verb is used to denote the ceremonial purification of the Jews before eating, by pouring water on the hands (~~40138~~ Luke 11:38; ~~40004~~ Mark 7:4); to signify the sufferings of Christ (~~40088~~ Mark 10:38,39; ~~40125~~ Luke 12:50); and to indicate the sacrament of baptism. It is the intensive form of [baptein], "to dip," and takes a wider meaning. The passages ~~40138~~ Luke 11:38 and ~~40004~~ Mark 7:4 show conclusively that the word does not invariably signify to immerse the whole body. Some have held that [baptismos] invariably means ceremonial purification, and that [baptisma] is reserved for the Christian rite; but the distinction can hardly be maintained. The former certainly means ceremonial purification in ~~40004~~ Mark 7:4, and in 7:8 (the King James Version); but it probably means the rite of baptism in ~~80002~~ Hebrews 6:2. Exegetes find other terms applied to Christian baptism. It is called 'the Water' in ~~40007~~ Acts 10:47: "Can any man

forbid 'the Water,' that these should not be baptized?"; the layer of the water in ~~406~~ Ephesians 5:26 the Revised Version, margin (where baptism is compared to the bridal bath taken by the bride before she was handed over to the bridegroom); and perhaps the laver of regeneration in ~~406~~ Titus 3:5 the Revised Version, margin (compare ~~401~~ 1 Corinthians 6:11), and illumination in ~~404~~ Hebrews 6:4; 10:32.

2. PRE-CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

1. Baptism of Proselytes:

Converts in the early centuries, whether Jews or Gentiles, could not have found this initiatory rite, in which they expressed their new-born faith, utterly unfamiliar. Water is the element naturally used for cleansing the body and its symbolical use entered into almost every cult; and into none more completely than the Jewish, whose ceremonial washings were proverbial. Besides those the Jew had what would seem to the convert a counterpart of the Christian rite in the baptism of proselytes by which Gentiles entered the circle of Judaism. For the Jews required three things of strangers who declared themselves to be converts to the Law of Moses: circumcision, baptism, and to offer sacrifice if they were men: the two latter if they were women. It is somewhat singular that no baptism of proselytes is forthcoming until about the beginning of the 3rd century; and yet no competent scholar doubts its existence. Schurer is full of contempt for those who insist on the argument from silence. Its presence enables us to see both how Jews accepted readily the baptism of John and to understand the point of objectors who questioned his right to insist that all Jews had to be purified ere they could be ready for the Messianic kingdom, although he was neither the Messiah nor a special prophet (~~409~~ John 1:19-23).

2. Baptism of John:

The baptism of John stood midway between the Jewish baptism of proselytes and Christian baptism. It differed from the former because it was more than a symbol of ceremonial purification; it was a baptism of repentance, a confession of sin, and of the need of moral cleansing, and was a symbol of forgiveness and of moral purity. All men, Jews who were ceremonially pure and Gentiles who were not, had to submit to this baptism of repentance and pardon. It differed from the latter because it only symbolized preparation to receive the salvation, the kingdom of God which John heralded, and did not imply entrance into that kingdom itself.

Those who had received it, as well as those who had not, had to enter the Christian community by the door of Christian baptism (~~441B~~ Acts 19:3-6). The Jewish custom of baptizing, whether displayed in their frequent ceremonial washings, in the baptism of proselytes or in the baptism of John, made Christian baptism a familiar and even expected rite to Jewish converts in the 1st century.

3. Baptism in the Pagan Mysteries:

Baptism, as an initiatory rite, was no less familiar to Gentile converts who had no acquaintance with the Jewish religion. The ceremonial washings of the priests of pagan religions have been often adduced as something which might familiarize Gentile converts with the rite which introduced them into the Christian community, but they were not initiations. A more exact parallel is easily found. It is often forgotten that in the earlier centuries when Christianity was slowly making its way in the pagan world pagan piety had deserted the official religions and taken refuge within the Mysteries, and that these Mysteries represented the popular pagan religions of the times. They were all private cults into which men and women were received one by one, and that by rites of initiation which each had to pass through personally. When admitted the converts became members of coteries, large or small, of like-minded persons, who had become initiated because their souls craved something which they believed they would receive in and through the rites of the cult. These initiations were secret, jealously guarded from the knowledge of all outsiders; still enough is known about them for us to be sure that among them baptism took an important place (Apuleius *Metamorphoses* xi). The rite was therefore as familiar to pagan as to Jewish converts, and it was no unexpected requirement for the convert to know that baptism was the doorway into the church of Christ. These heathen baptisms, like the baptism of proselytes, were for the most part simply ceremonial purifications; for while it is true that both in the cult of the Mysteries and beyond it a mode of purifying after great crimes was baptizing in flowing water (Eurip. *Iph. in Tauri* 167) or in the sea, yet it would appear that only ceremonial purification was thought of. Nor were ceremonial rites involving the use of water confined to the paganism of the early centuries. Such a ceremony denoted the reception of the newly-born child into pagan Scandinavian households. The father decided whether the infant was to be reared or exposed to perish. If he resolved to preserve the babe, water was poured over it and a name was given to it.

3. CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

1. The Administration of the Rite:

In the administration of the rite of Christian baptism three things have to be looked at: the act of baptizing; those who are entitled to perform it; and the recipients or those entitled to receive it. A complete act of baptizing involves three things: what has been called the *materia sacramenti*; the method of its use; and the *forma sacramenti*, the baptismal formula or form of words accompanying the use of the water. The *materia sacramenti* is water and for this reason baptism is called the Water Sacrament. The oldest ecclesiastical manual of discipline which has descended to us, the *Didache*, says that the water to be preferred is “living,” i.e. running water, water in a stream or river, or fresh flowing from a fountain; “But if thou hast not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm” (c. 7). In those directions the prescriptions of the ceremonial for the Jewish baptism of proselytes are closely followed. The earlier canons of the church permit any kind of water, fresh or salt, provided only it be true and natural water (*aqua vera et naturalis*).

2. The Mode of Using the Water:

(1) Immersion.

The use of the water is called *ablutio*.

According to the rules of by far the largest portion of the Christian church the water may be used in any one of three ways:

Immersion, where the recipient enters bodily into the water, and where, during the action, the head is plunged either once or three times beneath the surface; affusion, where water was poured upon the head of the recipient who stood either in water or on dry ground; and aspersion where water was sprinkled on the head or on the face. It has frequently been argued that the word [*baptizein*] invariably means “to dip” or immerse, and that therefore Christian baptism must have been performed originally by immersion only, and that the two other forms of affusion and aspersion or sprinkling are invalid — that there can be no real baptism unless the method of immersion be used. But the word which invariably means “to dip” is not [*baptizein*] but [*baptein*]. [*Baptizein*] has a wider signification; and its use to denote the Jewish ceremonial of pouring water on the hands (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲃ~~ Luke 11:38; ~~ⲁⲓⲓⲃ~~ Mark 7:4), as has already been said, proves

conclusively that it is impossible to conclude from the word itself that immersion is the only valid method of performing the rite. It may be admitted at once that immersion, where the whole body including the head is plunged into a pool of pure water, gives a more vivid picture of the cleansing of the soul from sin; and that complete surrounding with water suits better the metaphors of burial in Roman 6:4 and ~~5012~~Colossians 2:12, and of being surrounded by cloud in ~~5102~~1 Corinthians 10:2.

(2) Affusion.

On the other hand affusion is certainly a more vivid picture of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit which is equally symbolized in baptism. No definite information is given of the mode in which baptism was administered in apostolic times. Such phrases as “coming up out of the water,” “went down into the water” (~~4010~~Mark 1:10; ~~4088~~Acts 8:38) are as applicable to affusion as to immersion. The earliest account of the mode of baptizing occurs in the Didache (c. 7), where it is said: “Now concerning Baptism, thus baptize ye: having first uttered all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in living water. But if thou hast not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice in the name of Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost.” This seems to say that to baptize by immersion was the practice recommended for general use, but that the mode of affusion was also valid and enjoined on occasions. What is here prescribed in the Didache seems to have been the practice usually followed in the early centuries of the Christian church. Immersion was in common use: but affusion was also widely practiced: and both were esteemed usual and valid forms of baptizing. When immersion was used then the head of the recipient was plunged thrice beneath the surface at the mention of each name of the Trinity; when the mode was by affusion the same reference to the Trinity was kept by pouring water thrice upon the head. The two usages which were recognized and prescribed by the beginning of the 2nd century may have been in use throughout the apostolic period although definite information is lacking. When we remember the various pools in Jerusalem, and their use for ceremonial washings it is not impossible to suppose that the 3,000 who were baptized on the day of Pentecost may have been immersed, but, when the furnishing and conditions of Palestinian houses and of oriental jails are taken into account, it is difficult to conceive that at the baptisms of Cornelius and of the jailer, the ceremony was performed otherwise than by affusion. It is a

somewhat curious fact that if the evidence from written texts, whether ancient canons or writings of the earlier Fathers, be studied by themselves, the natural conclusion would seem to be that immersion was the almost universal form of administering the rite; but if the witness of the earliest pictorial representation be collected, then we must infer that affusion was the usual method and that immersion was exceptional; for the pictorial representations, almost without exception, display baptism performed by affusion, i.e. the recipient is seen standing in water while the minister pours water on the head. It may therefore be inferred that evidence for the almost universal practice of immersion, drawn from the fact that baptisms took place in river pools (it is more than probable that when we find the names of local saints given to pools in rivers, those places were their favorite places of administering the rite), or from the large size of almost all early medieval baptisteries, is by no means so conclusive as many have supposed, such places being equally applicable to affusion. It is also interesting to remember that when most of the Anabaptists of the 16th century insisted on adult baptism (re-baptism was their name for it) immersion was not the method practiced by them. During the great baptismal scene in the market-place of the city of Munster the ordinance was performed by the ministers pouring three cans of water on the heads of the recipients. They baptized by affusion and not by immersion. This was also the practice among the Mennonites or earliest Baptists. This double mode of administering the sacrament — by immersion or by affusion — prevailed in the churches of the first twelve centuries, and it was not until the 13th that the practice of *aspersio* or sprinkling was almost universally employed.

(3) Aspersio.

The third method of administering baptism, namely, by *aspersio* or sprinkling, has a different history from the other two. It was in the early centuries exclusively reserved for sick and infirm persons too weak to be submitted to immersion or affusion. There is evidence to show that those who received the rite in this form were somewhat despised; for the nicknames *clini* and *grabatorii* were, unworthily Cyprian declares, bestowed on them by neighbors. The question was even raised in the middle of the 3rd century, whether baptism by *aspersio* was a valid baptism and Cyprian was asked for his opinion on the matter. His answer is contained in his lxxvth epistle (lxi Hartel's ed.). There he contends that the ordinance administered this way is perfectly valid, and quotes in

support of his opinion various Old Testament texts which assert the purifying effects of water sprinkled (~~2365~~ Ezekiel 36:25,26; ~~4085~~ Numbers 8:5-7; 19:8,9,12,13). It is not the amount of the water or the method of its application which can cleanse from sin: "Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation and that where the faith of the giver and receiver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of God and by the truth of faith." His opinion prevailed. *Aspersio* was recognized as a valid, though exceptional, form of baptism. But it was long of commending itself to ministers and people, and did not attain to almost general use until the 13th century.

The idea that baptism is valid when practiced in the one method only of immersion can scarcely be looked on as anything else than a ritualistic idea.

3. Who May Perform Baptism:

The Scripture nowhere describes or limits the qualifications of those who are entitled to perform the rite of baptism. We find apostles, wandering preachers (~~4088~~ Acts 8:38), a private member of a small and persecuted community (~~4088~~ Acts 9:18) performing the rite. So in the sub-apostolic church we find the same liberty of practice. Clement of Alexandria tells us that the services of Christian women were necessary for the work of Christian missions, for they alone could have access to the gynaeceum and carry the message of the gospel there (*Strom.*, III, 6). Such women missionaries did not hesitate to baptize. Whatever credit may be given to the Acts of Paul and Theckla, it is at least historical that Theckla did exist, that she was converted by Paul, that she worked as a missionary and that she baptized her converts. Speaking generally it may be said that as a sacrament has always been looked upon as the recognition of presence within the Christian church, it is an act of the church and not of the individual believer; and therefore no one is entitled to perform the act who is not in some way a representative of the Christian community — the representative character ought to be maintained somehow. As soon as the community had taken regular and organized form the act of baptism was suitably performed by those who, as office-bearers, naturally represented the community. It was recognized that the pastor or bishop (for these terms were synonymous until the 4th century at least) ought to preside at the administration of the sacrament; but in the early church the power of delegation was recognized and practiced, and elders and deacons presided

at this and even at the Eucharist. What has been called lay-baptism is not forbidden in the New Testament and has the sanction of the early church. When superstitious views of baptism entered largely into the church and it was held that no unbaptized child could be saved, the practice arose of encouraging the baptism of all weakling infants by nurses. The Reformed church protested against this and was at pains to repudiate the superstitious thought of any mechanical efficacy in the rite by deprecating its exercise by any save approved and ordained ministers of the church. Still, while condemning lay-baptism as irregular, it may be questioned whether they would assert any administration of the rite to be invalid, provided only it had been performed with devout faith on the part of giver and receiver.

4. Who May Receive Baptism:

The recipients of Christian baptism are all those who make a presumably sincere profession of repentance of sin and of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Savior; together with the children of such believing parents. The requirements are set forth in the accounts given us of the performance of the rite in the New Testament, in which we see how the apostles obeyed the commands of their Master. Jesus had ordered them to “make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (^{<4189>}Matthew 28:19) — to “preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned” (^{<4165>}Mark 16:15,16). The apostle Peter said to the inquirers on the Day of Pentecost, “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit”; and 3,000 were added to the church through the initiatory rite of baptism. The Samaritans, who believed on Jesus through the preaching of Philip, were admitted to the Christian community through baptism; though in this case one of the baptized, Simon Magus, after his reception, was found to be still in “the bond of iniquity” (^{<4182>}Acts 8:12,23). The jailer and all his, Lydia and her household, at Philippi, were baptized by Paul on his and her profession of faith on Jesus, the Saviour. There is no evidence in any of the accounts we have of apostolic baptisms that any prolonged course of instruction was thought to be necessary; nothing of classes for catechumens such as we find in the early church by the close of the 2nd century, or in modern missionary enterprise. We find no mention of baptismal creeds, declarative or interrogative, in the New Testament accounts of baptisms. The profession of faith in the Lord Jesus, the Saviour, made by the head of the

family appears, so far as the New Testament records afford us information, to have been sufficient to secure the baptism of the “household” — a word which in these days included both servants and children.

(1) Baptism of Infants.

This brings us to the much-debated question whether infants are to be recognized as lawful recipients of Christian baptism. The New Testament Scriptures do not in so many words either forbid or command the baptism of children. The question is in this respect on all fours with the change of the holy day from the seventh to the first day of the week. No positive command authorizes the universal usage with regard to the Christian Sabbath day; that the change is authorized must be settled by a weighing of evidence. So it is with the case of infant baptism. It is neither commanded nor forbidden in so many words; and the question cannot be decided on such a basis. The strongest argument against the baptizing of infants lies in the thought that the conditions of the rite are repentance and faith; that these must be exercised by individuals, each one for himself and for herself; and that infants are incapable either of repentance or of faith of this kind. The argument seems weak in its second statement; it is more dogmatic than historical; and will be referred to later when the doctrine lying at the basis of the rite is examined. On the other hand a great deal of evidence supports the view that the baptism of infants, if not commanded, was at least permitted and practiced within the apostolic church. Paul connects baptism with circumcision and implies that under the gospel the former takes the place of the latter (^{<302>}Colossians 2:12); and as children were circumcised on the 8th day after birth, the inference follows naturally that children were also to be baptized. In the Old Testament, promises to parents included their children. In his sermon on the Day of Pentecost Peter declares to his hearers that the gospel promise is “to you and to your children” and connects this with the invitation to baptism (^{<428>}Acts 2:38,39). It is also noteworthy that children shared in the Jewish baptism of proselytes. Then we find in the New Testament narratives of baptisms that “households” were baptized — of Lydia (^{<465>}Acts 16:15), of the jailer at Philippi (^{<462>}Acts 16:32), of Stephanas (1 Cor 1:16). It is never said that the children of the household were exempted from the sacred rite. One has only to remember the position of the head of the household in that ancient world, to recollect how the household was thought to be embodied in its head, to see how the repentance and faith of the head of the household was looked upon as including those of all the members, not merely children but

servants, to feel that had the children been excluded from sharing in the rite the exclusion would have seemed such an unusual thing that it would have at least been mentioned and explained. our Lord expressly made very young children the types of those who entered into His kingdom (~~Mark~~ Mark 10:14-16); and Paul so unites parents with children in the faith of Christ that he does not hesitate to call the children of the believing husband or wife “holy,” and to imply that the children had passed from a state of “uncleanness” to a state of “holiness” through the faith of a parent. All these things seem to point to the fact that the rite which was the door of entrance into the visible community of the followers of Jesus was shared in by the children of believing parents. Besides evidence for the baptism of children goes back to the earliest times of the sub-apostolic church.

Irenaeus was the disciple of Polycarp, who had been the disciple of John, and it is difficult to draw any other conclusion from his statements than that he believed that the baptism of infants had been an established practice in the church long before his days (Adv. Haer., II, 22; compare 39). The witness of Tertullian is specially interesting; for he himself plainly thinks that adult baptism is to be preferred to the baptism of infants. He makes it plain that the custom of baptizing infants existed in his days, and we may be sure from the character and the learning of the man, that had he been able to affirm that infant-baptism had been a recent innovation and had not been a long-established usage descending from apostolic times, he would certainly have had no hesitation in using what would have seemed to him a very convincing way of dealing with his opponents. Tertullian’s testimony comes from the end of the 2nd century or the beginning of the 3rd century. Origen, the most learned Christian writer during the first three centuries and who comes a little later than Tertullian, in his 14th Homily on Luke bears witness to the fact that the baptism of infants was usual. He argues that original sin belongs to children because the church baptizes them. At the same time it is plain from a variety of evidence too long to cite that the baptism of infants was not a universal practice in the early church. The church of the early centuries was a mission church. It drew large numbers of its members from heathendom. In every mission church the baptism of adults will naturally take the foremost place and be most in evidence. But it is clear that many Christians were of the opinion of Tertullian and believed that baptism ought not to be administered to children but should be confined to adults. Nor was this a theory only; it was a continuous practice handed down from one generation to another in some Christian families. In the 4th century, few Christian leaders took a more important place than

Basil the Great and his brother Gregory of Nyssa. They belonged to a family who had been Christians for some generations; yet neither of the brothers was baptized until after his personal conversion, which does not appear to have come until they had attained the years of manhood. The whole evidence seems to show that in the early church, down to the end of the 4th century at least, infant and adult baptism were open questions and that the two practices existed side by side with each other without disturbing the unity of the churches. In the later Pelagian controversy it became evident that theory and practice of infant baptism had been able to assert itself and that the ordinance was always administered to children of members of the church.

(2) Baptism for the Dead.

Paul refers to a custom of “baptizing for the dead” (1 Cor 15:29). What this “vicarious baptism” or “baptism for the dead” was it is impossible to say, even whether it was practiced within the primitive Christian church. The passage is a very difficult one and has called forth a very large number of explanations, which are mere guesses. Paul neither commends it nor disapproves of it; he simply mentions its existence and uses the fact as an argument for the resurrection.

See BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

4. THE FORMULA OF BAPTISM.

The Formula of Christian baptism, in the mode which prevailed, is given in ~~(408)~~ Matthew 28:19: “I baptize thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” But it is curious that the words are not given in any description of Christian baptism until the time of Justin Martyr: and there they are not repeated exactly but in a slightly extended and explanatory form. He says that Christians “receive the washing with water in the name of God, the Ruler and Father of the universe, and of our Savior, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit” (1 Apol., 61). In every account of the performance of the rite in apostolic times a much shorter formula is in use. The 3,000 believers were baptized on the Day of Pentecost “in the name of Jesus” (~~(408)~~ Acts 2:38); and the same formula was used at the baptism of Cornelius and those that were with him (~~(408)~~ Acts 10:48). Indeed it would appear to have been the usual one, from Paul’s question to the Corinthians: “Were ye baptized into the name of Paul?” (1 Cor 1:13). The Samaritans were baptized “into the name of the Lord

Jesus” (~~4016~~ Acts 8:16); and the same formula (a common one in acts of devotion) was used in the case of the disciples at Ephesus. In some instances it is recorded that before baptism the converts were asked to make some confession of their faith, which took the form of declaring that Jesus was the Lord or that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. It may be inferred from a phrase in ~~4021~~ 1 Peter 3:21 that a formal interrogation was made, and that the answer was an acknowledgment that Jesus Christ was Lord. Scholars have exercised a great deal of ingenuity in trying to explain how, with what appear to be the very words of Jesus given in the Gospel of Mt, another and much shorter formula seems to have been used throughout the apostolic church. Some have imagined that the shorter formula was that used in baptizing disciples during the lifetime of our Lord (~~4001~~ John 4:1,2), and that the apostles having become accustomed to it continued to use it during their lives. Others declare that the phrases “in the name of Jesus Christ” or “of the Lord Jesus” are not meant to give the formula of baptism, but simply to denote that the rite was Christian. Others think that the full formula was always used and that the narratives in the Book of Acts and in the Pauline Epistles are merely brief summaries of what took place — an idea rather difficult to believe in the absence of any single reference to the longer formula. Others, again, insist that baptism in the name of one of the persons of the Trinity implies baptism in the name of the Three. While others declare that Matthew does not give the very words of Jesus but puts in His mouth what was the common formula used at the date and in the district where the First Gospel was written. Whatever explanation be given it is plain that the longer formula became universal or almost universal in the sub-apostolic church. Justin Martyr has been already. quoted. Tertullian, nearly half a century later, declares expressly that the “law of baptism has been imposed and the formula prescribed” in ~~4089~~ Matthew 28:19 (Deuteronomy Bapt., 13); and he adds in his *Adversus Praxean* (c. 26): “And it is not once only, but thrice, that we are immersed into the Three Persons, at each several mention of Their names.” The evidence to show that the formula given by Matthew became the established usage is overwhelming; but it is more than likely that the use of the shorter formula did not altogether die out, or, if it did, that it was revived. The historian Socrates informs us that some of the more extreme Arians “corrupted” baptism by using the name of Christ only in the formula; while injunctions to use the longer formula and punishments, including deposition, threatened to those who presumed to employ the shorter which meet us in collections of ecclesiastical canons (Apos.

Canons, 43, 50), prove that the practice of using the shorter formula existed in the 5th and 6th centuries, at all events in the East.

5. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

The sacraments, and baptism as one of them, are always described to be

- (1) signs representing as in a picture or figure spiritual benefits (1 Pet 3:21), and also
- (2) as seals or personal tokens and attestations corroborative of solemn promises of spiritual benefits.

Hence, the sacrament is said to have two parts: “the one an outward and sensible sign, used according to Christ’s appointment; the other an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified.” It is held, moreover, that when the rite of baptism has been duly and devoutly performed with faith on the part of both giver and receiver, the spiritual benefits do follow the performance of the rite. The question therefore arises: What are the spiritual and evangelical blessings portrayed and solemnly promised in baptism? In the New Testament we find that baptism is intimately connected with the following: with remission of sins, as in ^{<4216>}Acts 22:16 (“Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins”), and in ^{<3812>}Hebrews 10:22; with regeneration or the new birth, as in ^{<3806>}Titus 3:6 and ^{<3805>}John 3:5 (this idea also entered into the baptism of proselytes and even into the thought of baptism in the Mysteries; neophytes were taught that in the water they died to their old life and began a new one (Apuleius Meta. xi)); with engrafting into Christ, with union with Him, as in ^{<3827>}Galatians 3:27 — and union in definite ways, in His death, His burial and His resurrection, as in ^{<3808>}Romans 6:3-6; with entering into a new relationship with God, that of sonship, as in ^{<3806>}Galatians 3:26,27; with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, as in ^{<3823>}1 Corinthians 12:13; with belonging to the church, as in ^{<4184>}Acts 2:41; with the gift of salvation, as in ^{<4166>}Mark 16:16; ^{<3805>}John 3:5. From these and similar passages theologians conclude that baptism is a sign and seal of our engrafting into Christ and of our union with Him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption and life eternal; that the water in baptism represents and signifies both the blood of Christ, which takes away all our sins, and also the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit against the dominion of sin and the corruption of our human nature; and that baptizing with water signifies the cleansing from sin by the blood and for the merit of Christ, together with the mortification of sin and rising from sin to newness

of life by virtue of the death and resurrection of Christ. Or to put it more simply: Baptism teaches that all who are out of Christ are unclean by reason of sin and need to be cleansed. It signifies that just as washing with water cleanses the body so God in Christ cleanses the soul from sin by the Holy Spirit and that we are to see in this cleansing not merely pardon but also an actual freeing of the soul from the pollution and power of sin and therefore the beginnings of a new life. The sacrament also shows us that the cleansing is reached only through connection with the death of Christ, and further that through the new life begun in us we become in a special way united to Christ and enter into a new and filial relationship with God. Probably all Christians, reformed and unreformed, will agree in the above statement of the doctrinal meaning in the rite of baptism; and also that when the sacrament is rightly used the inward and spiritual grace promised is present along with the outward and visible signs. But Romanists and Protestants differ about what is meant by the right use of the sacrament. They separate on the question of its efficacy. The former understand by the right use simply the correct performance of the rite and the placing no obstacle in the way of the flow of efficacy. The latter insist that there can be no right use of the sacrament unless the recipient exercises faith, that without faith the sacrament is not efficacious and the inward and spiritual blessings do not accompany the external and visible signs. Whatever minor differences divide Protestant evangelical churches on this sacrament they are all agreed upon this, that where there is no faith there can be no regeneration. Here emerges doctrinally the difference between those who give and who refuse to give the sacrament to infants.

The Doctrine of Infant Baptism:

The latter taking their stand on the fundamental doctrine of all evangelical Christians that faith is necessary to make any sacrament efficacious, and assuming that the effect of an ordinance is always tied to the precise time of its administration, insist that only adults can perform such a conscious, intelligent, and individually independent act of faith, as they believe all Protestants insist on scriptural grounds to be necessary in the right use of a sacrament. Therefore they refuse to baptize infants and young children.

The great majority of evangelical Protestants practice infant baptism and do not think, due explanations being given, that it in any way conflicts with the idea that faith is necessary to the efficacy of the sacrament. The Baptist position appears to them to conflict with much of the teaching of the New Testament. It implies that all who are brought up in the faith of Christ and

within the Christian family still lack, when they come to years of discretion, that great change of heart and life which is symbolized in baptism, and can only receive it by a conscious, intelligent and thoroughly independent act of faith. This seems in accordance neither with Scripture nor with human nature. We are told that a child may be full of the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb (~~1094~~¹⁰¹⁵ Luke 1:15); that little children are in the kingdom of Christ (~~1094~~¹⁰¹⁵ Matthew 19:14); that children of believing parents are holy (1 Cor 7:14). Is there nothing in the fact that in the New Testament as in the Old Testament the promise is "to you and your children"? Besides, the argument of those who oppose the baptism of infants, if logically carried out, leads to consequences which few of them would accept. Faith is as essential to salvation, on all evangelical theology, as it is for the right use of the sacrament; and every one of the arguments brought against the baptism of infants is equally applicable to the denial of their salvation. Nor can the Baptist position be said to be true to the facts of ordinary human nature. Faith, in its evangelical sense of fiducia or trust, is not such an abrupt thing as they make it. Their demand for such a conscious, intelligent, strictly individualist act of faith sets aside some of the deepest facts of human nature. No one, young or old, is entirely self-dependent; nor are our thoughts and trust always or even frequently entirely independent and free from the unconscious influences of others. We are interwoven together in society; and what is true generally reveals itself still more strongly in the intimate relations of the family. Is it possible in all cases to trace the creative effects of the subtle imperceptible influences which surround children, or to say when the slowly dawning intelligence is first able to apprehend enough to trust in half-conscious ways? It is but a shallow view of human nature which sets all such considerations on the one side and insists on regarding nothing but isolated acts of knowledge or of faith. With all those thoughts in their minds, the great majority of evangelical churches admit and enjoin the baptism of infants. They believe that the children of believing parents are "born within the church and have interest in the covenant of grace and a right to its seal." They explain that the efficacy of a sacrament is not rigidly tied to the exact time of administration, and can be appropriated whenever faith is kindled and is able to rest on the external sign, and that the spiritual blessings signified in the rite can be appropriated again and again with each fresh kindling of faith. They declare that no one can tell how soon the dawning intelligence may awaken to the act of appropriation. Therefore these churches instruct their ministers in dispensing the sacrament to lay vows on parents that they

will train up the infants baptized “in the knowledge and fear of the Lord,” and will teach them the great blessings promised to them in and through the sacrament and teach them to appropriate these blessings for themselves. They further enjoin their ministers to admonish all who may witness a baptismal service to look back on their own baptism in order that their faith may be stirred afresh to appropriate for themselves the blessings which accompany the proper use of the rite.

LITERATURE.

The literature on the subject of baptism is very extensive. It may be sufficient to select the following: J. S. Candlish, *The Sacraments*, 10th thousand, 1900; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. christ. Archäologie*, V, 1820; Hofling, *Das Sakrament der Taufe*, 1846-48; J. B. Mozley, *Review of the Baptismal Controversy*, 2nd edition, 1895; W. Goode, *The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants*, 1849; W. Wall, *History of Infant Baptism*, 1705; E. B. Underhill, *Confessions of Faith of Baptist Churches of England* (Hanserd Knollys Soc., IX), 1854.

T. M. Lindsay

BAPTISM (LUTHERAN DOCTRINE):

1. THE TERM.

1. The Derivation:

The word “baptism” is the Anglicized form of the Greek [*baptisma*], or [*baptismos*]. These Greek words are verbal nouns derived from [*baptizo*], which, again, is the intensive form of the verb [*bapto*]. “[*Baptismos*] denotes the action of [*baptizein*] (the baptizing), [*baptisma*] the result of the action (the baptism)” (Cremer). This distinction differs from, but is not necessarily contrary to, that of Plummer, who infers from ~~Mark~~ Mark 7:4 and ~~Hebrews~~ Hebrews 9:10 that [*baptismos*] usually means lustrations or ceremonial washings, and from ~~Romans~~ Romans 6:4; ~~Ephesians~~ Ephesians 4:1 1 Pet 3:21 that [*baptisma*] denotes baptism proper (Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* (five volumes)).

2. The Meaning:

The Greek words from which our English “baptism” has been formed are

used by Greek writers, in classical antiquity, in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, with a great latitude of meaning. It is not possible to exhaust their meaning by any single English term. The action which the Greek words express may be performed by plunging, drenching, staining, dipping, sprinkling. The nouns [*baptisma*] and [*baptismos*] do not occur in the Septuagint; the verb [*baptizo*] occurs only in four places, and in two of them in a figurative sense (~~1154~~ 2 Kings 5:14; Judith 12:7; ~~2304~~ Isaiah 21:4; Ecclesiasticus 31, 34:25). Wherever these words occur in the New Testament, the context or, in the case of quotations, a comparison with the Old Testament will in many instances suggest which of the various renderings noted above should be adopted (compare ~~4004~~ Mark 7:4; ~~890~~ Hebrews 9:10 with ~~0498~~ Numbers 19:18,19; 8:7; ~~0204~~ Exodus 24:4-6; ~~4026~~ Acts 2:16,17,41 with ~~0208~~ Joel 2:28). But there are passages in which the particular form of the act of baptizing remains in doubt. “The assertion that the command to baptize is a command to immerse is utterly unauthorized” (Hodge).

3. The Application:

In the majority of Biblical instances the verbs and nouns denoting baptism are used in a lit sense, and signify the application of water to an object or a person for a certain purpose. The ceremonial washings of the Jews, the baptism of proselytes to the Jewish faith, common in the days of Christ, the baptism of John and of the disciples of Christ prior to the Day of Pentecost, and the Christian sacrament of baptism, are literal baptisms (*baptismus fluminis*, “baptism of the river,” i.e. water). But Scripture speaks also of figurative baptisms, without water (~~1072~~ Matthew 20:22; ~~4108~~ Mark 10:38; ~~0250~~ Luke 12:50 = the sufferings which overwhelmed Christ and His followers, especially the martyrs — *baptismus sanguinis*, “baptism of blood”; ~~0081~~ Matthew 3:11; ~~4008~~ Mark 1:8; ~~0316~~ Luke 3:16; ~~4006~~ Acts 1:5; 11:16 = the outpouring of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, which was a characteristic phenomenon of primitive Christianity — *baptismus flaminis*, “baptism of wind, breeze,” i.e. “spirit”). Some even take ~~0225~~ Matthew 21:25; ~~4110~~ Mark 11:30; ~~4185~~ Acts 18:25; ~~6002~~ 1 Corinthians 10:2 in a synecdochical sense, for doctrine of faith, baptism being a prominent feature of that doctrine (*baptismus luminis*, “baptism of light”).

4. Equivalent Terms:

Scripture occasionally alludes to Christian baptism without employing the regular term. Thus in ~~5016~~ Titus 3:5, and ~~4026~~ Ephesians 5:26 we have the term [*loutron*], “washing,” instead lent terms of [*baptisma*]. From this term

the Latin church derived its *lavacrum* (English “layer”) as a designation of baptism. In ^{<8102>}Hebrews 10:22 we have the verbs [*rhantizo*] and [*louo*], “sprinkle” and “wash”; in ^{<4153>}Ephesians 5:26 the verb [*katharizo*], “cleanse”; in ^{<4161>}1 Corinthians 6:11 the verb [*apolouo*], “wash” are evidently synonyms of [*baptizo*], and the act has been so denominated from its prime effect.

2. THE ORDINANCE.

1. The Teaching of Scripture:

Christian baptism, as now practiced, is a sacred ordinance of evangelical grace, solemnly appointed by the risen Christ, prior to His entering into the state of glory by His ascension, and designed to be a means, until His second coming, for admitting men to discipleship with Him. ^{<4158>}Matthew 28:18-20 and its parallel ^{<4165>}Mark 16:15,16 are the principal texts of Scripture on which the church in all ages has based every essential point of her teaching regarding this ordinance. The host of other baptismal texts of Scripture expand and illustrate the contents of these two texts. We have in these texts:

(1) An Authoritative Command

An authoritative (^{<4159>}Matthew 28:19) command, issued in plain terms: “Make disciples baptizing.” This command declares (a) *speciem actus*, i.e. it indicates with sufficient clearness, by the use of the term “baptize,” the external element to be employed, namely, water, and the form of the action to be performed by means of water, namely, any dipping, or pouring, or sprinkling, since the word “baptize” signifies any of these modes. On the strength of this command Luther held: “Baptism is not simple water only, but it is the water comprehended in God’s command”; and the Westminster Shorter Catechism (Ques. 94) calls baptism “a washing with water.” Water is distinctly mentioned as the baptismal element in ^{<4188>}Acts 8:38; 10:47; ^{<4153>}Ephesians 5:26; ^{<8102>}Hebrews 10:22. “There is no mention of any other element” (Plummer). The phraseology of ^{<4153>}Ephesians 5:26, “the washing of water with the word,” shows that not the external element alone, nor the physical action of applying the water, constitutes baptism; but “the word” must be added to the element and the action, in order that there may be a baptism. (*Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*, “Remove the word and what is water but water? The word is added to the element and it becomes a sacrament” Augustine). “Without the Word of

God the water is simple water, and no baptism” (Luther). The command prescribes (b) exercitium actus, i.e. it enjoins a continued exercise of this function of the messengers of Christ for all time.

(2) A Clear Declaration of the Object in View.

The participle “baptizing” qualifies the imperative “make disciples,” and expresses that, what the imperative states as the end, is to be attained by what the participle names as a means to that end. The participle “baptizing,” again, is qualified by “teaching” (~~4181~~ Matthew 28:20). The second participle is not connected by “and” with the first, hence, is subordinate to the first (Meyer). Discipleship is to be obtained by baptizing-teaching. There is no rigid law regarding the order and sequence of these actions laid down in these words; they merely state that Christ desires His disciples to be both baptized and fully informed as to His teaching.

(3) A Definite Promise:

Salvation (~~4161~~ Mark 16:16), i.e. complete and final deliverance from all evil, the securing of “the end of faith” (1 Pet 1:9). This is a comprehensive statement, as in ~~4182~~ 1 Peter 3:21, of the blessing of baptism. Scripture also states, in detail, particular baptismal blessings:

(a) Regeneration, ~~4185~~ Titus 3:5; ~~4188~~ John 3:3,5. Despite Calvin and others, the overwhelming consensus of interpreters still agrees with the ancient church and with Luther in explaining both these texts of baptism.

(b) Remission of sins, or justification (~~4128~~ Acts 2:38; 22:16; ~~4161~~ 1 Corinthians 6:11; ~~4185~~ Ephesians 5:26; ~~5102~~ Hebrews 10:22). This blessing, no doubt, is also intended in ~~4182~~ 1 Peter 3:21, where [*eperotema*] has been rendered “answer” by the King James Version while the Revised Version (British and American) renders “interrogation.” The word denotes a legal claim, which a person has a right to set up (See Cremer under the word and ~~4181~~ Romans 8:1).

(c) The establishment of a spiritual union with Christ, and a new relationship with God (~~4185~~ Galatians 3:26,27; ~~4188~~ Romans 6:3,4; ~~5102~~ Colossians 2:12). In this connection the prepositions with which [*baptizein*] in the New Testament connects may be noted. [*Baptizein eis*], “to baptize into,” always denotes the relation into which the party baptized is placed. The only exception is ~~4109~~ Mark 1:9. [*Baptizein en*], or [*baptizein epi*], “to baptize in” (~~4108~~ Acts 10:48; 2:38), denotes the basis on which the

new relation into which the baptized enters, is made to rest (Cremer).

(d) The sanctifying gifts of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:13; ^{<0085>}Titus 3:5). All these blessings Scripture declares to be effects of baptism (Wirkung der Taufe, Riehm, Handwörterb.). “Baptism is called ‘washing of regeneration,’ not merely because it symbolizes it, or pledges a man to it, but also, and chiefly, because it effects it” (Holtzmann, Huther, Pfleiderer, Weiss). “Regeneration, or being begotten of God, does not mean merely a new capacity for change in the direction of goodness, but an actual change. The legal washings were actual external purifications. Baptism is actual internal purification” (Plummer). To these modern authorities Luther can be added. He says: “Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe, as the words and promises of God declare” (Smaller Catech.). In ^{<0085>}Titus 3:5 the King James Version the force of the preposition *dia*, “by,” deserves to be noted: it declares baptism to be the regenerating, renewing, justifying, glorying medium to the heirs of eternal life. The baptismal promise is supported, not only in a general way, by the veracity and sincerity of the Speaker, who is the Divine Truth incarnate, but also in a special way, by the Author’s appeal to His sovereign majesty (^{<0085>}Matthew 28:18), and by the significant assurance of His personal (“I” = ego, is emphatic: Meyer) presence with the disciples in their afore-mentioned activity (^{<0085>}Matthew 28:20; compare ^{<0085>}Mark 16:20).

(4) A Plain Indication of the Scope:

“All nations,” “the whole creation” (*[pase te ktisei]* to be understood as in ^{<0023>}Colossians 1:23 = “all men”). Baptism is of universal application; it is a cosmopolitan ordinance before which differences such as of nationality, race, age, sex, social or civil status, are leveled (compare ^{<0085>}Colossians 3:11 with ^{<0023>}1 Corinthians 12:13). Accordingly, Christ orders baptism to be practiced “alway” (literally, “all days”), “even unto the end of the world,” i.e. unto the consummation of the present age, until the Second Advent of the Lord. For, throughout this period Christ promises His cooperative presence with the efforts of His disciples to make disciples.

(5) A Prescribed Formula for Administering the Ordinance:

“Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” The belief in the Trinity is fundamental to Christianity; accordingly, the sacred rite by which men are initiated into the Christian religion justly emphasizes this belief. The three Persons are mentioned as distinct from one another, but the baptismal command is issued upon their joint and coequal authority

(“in the name,” not “names”), thus indicating the Unity in Trinity. This ancient baptismal formula represents “the Father as the Originator, the Son as the Mediator, the Holy Ghost as the Realization, and the vital and vitalizing blessing of the promise and fulfillment,” which is extended to men in this ordinance (Cremer).

2. The Biblical History of the Ordinance:

After the Lord had entered into His glory, we find that in the era of the apostles and in the primitive Christian church baptism is the established and universally acknowledged rite by which persons are admitted to communion with the church (~~4138~~ Acts 2:38,41; 8:12 f,36,38; 9:18; 10:47 f; 16:15,33; 18:8; 22:16; ~~8168~~ Romans 6:3; ~~41213~~ 1 Corinthians 12:13; ~~8877~~ Galatians 3:27). Even in cases where an outpouring of the special gifts of the Holy Spirit had already taken place, baptism is still administered (~~4104~~ Acts 10:44 ff; 11:15 f). “Thus, baptism occupied among the Gentile converts to Christianity, and later among all Christians, the same position as circumcision in the Old Covenant (~~5121~~ Colossians 2:11 f; ~~8872~~ Galatians 5:2). It is, essentially, part of the foundation on which the unity of the Christian society rested from the beginning (~~4045~~ Ephesians 4:5; ~~41213~~ 1 Corinthians 12:13; ~~8877~~ Galatians 3:27 f)” (Riehm, Handwörterb.).

3. Types of Baptism:

In ~~4101~~ 1 Corinthians 10:1,2 the apostle states that the Israelites “were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” Farrar attempts the following solution of this type: “The passing under the cloud (~~12419~~ Exodus 14:19) and through the sea, constituting as it did their deliverance from bondage into freedom, their death to Egypt, and their birth to a new covenant, was a general type or dim shadow of Christian baptism (compare our collect, ‘figuring thereby Thy holy baptism’). But the typology is quite incidental; it is the moral lesson which is paramount. ‘Unto Moses’; rather, into. By this ‘baptism’ they accepted Moses as their Heavensent guide and teacher” (Pulpit Comm.). In ~~4102~~ 1 Peter 3:21 the apostle calls baptism the [*antitupon*] of the Deluge. Delitzsch (on ~~51024~~ Hebrews 9:24) suggests that [*tupos*] and [*antitupon*] in Greek represent the original figure and a copy made therefrom, or a prophetic foretype and its later accomplishment. The point of comparison is the saving power of water in either instance. Water saved Noah and his family by floating the ark which sheltered them, and by removing from them the disobedient generation which had sorely tried their faith, as it had tried God’s patience. In like manner the water of baptism

bears up the ark of the Christian church and saves its believing members, by separating them from their filthy and doomed fellow-men.

3. DIFFICULTIES.

1. Are ~~<128>~~Matthew 28:18-20 and ~~<165>~~Mark 16:15,16 Genuine?:

Feine (PER3, XIX, 396 f) and Kattenbusch (Sch-Herz, I, 435 f) argue that the Trinitarian formula in ~~<129>~~Matthew 28:19 is spurious, and that the text in Mark belongs to a section which was added to this Gospel at a later time. The former claim had first been advanced by Conybeare, but later research by Riggensbach has established the genuineness of the Trinitarian formula in Mt. Feine still maintains his doubts, however, on subjective grounds. As to the concluding section in Mark (16:9-20), Jerome is the first to call attention to its omission in most Greek manuscripts to which he had access. But Jerome himself acknowledged ~~<164>~~Mark 16:14 as genuine. Gregory of Nyssa reports that, while this section is missing in some manuscripts, in the more accurate ones many manuscripts contain it. No doctrinal scruple can arise on account of this section; for it contains nothing that is contrary to the doctrine of Scripture in other places on the same subject; and it has always been treated as genuine by the Christian church. The question is a purely historical one (see Bengel, Apparatus Criticus, 170 f).

2. Was the Trinitarian Formula Used in New Testament Times?:

No record of such use can be discovered in the Acts or the epistles of the apostles. The baptisms recorded in the New Testament after the Day of Pentecost are administered “in the name of Jesus Christ” (~~<128>~~Acts 2:38), “into the name of the Lord Jesus” (~~<186>~~Acts 8:16), “into Christ” (~~<183>~~Romans 6:3; ~~<187>~~Galatians 3:27). This difficulty was considered by the Fathers; Ambrose says: Quod verbo tacitum fuerat, expressum est fide, “What had not been expressed in word, was expressed by faith.” On close inspection the difficulty is found to rest on the assumption that the above are records of baptismal formulas used on those occasions. The fact is that these records contain no baptismal formula at all, but “merely state that such persons were baptized as acknowledged Jesus to be the Lord and the Christ” (Plummer). The same can be said of any person baptized in our day with the Trinitarian formula. That this formula was the established usage in the Christian church is proven by records of baptisms in Justin (Apol., I, 61) and Tertullian (Adv. Prax., XXVI).

3. Was Christian Baptism Really a New Ordinance?:

Baptism was practiced among the Jews prior to the solemn inauguration of this ordinance by the risen Christ. The ceremonial washings of the Jews are classed with the transient forms of the Levitical worship (^{<800>}Hebrews 9:9,10), which had not been intended to endure except “until a time of reformation.” They were removed when Christian baptism was erected into an abiding ordinance of the church of God (^{<801>}Colossians 2:11-13). It is erroneous to say that those ancient washings developed into Christian baptism. A shadow does not develop into a substance. Nor do we find the origin of Christian baptism in the baptism of proselytes, which seems to have been a Jewish church custom in the days of Christ. Though the rite of baptism was not unknown to the Jews, still the baptism of John startled them (^{<802>}John 1:25). Such passages as ^{<2004>}Isaiah 4:4 (1:16); ^{<805>}Ezekiel 36:25; 37:23; ^{<806>}Zechariah 13:1 had, no doubt, led them to expect a rite of purification in the days of the Messiah, which would supersede their Levitical purification. The delegation which they sent to John was to determine the Messianic character of John and his preaching and baptizing. Johannic baptism has been a fruitful theme of debate. The question does not affect the personal faith of any Christian at the present time; for there is no person living who has received Johannic baptism (Chemnitz). The entire subject and certain features of it, as the incident recorded ^{<400>}Acts 19:1-7, will continue to be debated. It is best to fix in our minds a few essential facts, which will enable us to put the Scriptural estimate on the baptism of John. John had received a Divine commission to preach and baptize (^{<401>}Luke 3:2; ^{<803>}John 1:33; ^{<402>}Matthew 21:25). He baptized with water (^{<803>}John 3:23). His baptism was honored by a wonderful manifestation of the holy Trinity (^{<406>}Matthew 3:16,17), and by the Redeemer, in His capacity as the Representative of sinful mankind, the sin-bearing Lamb of God, accepting baptism at John’s hand (^{<403>}Matthew 3:13 ff; ^{<802>}John 1:29 ff). It was of the necessity of receiving John’s baptism that Christ spoke to Nicodemus (^{<808>}John 3:3 ff). The Pharisees invited their eternal ruin by refusing John’s baptism (^{<403>}Luke 7:30); for John’s baptism was to shield them from the wrath to come (^{<407>}Matthew 3:7); it was for the remission of sin (^{<4004>}Mark 1:4); it was a washing of regeneration (^{<805>}John 3:5). When Jesus began His public ministry, He took up the preaching and baptism of John, and His disciples practiced it with such success that John rejoiced (^{<802>}John 3:22,25-36; 4:1,2). All this evidence fairly compels the belief that there was no essential difference between the baptism of John and the

baptism instituted by Christ; that what the risen Christ did in ^{<488>}Matthew 28:18-20 was merely to elevate a rite that had previously been adopted by an order “from above” to a permanent institution of His church, and to proclaim its universal application. The contrast which John himself declares between his baptism and that of Christ is not a contrast between two baptisms with water. The baptism of Christ, which John foretells, is a baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the Pentecostal baptism. But for the general purpose of begetting men unto a new life, sanctifying and saving them, the Spirit was also bestowed through John’s baptism (^{<485>}John 3:5).

4. Should Infants Be Baptized?:

The command in ^{<489>}Matthew 28:19; ^{<41616>}Mark 16:16 is all-embracing; so is the statement concerning the necessity of baptism in ^{<485>}John 3:5. After reading these statements, one feels inclined, not to ask, Should infants be baptized? but Why should they not be baptized? The onus probandi rests on those who reject infant baptism. The desire to have their infants baptized must have been manifested on the day when the first three thousand were baptized at Jerusalem, assuming that they were all adults. The old covenant had provided for their children; was the new to be inferior to the old in this respect? (See Plummer in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes).) The baptism of entire households is presumptive evidence that children and infants were baptized in apostolic times (^{<4165>}Acts 16:15,33; 18:8; ^{<4016>}1 Corinthians 1:16). The arguments against infant baptism imply defective views on the subject of original sin and the efficacy of baptism. Infant faith — for, faith is as necessary to the infant as to the adult — may baffle our attempts at explanation and definition; but God who extends His promises also to children (^{<4129>}Acts 2:39), who established His covenant even with beasts (^{<4096>}Genesis 9:16,17); Christ who blessed also little children (^{<4103>}Mark 10:13 ff), and spoke of them as believers (^{<486>}Matthew 18:6), certainly does not consider the regeneration of a child or infant a greater task than that of an adult (compare ^{<483>}Matthew 18:3,4).

5. Why Did Paul not Baptize?:

Paul did baptize Crispus, Gaius and Stephanas with his household. These baptisms he performed at Corinth alone; we have no record of his baptisms at other places. What Paul declares in ^{<4014>}1 Corinthians 1:14-17 is, that by his baptizing he could not have become the cause of the divisions in the Corinthian congregation, because he had baptized only a few persons at Corinth, and, moreover, he had not baptized in his own name, hence had

attached no one to his person. The statement, “Christ sent me not to baptize,” is made after the Semitic idiom, and means: “not so much to baptize as to preach” (Farrar in Pulpit Commentary). If they are taken in any other sense, it is impossible to protect Paul against the charge that he did something that he was not authorized to do, when he baptized Crispus, etc.

6. What Is the Baptism for the Dead?:

1 Cor 15:29 is sometimes taken to mean that the early Christians practiced baptism by proxy. After they had been converted to Christianity, it is held, they desired to convey the benefits of their faith to their departed friends who had died in paganism, by having themselves baptized “in their behalf,” perhaps on their graves. We have no evidence from history that such a practice prevailed in the early Christian churches. Nor does the text suggest it. The Greek preposition [*hyper*] expresses also the motive that may prompt a person to a certain action. In this case the motive was suggested by the dead, namely, by the dead in so far as they shall rise. The context shows this to be the meaning: If a person has sought baptism in view of the fact that the dead are to rise to be judged, his baptism is valueless, if the dead do not rise.

See BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

W. H. T. Dau

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION

<bap-tiz'-mal re-jen-er-a'-shun>: As indicated in the general articles on **BAPTISM** and **SACRAMENT**, the doctrine ordinarily held by Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, and also by Low-Church Episcopalians, differs from that of the Roman and Greek churches, and of High-Church Anglicans, in its rejection of the idea that baptism is the instrumental cause of regeneration, and that the grace of regeneration is effectually conveyed through the administration of that rite wherever duly performed. The teaching of Scripture on this subject is held to be that salvation is immediately dependent on faith, which, as a fruit of the operation of the Spirit of God in the soul, already, in its reception of Christ, implies the regenerating action of that Spirit, and is itself one evidence of it. To faith in Christ is attached the promise of forgiveness, and of all other blessings. Baptism is administered to those who already possess (at least profess) this faith, and symbolizes the dying to sin and rising to

righteousness implicit in the act of faith (Romans 6). It is the symbol of a cleansing from sin and renewal by God's Spirit, but not the agency effecting that renewal, even instrumentally. Baptism is not, indeed, to be regarded as a bare symbol. It may be expected that its believing reception will be accompanied by fresh measures of grace, strengthening and fitting for the new life. This, however, as the life is already there, has nothing to do with the idea of baptism as an *opus operatum*, working a spiritual change in virtue of its mere administration. In Scripture the agency with which regeneration is specially connected is the Divine "word" (compare ~~ROM~~ 1 Peter 1:23). Without living faith, in those capable of its exercise, the outward rite can avail nothing. The supposed "regeneration" may be received — in multitudes of instances is received — without the least apparent change in heart or life.

The above, naturally, applies to adults; the case of children, born and growing up within the Christian community, is on a different footing. Those who recognize the right of such to baptism hold that in the normal Christian development children of believing parents should be the subjects of Divine grace from the commencement (~~ROM~~ Ephesians 6:4); they therefore properly receive the initiatory rite of the Christian church. The faith of the parent, in presenting his child for baptism, lays hold on God's promise to be a God to him and to his children; and he is entitled to hope for that which baptism pledges to him. But this, again, has no relation to the idea of regeneration through baptism.

James Orr

ANGLICAN (HIGH-CHURCH) DOCTRINE

Regeneration, the initial gift of life in Christ, is, in the church's normal system, associated with the sacrament of baptism. The basis for this teaching and practice of the church is found primarily in our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus (~~ROM~~ John 3:1-8) wherein the new birth is associated not only with the quickening Spirit but with the element of water. The Saviour's words, literally translated, are as follows: "Except one be born (out) of water and Spirit (*ex hudatos kai pneumatos gennaomai*), he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (That it is the impersonal aspect of the Divine Spirit, i.e. as equivalent to "spiritual life" which is here presented, is indicated by the absence of the article in the Greek of ~~ROM~~ John 3:5.) Entrance into the kingdom of God implies entrance into the church as the outward and visible embodiment of that kingdom.

our Lord, in the passage above cited, does not limit the possibility or the need of “new birth” to those who have arrived at adult age, or “years of discretion,” but uses the general pronoun [*tis*], “anyone.” The Anglican church does not, however, teach that baptism is unconditionally necessary, but only that it is “generally” necessary to salvation (compare the language of the Church Catechism with the qualification mentioned in the Prayer-Book “Office for the Baptism of Those of Riper Years,” “Whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this Sacrament, where it may be had”). It is not taught that the grace of God is absolutely or unconditionally bound to the external means, but only that these sacramental agencies are the ordinary and normal channels of Divine grace.

The typical form of baptism is that appropriate to the initiation of adults into the Christian body. Justin Martyr in his First Apology (chapter lxi) no doubt testifies to what was the general view of Christians in the 2nd century (circa 150 AD): “As many as are persuaded and believe that the things taught and said by us are true, and, moreover, take upon them to live accordingly, are taught to pray and ask of God with fasting for forgiveness of their former sins; and then they are brought to a place of water, and there regenerated after the same manner with ourselves; for they are washed in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.” For the due administration of this sacrament, personal faith and repentance on the part of the candidate are prerequisite conditions. However, “the baptism of young children” (i.e. of infants) “is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable to the institution of Christ” (XXXIX Articles, Art. XXVII, sub fin.). In the service “For the Baptism of Infants,” repentance and faith are promised for the children by their “sureties” (ordinarily known as “sponsors” or “godparents”), “which promise, when they come to age (the children) themselves are bound to perform.”

The person, whether adult or infant, receives in his baptism a real forgiveness; a washing away of all sins, whether original or actual. He also receives, at least in germ, the beginnings of new life in Christ; which life, however, must be developed and brought to perfection through his personal cooperation with the grace of God. But regeneration, as such, is not conversion; it is not even faith or love, strictly speaking. These latter, while they are conditions, or effects, or evidences of regeneration, are not regeneration itself, which is purely the work of God, operating by His creative power, through the Holy Ghost. The moral test of the existence of

spiritual life is the presence in heart and conduct of the love of God and of obedience to His commandments (see 1 John *passim*).

It may be added that the bestowment of the gifts of spiritual strength — of the manifold graces and of the fullness of the Holy Spirit — is primarily associated with the laying on of hands (confirmation) rather than with baptism proper; the rite of confirmation was, however, originally connected with the baptismal service, as an adjunct to it. The newly-made Christian is not to rest content with the initial gift of life; he is bound to strive forward unto perfection. Confirmation is, in a sense, the completion of baptism. “The doctrine of laying on of hands” is accordingly connected with “the doctrine of baptisms,” and both are reckoned by the author of the Epistle to the He as among “the first principles of Christ” (~~scrib~~ Hebrews 6:1,2 the King James Version).

LITERATURE.

For the Anglican doctrine on the subject of regeneration in baptism the following authorities may be consulted: Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, V, lix, lx; Waterland, The Doct. Use of Christian Sacraments; Regeneration; Wall, Infant Baptism; R. I. Wilberforce, The Doctrine of Holy Baptism; Darwell Stone, Holy Baptism, in “The Oxford Library of Practical Theology”; A. J. Mason, The Faith of the Gospel. For patristic teaching on this subject, compare Tertullian, Deuteronomy Baptismo.

William Samuel Bishop

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE

1. Definition of Terms:

Regeneration is here taken in its strict meaning to denote that internal spiritual change, not of the substance, but of the qualities, of the intellect and will of natural man, by which blindness, darkness in regard to spiritual matters, especially the gospel, is removed from the former, and spiritual bondage, impotency, death from the latter (2 Cor 3:5; ~~scrib~~ Acts 26:18; ~~scrib~~ Philippians 2:13), and the heart of the sinner is made to savingly know and appropriate the Lord Jesus Christ and the merits of His atoning sacrifice, as its only hope for a God-pleasing life here in time and a life in glory hereafter. Regeneration in the strict sense signifies the first spiritual movements and impulses in man, the beginning of his thinking Divine thoughts, cherishing holy desires and willing God-like volitions. But it does

not signify the radical extinction of sin in man; for evil concupiscence remains also in the regenerate as a hostile element to the new life (~~4073~~ Romans 7:23-25; ~~4856~~ Galatians 5:16,17). [*Peccatum tollitur in baptismo, non ut non sit, sed ut non obsit*] — Augustine. “Sin is removed in baptism, not that it may not be, but that it may not hurt.” Reduced to its lowest terms, regeneration in the strict sense may be defined as the kindling of saving faith in the heart of the sinner; for according to ~~4601~~ 1 John 5:1, “whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God.” Such terms as new creation (2 Cor 5:17; ~~4865~~ Galatians 6:15 margin), spiritual quickening, or vivification (~~4005~~ Ephesians 2:5; ~~4811~~ Romans 6:11), spiritual resurrection (~~4005~~ Ephesians 2:6; ~~5000~~ Colossians 3:1), are true synonyms of regeneration in the strict sense. In the point of time justification coincides with regeneration in the strict sense; for it is by faith, too, that the sinner is justified. But these two spiritual events must not be confounded; for justification affects, not the internal conditions of the sinner’s heart, but his legal standing with God the righteous Judge. Regeneration is called baptismal regeneration in so far as it occurs in the event and as an effect of the application of the Christian baptism.

See BAPTISM (I), I, 6.

2. Scriptural Basis of This Doctrine:

The two leading texts of Scripture which declare in plain terms that baptism is a means for effecting regeneration in the strict sense are ~~4885~~ John 3:5 and ~~5885~~ Titus 3:5. But this doctrine is implied in ~~4028~~ Acts 2:38; ~~4885~~ Ephesians 5:26; ~~4882~~ Galatians 3:27; ~~4882~~ 1 Peter 3:21. In ~~4882~~ John 3:7 it is immaterial whether [*anóthen gennethenai*] is rendered “to be born from above” or “to be born a second time.” For the second birth is never of the flesh (~~4885~~ John 1:13; 3:4,5); hence, is always of divine origin, “from above.” It is ascribed to the agency of the entire Trinity: the Father (~~5008~~ James 1:18; ~~4008~~ 1 Peter 1:3); the Son (~~4012~~ John 1:12); and the Spirit (~~5885~~ Titus 3:5). But by appropriation it is generally attributed to the Spirit alone, whose particular function is that of Quickener (see Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Worterb.*, 9th edition, under the word “pneuma,” 894 f). Baptism is an instrument by which the Holy Spirit effects regeneration. “Water and the Spirit” (~~4885~~ John 3:5) is a paraphrastic description of baptism: “water,” inasmuch as the man is baptized therewith (~~4882~~ 1 John 5:7,8; ~~4885~~ Ephesians 5:26) for the forgiveness of sin (~~4028~~ Acts 2:33; 22:16; ~~4881~~ 1 Corinthians 6:11), and “Spirit,” inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is given to the person baptized in order to his spiritual renewal and sanctification; “both together — the

former as *causa medians*, the latter as *causa efficiens* — constitute the objective and causative element out of which (compare ^{<B13>}John 1:13) the birth from above is produced (ek)” (Meyer). In ^{<B16>}Titus 3:5 “the expression [*to loutrou palingenesias*], literally, ‘bath of regeneration,’ has been very arbitrarily interpreted by some expositors, some taking [*loutron*] as a figurative name for the regeneration itself, or for the *praedicatio evangelii*, ‘preaching of the gospel’ or for the Holy Spirit, or for the abundant imparting of the Spirit. From ^{<B16>}Ephesians 5:26 it is clear that it can mean nothing else than baptism; compare too, ^{<B12>}Hebrews 10:22; ^{<B11>}1 Corinthians 6:11; ^{<B16>}Acts 22:16.” Of this laver of regeneration Paul says that through it ([*dia*]), i.e. by its instrumentality, men are saved. Meyer is right when, correcting a former view of his, he states: “According to the context, Paul calls baptism the bath of the new birth, not meaning that it pledges us to the new birth (‘to complete the process of moral purification, of expiation and sanctification,’ Matthies), nor that it is a visible image of the new birth (Deuteronomy Wette), for neither in the one sense nor in the other could it be regarded as a means of saving. Paul uses that name for it as the bath by means of which God actually brings about the new birth.” The application of baptism and the operation of the Spirit must be viewed as one undivided action. Thus the offense of Spurgeon, Weiss and others at “regeneration by water-baptism” can be removed.

3. Faith in Baptism:

Baptism does not produce salutary effects *ex opere operato*, i.e. by the mere external performance of the baptismal action. No instrument with which Divine grace works does. Even the preaching of the gospel is void of saving results if not “mixed with faith” (^{<B12>}Hebrews 4:2 the King James Version). Luther correctly describes the working of baptism thus: “How can water do such great things? It is not the water indeed that does them, but the Word of God which is in and with the water (God’s giving hand), and faith which trusts such word of God in the water (man’s receiving hand).” But this faith, which is required for a salutary use of the gospel and baptism, is wrought by these as instruments which the Holy Spirit employs to produce faith; not by imparting to them a magical power but by uniting His Divine power with them (^{<B17>}Romans 10:17; ^{<B16>}2 Corinthians 4:6; ^{<B16>}Ephesians 5:26).

4. Infants and Adults:

The comprehensive statements in ^{<B16>}John 3:6; ^{<B16>}Ephesians 2:3 (“by nature”) show that infants are in need of being regenerated, and

Matthew 18:3,6, that they are capable of faith. It is not more difficult for the Holy Spirit to work faith in infants by baptism, than in adults by the preaching of the gospel. And infant faith, though it may baffle our attempts at exact definition, is nevertheless honored in Scripture with the word which denotes genuine faith, *pisteuein*, i.e. trustfully relying on Christ (Matthew 18:6; compare 2 Timothy 3:15; 1:5). In the case of adults who have received faith through hearing and reading the gospel (James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23; 1 Corinthians 4:15), baptism is still “the washing of regeneration,” because it is a seal to them of the righteousness which these people have previously obtained by believing the gospel (Romans 4:11-13; Galatians 3:7); and it reminds them of, and enables them to discharge, their daily duty of putting away the old and putting on the new man (Ephesians 4:22,24), just as the Word is still the regenerating word of truth (James 1:18) though it be preached to persons who are regenerated a long time ago. Accordingly, Luther rightly extends the regenerating and renewing influences of baptism throughout the life of a Christian, when he says “Baptizing with water signifies that the old Adam in us should, by daily contrition and repentance, be drowned and die, with all sins and evil lusts; and, again, a new man should come forth and arise, who shall live before God in righteousness and purity forever” (Smaller Catechism).

W. H. T. Dau

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD

([βαπτίζομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, baptizomai huper ton nekron]).

1. PAUL’S ARGUMENT:

Some of the Corinthian Christians denied the resurrection of the dead, and Paul advances three arguments to convince them that the dead will be raised:

- (1) “If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised,” but Christ is raised (1 Cor 15:13,20).
- (2) If the dead are not raised, why are men being baptized for the dead (1 Cor 15:29)?
- (3) Why should the apostle himself wage his spiritual warfare (1 Cor 15:30)?

The first argument rests upon the central fact of Christianity, and the other two are appeals to the consistency of the Corinthians, and of Paul himself. Whatever “baptism for the dead” meant, it was, in Paul’s opinion, as real, valid and legitimate a premise from which to conclude that the dead would rise as his own sufferings. The natural meaning of the words is obvious. Men in Corinth, and possibly elsewhere, were being continually baptized on behalf of others who were at the time dead, with a view to benefiting them in the resurrection, but if there be no resurrection, what shall they thus accomplish, and why do they do it? “The only legitimate reference is to a practice of survivors allowing themselves to be baptized on behalf of (believing?) friends who had died without baptism” (Alford in the place cited.).

2. PATRISTIC EVIDENCE:

Tertullian believed that Paul referred to a custom of vicarious baptism (Res., 48c; Adv. Marc., 5.10). There is evidence that the early church knew such a practice. Epiphanius mentions a tradition that the custom obtained among the Cerinthians (Haer., 28 6). And Chrysostom states that it prevailed among the Marcionites.

3. MODERN VIEWS:

But commentators have offered between thirty and forty other interpretations, more or less strained, of the passage. (For a summary of different views see T. C. Edwards and Stanley, Comms., at the place) Two of the most reasonable views from recent commentators are: “What shall they do who receive baptism on account of the dead? i.e. with a view to the resurrection of the dead?” and therefore to sharing in it themselves (Canon Evans, Speaker’s Comm., at the place); “that the death of Christians led to the conversion of survivors, who in the first instance ‘for the sake of the dead’ (their beloved dead), and in the hope of reunion, turn to Christ” (Findlay, Expositor’s Greek Test., at the place). Both ideas may be true, but they are simply imported into this passage, and the latter also is quite irrelevant to the argument and makes Paul identify conversion with baptism.

4. THE DIFFICULTY:

But why is all this ingenuity expended to evade the natural meaning? Because

(1) such a custom would be a superstition involving the principle of opus operarum; and

(2) Paul could not share or even tolerate a contemporary idea which is now regarded as superstition.

To reply (with Alford) that Paul does not approve the custom will not serve the purpose, for he would scarcely base so great an argument, even as an argumentum ad hominem, on a practice which he regarded as wholly false and superstitious. The retort of those who denied the resurrection would be too obvious. But why should it be necessary to suppose that Paul rose above all the limitations of his age? The idea that symbolic acts had a vicarious significance had sunk deeply into the Jewish mind, and it would not be surprising if it took more than twenty years for the leaven of the gospel to work all the Jew out of Paul. At least it serves the apostle's credit ill to make his argument meaningless or absurd in order to save him from sharing at all in the inadequate conceptions of his age. He made for himself no claim of infallibility.

T. Rees

BAPTISM OF FIRE

(ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, en pneumati hagio kai puri): This expression is used in ^{ABE}Matthew 3:11. The copulative [καὶ, kai] requires that the baptism “in the Holy Ghost and in fire,” should be regarded as one and the same thing. It does violence to the construction, therefore, to make this statement refer to the fire Of judgment. The difficulty has always been in associating fire with the person of the Holy Ghost. But in the connection of fire with the work or influence of the Holy Ghost the difficulty disappears. The thought of John is that the Saviour would give them the Divine Sanctifier as purifying water to wash away their sins and as a refining fire to consume their dross; to kindle in their hearts the holy flame of Divine love and zeal; to illuminate their souls with heavenly wisdom. The statement, therefore, in this verse indicates the manner in which Christ will admit them to discipleship and prepare them for His service.

See BAPTISM; FIRE.

Jacob W. Kapp

BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

1. THE BIBLICAL MATERIAL:

The expression “baptism of the Holy Spirit” is based on a number of predictions found in our four Gospels and in connection with these the record of their fulfillment in the Book of Acts. The passages in the Gospels are as follows: ^{<401>}Matthew 3:11: “I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire.” The last clause is [αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, autos humas baptisei en pneumati hagio kai puri]. In ^{<402>}Mark 1:8 and ^{<403>}Luke 3:16 we have the declaration in a slightly modified form; and in ^{<404>}John 1:33 John the Baptist declares that the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at the baptism of the latter marked out Jesus as “he that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit.” Again in ^{<405>}John 7:37,38 we read: “Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water.” Then the evangelist adds in ^{<406>}John 7:39: “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.” These are the specific references in the four Gospels to the baptisms of the Holy Spirit. In Acts we find direct reference by Luke to the promised baptism in the Holy Spirit. In ^{<407>}Acts 1:5 Jesus, just before the ascension, contrasts John’s baptism in water with the baptism in the Holy Spirit which the disciples are to receive “not many days hence,” and in ^{<408>}Acts 1:8 power in witnessing for Jesus is predicted as the result of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. On the evening of the resurrection day Jesus appeared to the disciples and “he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit” (^{<409>}John 20:22). This was probably not a wholly symbolic act but an actual communication to the disciples, in some measure, of the gift of the Spirit, preliminary to the later complete bestowal.

We observe next the fulfillment of these predictions as recorded in Acts. The gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost and the miraculous manifestations which followed are clearly the chief historical fulfillment of the prediction of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Among the manifestations of the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost were first those which were physical, such as “a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled

all the house where they were sitting” (Acts 2:2), and the appearance of “tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them” (Acts 2:3). Secondly, there were spiritual results: “And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance” (Acts 2:4). In Acts 2:16 ff Peter declares that this bestowment of the Holy Spirit is in fulfillment of the prediction made by the prophet Joel and he cites the words in Acts 2:28 ff of Joel’s prophecy.

There is one other important passage in Acts in which reference is made to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. While Peter was speaking to Cornelius (Acts 10:44) the Holy Spirit fell on all that heard the word and they of the circumcision who were with Peter “were amazed” “because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit.” When giving the brethren at Jerusalem an account of his visit to Cornelius, Peter declares that this event which he had witnessed was a baptism of the Holy Spirit (Acts 11:16): “And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit.”

2. SIGNIFICANCE OF BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT:

We consider next the significance of the baptism of the Holy Spirit from various points of view.

(1) From the Point of View of Old Testament Teaching as to the Gift of the Spirit.

The prophecy of Joel quoted by Peter indicates something extraordinary in the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost. The Spirit now comes in new forms of manifestation and with new power. The various classes mentioned as receiving the Spirit indicate the wide diffusion of the new power. In the Old Testament usually the Spirit was bestowed upon individuals; here the gift is to the group of disciples, the church. Here the gift is permanently bestowed, while in the Old Testament it was usually transient and for a special purpose. Here again the Spirit comes in fullness as contrasted with the partial bestowment in Old Testament times.

(2) From the Point of View of the Ascended Christ.

In Luke 24:49 Jesus commands the disciples to tarry in the city “until ye be clothed with power from on high,” and in John 15:26 He speaks of the Comforter “whom I will send unto you from the Father,” “he shall bear

witness of me”; and in ~~<BIB>~~ John 16:13 Jesus declares that the Spirit when He comes shall guide the disciples into all truth, and He shall show them things to come. In this verse the Spirit is called the Spirit of truth. It was fitting that the Spirit who was to interpret truth and guide into all truth should come in fullness after, rather than before, the completion of the life-task of the Messiah. The historical manifestation of Divine truth as thus completed made necessary the gift of the Spirit in fullness. Christ Himself was the giver of the Spirit. The Spirit now takes the place of the ascended Christ, or rather takes the things of Christ and shows them to the disciples. The baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost thus becomes the great historic event signaling the beginning of a new era in the kingdom of God in which the whole movement is lifted to the spiritual plane, and the task of evangelizing the world is formally begun.

*(3) The Significance of the Baptism of the Spirit
from the Point of View of the Disciples.*

It can scarcely be said with truth that Pentecost was the birthday of the church. Jesus had spoken of His church during His earthly ministry. The spiritual relation to Christ which constitutes the basis of the church existed prior to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But that baptism established the church in several ways. First in unity. The external bond of unity now gives place to an inner spiritual bond of profound significance. Secondly, the church now becomes conscious of a spiritual mission, and theocratic ideals of the kingdom disappear. Thirdly, the church is now endued with power for its work. Among the gifts bestowed were the gift of prophecy in the large sense of speaking for God, and the gift of tongues which enabled disciples to speak in foreign tongues. The account in the second chapter of Acts admits of no other construction. There was also bestowed power in witnessing for Christ. This was indeed one of the most prominent blessings named in connection with the promise of the baptism of the Spirit. The power of working miracles was also bestowed (~~<HR>~~ Acts 3:4 ff; 5:12 ff). Later in the epistles of Paul much emphasis is given to the Spirit as the sanctifying agency in the hearts of believers. In Acts the word of the Spirit is chiefly Messianic, that is, the Spirit’s activity is all seen in relation to the extension of the Messianic kingdom. The occasion for the outpouring of the Spirit is Pentecost when men from all nations are assembled in Jerusalem. The symbolic representation of tongues of fire is suggestive of preaching, and the glossolalia, or speaking with tongues which followed, so that men of various nations heard the gospel in their own languages,

indicates that the baptism of the Spirit had a very special relation to the task of world-wide evangelization for the bringing in of the kingdom of God.

3. FINALITY OF THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT:

The question is often raised whether or not the baptism of the Holy Spirit occurred once for all or is repeated in subsequent baptisms. The evidence seems to point to the former view to the extent at least of being limited to outpourings which took place in connection with events recorded in the early chapters of the Book of Acts. The following considerations favor this view:

- (1) In the first chapter of Acts Jesus predicts, according to Luke's account, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit would take place, "not many days hence" (~~4105~~ Acts 1:5). This would seem to point to a definite and specific event rather than to a continuous process.
 - (2) Again, Peter's citation in ~~4127~~ Acts 2:17-21 of Joel's prophecy shows that in Peter's mind the event which his hearers were then witnessing was the definite fulfillment of the words of Joel.
 - (3) Notice in the third place that only one other event in the New Testament is described as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and for special reasons this may be regarded as the completion of the Pentecostal baptism. The passage is that contained in ~~4100~~ Acts 10:1 through 11:18 in which the record is given of the following events:
 - (a) miraculous vision given to Peter on the housetop (~~4101~~ Acts 10:11-16) indicating that the things about to occur are of unique importance;
 - (b) the speaking with tongues (~~4105~~ Acts 10:45,46);
 - (c) Peter declares to the brethren at Jerusalem that the Holy Ghost fell on the Gentiles in this instance of Cornelius and his household "as on us at the beginning" (~~4115~~ Acts 11:15);
 - (d) Peter also declares that this was a fulfillment of the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit (~~4116~~ Acts 11:16,17);
 - (e) the Jewish Christians who heard Peter's account of the matter acknowledged this as proof that God had also extended the privileges of the gospel to the Gentiles (~~4118~~ Acts 11:18).
- The baptism of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon Cornelius and his household is thus directly linked with the first outpouring at Pentecost, and as the

event which signalized the opening of the door of the gospel formally to Gentiles it is in complete harmony with the missionary significance of the first great Pentecostal outpouring. It was a turning point or crisis in the Messianic kingdom and seems designed to complete the Pentecostal gift by showing that Gentiles as well as Jews are to be embraced in all the privileges of the new dispensation.

(4) We observe again that nowhere in the epistles do we find a repetition of the baptism of the Spirit. This would be remarkable if it had been understood by the writers of the epistles that the baptism of the Spirit was frequently to be repeated. There is no evidence outside the Book of Acts that the baptism of the Spirit ever occurred in the later New Testament times. In ^{<423>}1 Corinthians 12:13 Paul says, “For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, and were all made to drink of one Spirit.” But here the reference is not to the baptism of the Spirit, but rather to a baptism into the church which is the body of Christ. We conclude, therefore, that the Pentecostal baptism taken in conjunction with the baptism of the Spirit in the case of Cornelius completes the baptism of the Holy Spirit according to the New Testament teaching. The baptism of the Spirit as thus bestowed was, however, the definite gift of the Spirit in His fullness for every form of spiritual blessing necessary in the progress of the kingdom and as the permanent and abiding gift of God to His people. In all subsequent New Testament writings there is the assumption of this presence of the Spirit and of His availability for all believers. The various commands and exhortations of the epistles are based on the assumption that the baptism of the Spirit has already taken place, and that, according to the prediction of Jesus to the disciples, the Spirit was to abide with them forever (^{<546>}John 14:16). We should not therefore confound other forms of expression found in the New Testament with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When Christians are enjoined to “walk by the Spirit” (^{<516>}Galatians 5:16) and “be filled with the Spirit” (^{<518>}Ephesians 5:18), or when the Spirit is described as an anointing ([^{<519>}χρίσμα, chrisma]) as in ^{<521>}1 John 2:20-27, and as the “earnest of our inheritance” ([^{<522>}ἄρραβών, arrabon]). as in ^{<514>}Ephesians 1:14, and when various other similar expressions are employed in the epistles of the New Testament, we are not to understand the baptism of the Holy Spirit. These expressions indicate aspects of the Spirit’s work in believers or of the believer’s appropriation of the gifts and blessings of the Spirit rather than the historical baptism of the Spirit.

4. RELATION OF BAPTISM OF THE SPIRIT TO OTHER BAPTISMS:

Three final points require brief attention, namely, the relation of the baptism of the Spirit to the baptism in water, and to the baptism in fire, and to the laying on of hands.

(1) We note that the baptism in fire is coupled with the baptism in the Spirit in ^{<4081>}Matthew 3:11 and in ^{<4086>}Luke 3:16. These passages give the word of John the Baptist. John speaks of the coming One who “shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire” (^{<4086>}Luke 3:16). This baptism in fire is often taken as being parallel and synonymous with the baptism in the Spirit. The context however in both Matthew and Luke seems to favor another meaning. Jesus’ Messianic work will be both cleansing and destructive. The “you” addressed by John included the people generally and might naturally embrace both classes, those whose attitude to Jesus would be believing and those who would refuse to believe. His action as Messiah would affect all men. Some He would regenerate and purify through the Holy Ghost. Others He would destroy through the fire of punishment. This view is favored by the context in both gospels. In both the destructive energy of Christ is coupled with His saving power in other terms which admit of no doubt. The wheat He gathers into the garner and the chaff He burns with unquenchable fire.

(2) The baptism of the Holy Spirit was not meant to supersede water baptism. This is clear from the whole of the history in the Book of Acts, where water baptism is uniformly administered to converts after the Pentecostal baptism of the Spirit, as well as from the numerous references to water baptisms in the epistles. The evidence here is so abundant that it is unnecessary to develop it in detail. See ^{<6008>}Romans 6:3; ^{<6014>}1 Corinthians 1:14-17; 10:2; 12:13; 15:29; ^{<6027>}Galatians 3:27; ^{<6045>}Ephesians 4:5; ^{<6022>}Colossians 2:12; ^{<6021>}1 Peter 3:21.

(3) In ^{<4087>}Acts 8:17 and 19:6 the Holy Spirit is bestowed in connection with the laying on of the hands of apostles, but these are not to be regarded as instances of the baptism of the Spirit in the strict sense, but rather as instances of the reception by believers of the Spirit which had already been bestowed in fullness at Pentecost.

LITERATURE.

Arts. on Holy Spirit in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) and Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels; article on “Spiritual Gifts” in Encyclopedia Biblica; Moule, Veni Creator; Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; Kuyper, The Work of the Holy Spirit.

See also HOLY SPIRIT.

E. Y. Mullins

BAPTISM, INFANT

See BAPTISM (I), II; (II), III, 3, v; (III), III, 3.

BAPTIST

<bap'-tist>.

See JOHN THE BAPTIST.

BAR (1)

<bar> (prefix): Aramaic for the Hebrew בן [ben], “son.” Compare Aramaic sections of Ezra and Daniel. In the Old Testament the word is found three times in ^{<1802>}Proverbs 31:2 and once in Syriac ^{<1912>}Psalm 2:12 (Hier. translates “pure”). In the New Testament “Bar” is frequently employed as prefix to names of persons. Compare Barabbas; Bar-Jesus; Bar-Jonah; Barnabas; Barsabbas; Bartholomew; Bartimeus.

See BEN.

BAR (2)

<bar> (substantive):

(1) j " yrBi[beriach] = “a bolt” (^{<0236>}Exodus 26:26-29; 35:11; 36:31-34; 39:33; 40:18; ^{<0486>}Numbers 3:36; 4:31; ^{<0885>}Deuteronomy 3:5; ^{<0718>}Judges 16:3; ^{<0237>}1 Samuel 23:7; ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13; ^{<1486>}2 Chronicles 8:5; 14:7; ^{<0888>}Nehemiah 3:3,6,13-15; ^{<0880>}Job 38:10 “bars and doors” for the sea (the bank or shore of the sea); ^{<1976>}Psalm 107:16; 147:13 “the bars of thy gates”: the walls of the city were now rebuilt and its gates only closed and barred

by night (see ^{<100B>}Nehemiah 7:3); ^{<0189>}Proverbs 18:19, “bars of a castle”; ^{<245D>}Isaiah 45:2; ^{<245B>}Jeremiah 49:31; 51:30; ^{<2109>}Lamentations 2:9; ^{<2681>}Ezekiel 38:11): meaning “a rock in the sea” (^{<3016>}Jonah 2:6).

(2) **fw** [moT] = “a staff,” “stick,” “pole” (^{<0040>}Numbers 4:10,12 margin); “strong fortification and great impediment” (^{<245D>}Isaiah 45:2; Amos 1:5, “the bolt of Damascus”: no need here to render prince, as some do (G. A. Smith in the place cited.)).

(3) **dB** [badh] = “staff,” “part of body,” “strength” (^{<1876>}Job 17:16, “bars of Sheol”: the gates of the world of the dead; compare ^{<2380>}Isaiah 38:10; some read, “Will the bars of Sheol fall?”).

(4) **lyfm** [meTil] = “something hammered out, a (forged) bar” (^{<1808>}Job 40:18).

See DOOR; GATE; HOUSE.

Frank E. Hirsch

BARABBAS

<ba-rab'-as> ([**Barabbas**]): For Aramaic Bar-abba = literally, “son of the father,” i.e. of the master or teacher. Abba in the time of Jesus was perhaps a title of honor (^{<129>}Matthew 23:9), but became later a proper name. The variant Barrabban found in the Harclean Syriac would mean “son of the rabbi or teacher.” Origen knew and does not absolutely condemn a reading of ^{<1716>}Matthew 27:16,17, which gave the name “Jesus Barabbas,” but although it is also found in a few cursives and in the Aramaic and the Jerusalem Syriac versions in this place only, it is probably due to a scribe’s error in transcription (Westcott-Hort, App., 19-20). If the name was simply Barabbas or Barrabban, it may still have meant that the man was a rabbi’s son, or it may have been a purely conventional proper name, signifying nothing. He was the criminal chosen by the Jerusalem mob, at the instigation of the priests, in preference to Jesus Christ, for Pilate to release on the feast of Passover (^{<1155>}Mark 15:15; ^{<1721>}Matthew 27:20,21; ^{<2318>}Luke 23:18; ^{<1841>}John 18:40). Matthew calls him “a notable (i.e. notorious) prisoner” (27:16). Mark says that he was “bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed murder” (15:7). Luke states that he was cast into prison “for a certain

insurrection made in the city, and for murder” (23:19; compare ^{<4714>}Acts 3:14). John calls him a “robber” or “brigand” (18:40). Nothing further is known of him, nor of the insurrection in which he took part. Luke’s statement that he was a murderer is probably a deduction from Mark’s more circumstantial statement, that he was only one of a gang, who in a rising had committed murder. Whether robbery was the motive of his crime, as John suggests, or whether he was “a man who had raised a revolt against the Roman power” (Gould) cannot be decided. But it seems equally improbable that the priests (the pro-Roman party) would urge the release of a political prisoner and that Pilate would grant it, especially when the former were urging, and the latter could not resist, the execution of Jesus on a political charge (^{<4712>}Luke 23:2). The insurrection may have been a notorious case of brigandage. To say that the Jews would not be interested in the release of such a prisoner, is to forget the history of mobs. The custom referred to of releasing a prisoner on the Passover is otherwise unknown. “What Matthew (and John) represents as brought about by Pilate, Mark makes to appear as if it were suggested by the people themselves. An unessential variation” (Meyer). For a view of the incident as semi-legendary growth, see Schmiedel in *Encyclopedia Biblica*. See also Allen, Matthew, and Gould, Mark, at the place, and article “Barabbas” by Plummer in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* (five volumes).

T. Rees

BARACHEL

^{<bar'-a-kel>} (𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤌; [barakh'el], “God blesses”): Barachel, the Buzite, of the family of Ram, was the father of Elihu, who was the last one to reason with Job (^{<1831>}Job 32:2,6). Compare *BUZ*; *RAM*.

BARACHIAH

^{<bar-a-ki'-a>} ([𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓, Barachias]; the King James Version Barachias; ^{<4735>}Matthew 23:35): Father of Zachariah who was murdered between the sanctuary and the altar. It is possible that reference is made to Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (^{<4741>}2 Chronicles 24:20 ff), whom Matthew by mistake calls “Z., the son of Barachiah.” ^{<4715>}Luke 11:51 omits the name of the father of Z. (compare Zahn’s *Kommentar*, 649, note).

BARACHIAS

<bar-a-ki'-as>.

See *BARACHIAH*.

BARAK

<ba'-rak> (**qrB**_i[baraq], “lightning flash”): The name occurs in Sabea **sqr**rb**** [barqac], in Palmyrene **qrb** [baraq], and in Punic Barcas, as surname of Hamilcar; and as Divine name in Assyrian Ramman-Birqu and Gibil-Birqu (Del. Assyrian, HWB, 187). Barak was the son of Abinoam of Kedesh, a refuge city in Mt. Naphtali. He was summoned by the prophetess Deborah to lead his countrymen to war against the Canaanites under the leadership of Sisera. From the celebrated ode of Deborah we gather that Israel suffered at the hand of the enemy; the caravan roads were in danger, traffic almost ceased; the cultivated country was plundered (^{<QRB>}Judges 5:6,7). The fighting men in Israel were disarmed, a shield was not to be seen nor a spear among forty thousand men (^{<QRB>}Judges 5:8). The prophetess raised the signal of struggle for independence. Soon Barak came to her aid. With an army of 10,000 men — according to ^{<QHB>}Judges 4:10 they were all drawn from Zebulun and Naphtali, whereas ^{<QFB>}Judges 5:13-18 adds Benjamin, Machir and Issachar to the list of faithful tribes — Barak, accompanied by Deborah, rushed to the summit of Mt. Tabor. This location was very favorable to the rudely armed Israelites in warding off the danger of the well-armed enemy. The wooded slopes protected them against the chariots of the Canaanites. In addition they were within striking distance should the enemy expose himself on the march. Under the heavy rainfall the alluvial plain became a morass, in which the heavy-armed troops found it impossible to move. Soon the little stream Kishon was filled with chariots, horses and Canaanites. Sisera abandoned his chariot and fled on foot. Barak pursued him and found him murdered by Jael in her tent. This completed the victory. See *BEDAN*; Moore, “Judges,” at the place.
— *Samuel Cohon*

BARBARIAN; BARBAROUS

<bar-ba'-ri-an>, <bar'-ba-rus> ([βάρβαρος, barbaros]): A word probably formed by imitation of the unintelligible sounds of foreign speech, and hence, in the mouth of a Greek it meant anything that was not Greek,

language, people or customs. With the spread of Greek language and culture, it came to be used generally for all that was non-Greek. Philo and Josephus sometimes called their own nation “barbarians,” and so did Roman writers up to the Augustan age, when they adopted Greek culture, and reckoned themselves with the Greeks as the only cultured people in the world. Therefore Greek and barbarian meant the whole human race (~~80H~~ Romans 1:14).

In ~~80R~~ Colossians 3:11, “barbarian, Scythian” is not a classification or antithesis but a “climax” (Abbott) = “barbarians, even Scythians, the lowest type of barbarians.” In Christ, all racial distinctions, even the most pronounced, disappear.

In ~~84H~~ 1 Corinthians 14:11 Paul uses the term in its more primitive sense of one speaking a foreign, and therefore, an unintelligible language: “If then I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh will be a barbarian unto me.” The speaking with tongues would not be a means of communication. The excited inarticulate ejaculations of the Corinthian revivalists were worse than useless unless someone had the gift of articulating in intelligible language the force of feeling that produced them ([*dunamis tes phones*], literally, “the power of the sound”).

In ~~48D~~ Acts 28:2,4 (in the King James Version of ~~48D~~ Acts 28:2 “barbarous people” = barbarians) the writer, perhaps from the Greek-Roman standpoint, calls the inhabitants of Melita barbarians, as being descendants of the old Phoenician settlers, or possibly in the more general sense of “strangers.” For the later sense of “brutal,” “cruel,” “savage,” see 2 Macc 2:21; 4:25; 15:2.

T. Rees

BARBER

<bar'-ber>:

(1) The English word “barber” is from Latin *barba*, “beard” = a man who shaves the beard. Dressing and trimming the hair came to be added to his work. “Barber” is found only once English Versions of the Bible, in ~~48D~~ Ezekiel 5:1, “Take thee a sharp sword; as a barber’s razor shalt thou take it unto thee, and shalt cause it to pass upon thy head and upon thy beard” (compare [Chaghgha’] 4b, Shab, section 6).

(2) In ^{<0414>}Genesis 41:14 we probably have a case of conformity to Egyptian, rather than Palestinian custom, where Joseph “shaved himself, and changed his raiment, and came in unto Pharaoh.” It is known that Egyptians of the higher classes shaved the beard regularly and completely (as the Hittites, Elamites and early Babylonians seem to have done), except that fashion allowed, as an exception to the rule, a small tuft, or “goatee,” under the chin.

(3) We learn from various Scriptural allusions, as well as from other sources (compare W. Max Muller, *Asien und Europa*, 296 ff), that the business of the oriental barber included, besides ceremonial shaving, the trimming and polling of the hair and the beard. Compare ^{<0924>}2 Samuel 19:24 where it appears that the moustache (Hebrew [sapham]; the King James Version “beard”) received regular trimming; and ^{<0214>}1 Samuel 21:14, where the neglect of the beard is set down as a sign of madness.

That men wore wigs and false beards in ancient days, the latter showing the rank of the wearer, appears from Herodotus ii.36; iii.12; and Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, II, 324, etc. Josephus, *Vita*, II, gives one case where false hair appears to have been used as an intentional disguise. See also Polyb. iii.78.

(4) The business of the barber (see ^{<3610>}Ezekiel 5:1, “as a barber’s razor shalt thou take it unto thee, and shalt cause it to pass upon thy head and upon thy beard”), outside of ceremonial shaving, may have consisted in trimming and polling the beard and the hair of the head. Of other nations with whom Israel of old came in contact, the Hittites and Elamites, it is now known, shaved the beard completely, as the earliest Babylonians also seem to have done.

(5) The prohibition enjoined in the Mosaic law upon “the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok” (^{<3415>}Ezekiel 44:15,20) forbidding either “shaving the head,” or “suffering their locks to grow long,” or shaving off the corners of their beard (^{<0216>}Leviticus 21:5), was clearly, in a sense peculiar to the priests, etc.: “They (the priests) shall only cut off,” i.e. trim, not shave, “the hair of their heads” (^{<3420>}Ezekiel 44:20b). But in the Apostolical Constitutions, I, 3, insistence is laid upon the Biblical prohibition as applicable to all as regards the removal of the beard (compare Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.*, III, edition Migne, I, 580 f). Jerome on ^{<3420>}Ezekiel 44:20 and some of the Jewish sages find the basis of this prohibition in the fact that God gave a beard to man to distinguish him

from the woman — so, they reasoned, it is wrong thus to go against Nature (compare Bahya, on ^{<1827>}Leviticus 19:27).

(6) In the Palestine of the Greek period, say in the 3rd century BC, when there was a large infusion of Hellenic population and influence, clipping of the beard prevailed in some circles, being omitted only in times of mourning, etc. The common people, however, seem to have seen little distinction between clipping the beard and shaving. But see pictures of captive Jews with clipped beard in the British Museum.

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, heb. Arch., 110; Nowack, Lehrbuch der Heb. Arch., 134; W. Max Muller, Asien und Europa, 296 ff.

George B. Eager

BARCHUS

^{<bar'-kus>} (Codex Vaticanus, [^{Βαχούς}, Bachous]; Codex Alexandrinus, [^{Βαρχοονέ}, Barchoue]; the King James Version Charchus, from Aldine edition, [*Charkous*]; 1 Esdras 5:32 = Barkos (^{<1828>}Ezra 2:53; ^{<1825>}Nehemiah 7:55)): The descendants of Barchus (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BAREFOOT

^{<bar'-foot>}.

1. INTRODUCTORY:

The word is found in the following passages: English Versions of the Bible, “He went barefoot” (^{<1850>}2 Samuel 15:30); “(Isaiah) did so, walking barefoot” (^{<2310>}Isaiah 20:2); and like the Egyptians, “naked and barefoot” (^{<2318>}Isaiah 20:3,4). It seems that David in his flight before Absalom “went barefoot,” not to facilitate his flight, but to show his grief (^{<1850>}2 Samuel 15:30), and that Micah (1:8) makes “going barefoot” a sign of mourning (Septuagint: “to be barefoot”; the King James Version “stripped”). The nakedness and bare feet of the prophet Isaiah (20:2) may have been intended to symbolize and express sympathy for the forlorn condition of captives (compare ^{<1827>}Job 12:17,19, where the King James Version and the

Revised Version (British and American) have “spoiled,” but some authorities give as the true translation “barefoot”).

Jastrow, in article on “Tearing the Garments” (Jour. of the Am. Oriental Soc., XXI, 23-39) presents a view worth considering of going barefoot as a sign of mourning and then of grief in general (compare also Jewish Encyclopedia, article “Barefoot”). All these passages seem to imply the discomfort or going barefoot on long journeys, over stony roads or hot sands; but then, as now, in the Orient sandals seem to have been little worn ordinarily in and around the house.

See SHOES.

2. AN ANCIENT ORIENTAL CUSTOM:

The “shoes” of the ancients, as we know from many sources, were “sandals,” i.e. simply soles, for the most part of rawhide, tied to the feet to protect them against the gravel, stones or thorns of the road. Shoes of the modern sort, as well as socks and stockings, were unknown. In ancient times it was certainly a common custom in Bible lands to go about in and around one’s house without sandals. The peasantry, indeed, like the fellaheen of today, being hardened to it, often went afield barefoot. But for a king, or a prophet, a priest or a worshipper, to go barefoot, was another matter, as it was also for a mourner, for one in great distress, to be found walking the streets of a city, or going any distance in bare feet. Here we come again to customs peculiar to the Orient, and of various significance. For instance, it was considered then, as it is now in the Moslem world, profane and shocking, nothing short of a desecration, to enter a sanctuary, or walk on “holy ground,” with dust-covered shoes, or unwashed feet. Moses and Joshua were commanded to take off their shoes when on “holy ground” (~~Ex~~Exodus 3:5; ~~Jos~~Joshua 5:15). “No one was allowed to walk on the temple ground with shoes on, or with dust on his feet” (Ber., IX, 5; compare Jamblichus, Pythagoras, section 105). No one in the East today is allowed to enter any mosque with shoes on, or without first putting slippers furnished for the purpose over his shoes. As a rule, too, the feet must be cleansed by ablution in every such case, as well as hands and feet before each meal.

3. PRIESTS ON DUTY WENT BAREFOOT:

The priests of Israel, as would seem true of the priests in general among the ancients, wore no shoes when ministering (see Silius Italicus, III, 28; compare Theodoret on Exodus 3, questio 7; and Yer. Shet., 5, 48d). In ancient times, certainly the priests of Israel, when going upon the platform to serve before the ark, in Tabernacle or temple, as later in the synagogue to bless the congregation, went barefoot; though today strange to say, such ministering priests among the Jews wear stockings, and are not supposed to be barefoot (CoTah, 40a; RH, 316; Shulchan 'Arukh, 'Orach Chayyim, 128, 5; see Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Barefoot").

4. REASONS FOR THE ANCIENT CUSTOM:

The reason or reasons for the removal of the shoes in such cases as the above, we are not at a loss to divine; but when it comes to the removal of the shoes in times of mourning, etc., opinions differ. Some see in such customs a trace of ancestor-worship; others find simply a reversion or return to primitive modes of life; while others still, in agreement with a widely prevalent Jewish view, suggest that it was adopted as a perfectly natural symbol of humility and simplicity of life, appropriate to occasions of grief, distress and deep solemnity of feeling.

The shoes are set aside now by many modern Jews on the Day of Atonement and on the Ninth of Ab.

LITERATURE.

Winer, Robinson, Biblical Researches, under the word "Priester und Schuhe"; Riehm, Handwörterbuch des bib. Alt., under the word "Schuhe."

George B. Eager

BARHUMITE

<bar-hu'-mit>.

See *BAHARUMITE*.

BARIAH

<ba-ri'-ah> (j " yrB;[bariach], “fugitive”): Bariah was a descendant of David in the line of Solomon (<B2>1 Chronicles 3:22).

BAR-JESUS

<bar-je'-zus> ([Bαριησοῦς, Bariesous]): “A certain sorcerer (Greek [magos]), a false prophet, a Jew” whom Paul and Silas found at Paphos in Cyprus in the train of Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul (<H16>Acts 13:6 ff). The proconsul was “a man of understanding” (literally, a prudent or sagacious man), of an inquiring mind, interested in the thought and magic of his times. This characteristic explains the presence of a magos among his staff and his desire to hear Barnabas and Saul. Bar-Jesus was the magician’s Jewish name. Elymas is said to be the interpretation of his name (<H18>Acts 13:8). It is the Greek transliteration of an Aramaic or Arabic word equivalent to Greek magos. From Arabic `alama, “to know” is derived `alim, “a wise” or “learned man.” In Koran, Sur note 106, Moses is called Sachir `alim, “wise magician.” Elymas therefore means “sorcerer” (compare Simon “Magus”).

The East was flooding the Roman Empire with its new and wonderful religious systems, which, culminating in neo-Platonism, were the great rivals of Christianity both in their cruder and in their more strictly religious forms. Superstition was extremely prevalent, and wonder-workers of all kinds, whether imposters or honest exponents of some new faith, found their task easy through the credulity of the public. Babylonia was the home of magic, for charms are found on the oldest tablets. “Magos” was originally applied to the priests of the Persians who overran Babylonia, but the title degenerated when it was assumed by baser persons for baser articles Juvenal (vi.562, etc.), Horace (Sat. i.2.1) and other Latin authors mention Chaldean astrologers and impostors, probably Babylonian Jews. Many of the Magians, however, were the scientists of their day, the heirs of the science of Babylon and the lore of Persia, and not merely pretenders or conjurers (*see MAGIC*). It may have been as the representative of some oriental system, a compound of “science” and religion, that Bar-Jesus was attached to the train of Sergius Paulus.

Both Sergius and Elymas had heard about the teaching of the apostles, and this aroused the curiosity of Sergius and the fear of Elymas. When the

apostles came, obedient to the command of the proconsul, their doctrine visibly produced on him a considerable impression. Fearing lest his position of influence and gain would be taken by the new teachers, Elymas “withstood them, seeking to turn aside the proconsul from the faith” (^{<4138>}Acts 13:8). Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, worked a wonder on the wonder-worker by striking him blind with his word, thus revealing to the proconsul that behind him was Divine power. Sergius Paulus believed, “being astonished at the teaching of the Lord” (^{<4132>}Acts 13:12).

S. F. Hunter

BAR-JONAH

^{<bar-jo’-na>} ([^{Bαρ-ιονᾶς}, Bar-ionas]): Simon Peter’s patronymic (^{<4167>}Matthew 16:17). Bar is Aramaic for “son” (compare Bar-timaeus, Bartholomew, etc.), and corresponds to Hebrew [ben]. Thus we are to understand that Peter’s father’s name was Jonah. But in ^{<4142>}John 1:42; 21:15-17, according to the best reading, his name is given as John (so the Revised Version (British and American), instead of the King James Version Jona, Jonas). There are two hypotheses to account for this difference:

(1) Ionas (Jonah) in ^{<4167>}Matthew 16:17 may be simply a contraction of Ioanes (John);

(2) Peter’s father may have been known by two names, Jonah and John.

D. Miall Edwards

BARKOS

^{<bar’-kos>} (^{swqr} “B” [barqoc], “party-colored” (?): compare Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 68, note 2): The descendants of Barkos returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (^{<4153>}Ezra 2:53; ^{<4155>}Nehemiah 7:55). Compare Barchus (1 Esdras 5:32).

BARLEY

^{<bar’-li>} (^{hr[o]}[se`orah]):

(1) In the Bible, as in modern times, barley was a characteristic product of Palestine — “a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees,” etc. (^{<4188>}Deuteronomy 8:8), the failure of whose crop was a national disaster

(^{<2011>} Joel 1:11). It was, and is, grown chiefly as provender for horses and asses (^{<1108>} 1 Kings 4:28), oats being practically unknown, but it was, as it now is, to some extent, the food of the poor in country districts (^{<1817>} Ruth 2:17; ^{<1742>} 2 Kings 4:42; ^{<1110>} John 6:9,13). Probably this is the meaning of the dream of the Midianite concerning Gideon: “Behold, I dreamed a dream; and, lo, a cake of barley bread tumbled into the camp of Midian, and came unto the tent, and smote it so that it fell, and turned it upside down, so that the tent lay flat. And his fellow answered and said, This is nothing else save the sword of Gideon, the son of Joash, a man of Israel” (^{<1713>} Judges 7:13 f). Here the barley loaf is type of the peasant origin of Gideon’s army and perhaps, too, of his own lowly condition.

Barley was (^{<2049>} Ezekiel 4:9) one of the ingredients from which the prophet was to make bread and “eat it as barley cakes” after having baked it under repulsive conditions (^{<2042>} Ezekiel 4:12), as a sign to the people. The false prophetesses (^{<2339>} Ezekiel 13:19) are said to have profaned God among the people for “handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread.”

Barley was also used in the *ORDEAL OF JEALOUSY* (s.v.). It was with five barley loaves and two fishes that our Lord fed the five thousand (^{<1119>} John 6:9,10).

(2) Several varieties of barley are grown in Palestine. The *Hordeum distichum* or two-rowed barley is probably the nearest to the original stock, but *Hordeum tetrastichum*, with grains in four rows, and *Hordeum hexastichum*, with six rows, are also common and ancient; the last is found depicted upon Egyptian monuments.

Barley is always sown in the autumn, after the “early rains,” and the barley harvest, which for any given locality precedes the wheat harvest (^{<1118>} Exodus 9:31 f), begins near Jericho in April — or even March — but in the hill country of Palestine is not concluded until the end of May or beginning of June.

The barley harvest was a well-marked season of the year (*see TIME*) and the barley-corn was a well-known measure of length.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

E. W. G. Masterman

BARN

<bar> (**hrWgm**) [meghurah], “a granary,” “fear,” ^{<3129>}Haggai 2:19; **µsa**; [acam], “a storehouse,” ^{<3180>}Proverbs 3:10; **htWgMh** [mammeghurah], “a repository,” ^{<3017>}Joel 1:17; [**ἀποθήκη**, apothēke], ^{<4165>}Matthew 6:26; 13:30; ^{<3128>}Luke 12:18,24): A place for the storing of grain, usually a dry cistern in the ground, covered over with a thick layer of earth. “Grain is not stored in the East until it is threshed and winnowed. The [apothēke] in Roman times was probably a building of some kind. But the immemorial usage of the East has been to conceal the grain, in carefully prepared pits or caves, which, being perfectly dry, will preserve it for years. It thus escaped, as far as possible, the attentions of the tax-gatherer as well as of the robber — not always easily distinguished in the East; compare ^{<2418>}Jeremiah 41:8” (Temple Dictionary, 215).
Figurative of heaven (^{<4130>}Matthew 13:30).

See **AGRICULTURE**; **GARNER**.

M. O. Evans

BARNABAS

<bar'-na-bas> (**Βαρνάβας**, Barnabas], “son of exhortation,” or possibly “son of Nebo”): This name was applied to the associate of Paul, who was originally called Joses or Joseph (^{<4085>}Acts 4:36), as a testimony to his eloquence. Its literal meaning is “son of prophecy” (bar, “son”; nebhu’ah, “prophecy”). Compare word for prophet in ^{<3207>}Genesis 20:7; ^{<3185>}Deuteronomy 18:15,18, etc. This is interpreted in ^{<4085>}Acts 4:36 as “son of exhortation” the Revised Version (British and American), or “son of consolation” the King James Version, expressing two sides of the Greek [*paraklesis*], that are not exclusive. The office of a prophet being more than to foretell, all these interpretations are admissible in estimating Barnabas as a preacher. “Deismann (Bibelstudien, 175-78) considers Barnabas the Jewish Grecized form of Barnebaus, a personal Semitic name recently discovered in Asia Minor inscriptions, and meaning “son of Nebo” (Standard Bible Dictionary in the place cited.).
He was a Levite from the island of Cyprus, and cousin, not “nephew” (the King James Version), of the evangelist Mark, the word anepsios (^{<5140>}Colossians 4:10), being used in ^{<4851>}Numbers 36:11, for “father’s brothers’ sons.” When we first learn of him, he had removed to Jerusalem,

and acquired property there. He sold “a field,” and contributed its price to the support of the poorer members of the church (~~406~~ Acts 4:36 ff). In ~~412~~ Acts 11:24 he is described as “a good man and full of the Holy Spirit” (compare ~~310~~ Isaiah 11:2; ~~408~~ 1 Corinthians 12:8,11) “and of faith,” traits that gave him influence and leadership. Possibly on the ground of former acquaintanceship, interceding as Paul’s sponsor and surety, he removed the distrust of the disciples at Jerusalem and secured the admission of the former persecutor into their fellowship. When the preaching of some of the countrymen of Barnabas had begun a movement toward Christianity among the Greeks at Antioch, Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to give it encouragement and direction, and, after a personal visit, recognizing its importance and needs, sought out Paul at Tarsus, and brought him back as his associate. At the close of a year’s successful work, Barnabas and Paul were sent to Jerusalem with contributions from the infant church for the famine sufferers in the older congregation (~~413~~ Acts 11:30). Ordained as missionaries on their return (~~413~~ Acts 13:3), and accompanied by John Mark, they proceeded upon what is ordinarily known as the “First Missionary Journey” of Paul (~~413~~ Acts 13:4,5). Its history belongs to Paul’s life. Barnabas as well as Paul is designated “an apostle” (~~414~~ Acts 14:14). Up to ~~413~~ Acts 13:43, the precedency is constantly ascribed to Barnabas; from that point, except in 14:14 and 15:12,25, we read “Paul and Barnabas,” instead of “Barnabas and Saul.” The latter becomes the chief spokesman. The people at Lystra named Paul, because of his fervid oratory, Mercurius, while the quiet dignity and reserved strength of Barnabas gave him the title of Jupiter (~~412~~ Acts 14:12). Barnabas escaped the violence which Paul suffered at Iconium (~~414~~ Acts 14:19).

Upon their return from this first missionary tour, they were sent, with other representatives of the church at Antioch, to confer with the apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem concerning the obligation of circumcision and the ceremonial law in general under the New Testament — the synod of Jerusalem. A separation from Paul seems to begin with a temporary yielding of Barnabas in favor of the inconsistent course of Peter (~~413~~ Galatians 2:13). This was followed by a more serious rupture concerning Mark. On the second journey, Paul proceeded alone, while Barnabas and Mark went to Cyprus. Luther and Calvin regard ~~418~~ 2 Corinthians 8:18,19 as meaning Barnabas by “the brother whose praise is spread through all the churches,” and indicating, therefore, subsequent joint work. The incidental allusions in ~~406~~ 1 Corinthians 9:6 and ~~413~~ Galatians 2:13 (“even Barnabas”) show at any rate Paul’s continued

appreciation of his former associate. Like Paul, he accepted no support from those to whom he ministered.

Tertullian, followed in recent years by Grau and Zahn, regard him as the author of the Epistle to the He. The document published among patristic writings as the Epistle of Barnabas, and found in full in the Codex Sinaiticus, is universally assigned today to a later period. “The writer nowhere claims to be the apostle Barnabas; possibly its author was some unknown namesake of ‘the son of consolation’” (Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, 239 f).

H. E. Jacobs

BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF

See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES.

BARNABAS, GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

BARODIS

<ba-ro'-dis> ([Βαρωδείς, Barodeis], 1 Esdras 5:34): The descendants of Barodis (sons of the servants of Solomon) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem. Omitted in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7.

BARREL

<bar'-el>: The word “barrel” in the King James Version (see ^{<1172>}1 Kings 17:12,14,16; 18:33: “The barrel of meal,” “fill four barrels with water,” etc.) stands for the large earthenware jar (so the American Standard Revised Version) used in the East for carrying water from the spring or well, and for storing grain, etc., according to a custom that still persists. It is elsewhere (EV) more fitly rendered “pitcher.”

See HOUSE; PITCHER, etc.

BARREN; BARRENNESS

<bar'-en>, <bar'-en-nes> hYxi[tsiyah]; hj l æl[melehah]; l kʊ; [shakhol]; rɒl[ˈ aqar]; [στεῖρος, steiros]; [ἀργός, argos]):

(1) Of land that bears no crop, either

(a) because it is naturally poor and sterile: [tsiyah] “dry” (^{<917>}Joel 2:20), [melechah], “salt” (^{<896>}Job 39:6 the King James Version), [shakhol], “miscarrying” (^{<129>}2 Kings 2:19,21), or

(b) because it is, under God’s curse, turned into a [melechah] or salt desert, for the wickedness of the people that dwell therein (^{<843>}Psalm 107:34 the King James Version; compare ^{<1087>}Genesis 3:17,18).

(2) Of females that bear no issue: [ʿaqar]: Sarah (^{<113>}Genesis 11:30); Rebekah (^{<129>}Genesis 25:21); Rachel (^{<128>}Genesis 29:31); Manoah’s wife (^{<132>}Judges 13:2,3); Hannah (^{<1015>}1 Samuel 2:5); [steiros]: Elisabeth (^{<1007>}Luke 1:7,36).

In Israel and among oriental peoples generally barrenness was a woman’s and a family’s greatest misfortune. The highest sanctions of religion and patriotism blessed the fruitful woman, because children were necessary for the perpetuation of the tribe and its religion. It is significant that the mothers of the Hebrew race, Sarah, Rebekah and Rachel, were by nature sterile, and therefore God’s special intervention shows His particular favor to Israel. Fruitfulness was God’s special blessing to His people (^{<1235>}Exodus 23:26; ^{<874>}Deuteronomy 7:14; ^{<839>}Psalm 113:9). A complete family is an emblem of beauty (Song 4:2; 6:6). Metaphorically, Israel, in her days of adversity, when her children were exiled, was barren, but in her restoration she shall rejoice in many children (^{<280>}Isaiah 54:1; ^{<802>}Galatians 4:27). The utter despair and terror of the destruction of Jerusalem could go no farther than that the barren should be called blessed (^{<1239>}Luke 23:29).

(3) Argos is translated in the King James Version “barren,” but in the Revised Version (British and American) more accurately “idle” (2 Pet 1:8).

T. Rees

BARSABAS; BARSABBAS

<bar'-sa-bas>, <bar-sab'-as>.

See JOSEPH BARSABBAS; JUDAS BARSABBAS.

BARTACUS

<bar'-ta-kus> ([**Βάρτακος**, Bartakos]; Josephus [**Ραβεζάκης**, Rhabezdkes]; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Bezazes (1 Esdras 4:29)): The father of Apame. He is called "the illustrious," probably because of rank and merits. The family seems to be of Persian origin since the name Bartacus (Syriac,) in the form of Artachaeas is mentioned by Herodotus (vii.22.117) as a person of rank in the Persian army of Xerxes and the name of his daughter Apame is identical with that of a Persian princess who married Seleucus I, Nicator, and became the mother of Antiochus I. Apamea, a city in Asia Minor founded by Seleucus I, is named in honor of his wife Apame. Compare *APAME*; *ILLUSTRIOUS*.

BARTHOLOMEW

<bar-thol'-o-mu> ([**Βαρθολομαῖος**, Bartholomaios], i.e. "son of Tolmai or Tolmai"): One of the Twelve Apostles (~~400B~~ Matthew 10:3; ~~400B~~ Mark 3:18; ~~406A~~ Luke 6:14; ~~401B~~ Acts 1:13). There is no further reference to him in the New Testament. According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50) "Bartholomew was of the house of Naphtali. Now his name was formerly John, but our Lord changed it because of John the son of Zebedee, His beloved." A "Gospel of Bartholomew" is mentioned by Hieronymus (Comm. Proem ad Matth.), and Gelasius gives the tradition that Bartholomew brought the Hebrew gospel of Matthew to India. In the "Preaching of Bartholomew in the Oasis" (compare Budge, II, 90) he is referred to as preaching probably in the oasis of Al Bahnasa, and according to the "Preaching of Andrew and Bartholomew" he labored among the Parthians (Budge, II, 183). The "Martyrdom of Bartholomew" states that he was placed in a sack and cast into the sea. From the 9th century onward, Bartholomew has generally been identified with Nathanael, but this view has not been conclusively established.

See *NATHANAEL*.

C. M. Kerr

BARTHOLOMEW, GOSPEL OF

See *APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS*; *BARTHOLOMEW*.

BARTIMAEUS

<bar-ti-me'-us> ([Βαρτίμαιος, Bartimaïos]): A hybrid word from Aramaic bar = “son,” and Greek [timaïos] = “honorable.” For the improbability of the derivation from bar-tim'ai = “son of the unclean,” and of the allegorical meaning = the Gentiles or spiritually blind, see Schmiedel in Encyclopedia Biblica. In Mark (10:46-52) Bartimeus is given as the name of a blind beggar, whose eyes Jesus Christ opened as He went out from Jericho on His last journey to Jerusalem. An almost identical account is given by Luke (18:35-43), except that the incident occurred “as he drew nigh unto Jericho,” and the name of the blind man is not given. Again, according to Matthew (20:29-34), “as they went out from Jericho” (like Mk) two blind men (unlike Mark and Lk) receive their sight. It is not absolutely impossible that two or even three events are recorded, but so close is the similarity of the three accounts that it is highly improbable. Regarding them as referring to the same event, it is easy to understand how the discrepancies arose in the passage of the story from mouth to mouth. The main incident is clear enough, and on purely historical grounds, the miracle cannot be denied. The discrepancies themselves are evidence of the wide currency of the story before our Gospels assumed their present form. It is only a most mechanical theory of inspiration that would demand their harmonization.

T. Rees

BARUCH

<ba'-ruk>, <bar'-uk> (𐤁𐤒𐤅; [baruk]; [Βαρούχ, Barouch], “blessed”):

(1) Son of Neriah and brother of Seraiah, King Zedekiah's chamberlain (²⁶¹⁹Jeremiah 51:59). He was the devoted friend (²⁶²⁰Jeremiah 32:12), the amanuensis (36:4 ff, 32) and faithful attendant (36:10 ff; Josephus, Ant, X, vi, 2) of the prophet Jeremiah. He seems to have been of noble family (see Ant, X, ix, 1; compare ²⁶¹⁹Jeremiah 51:59; Baruch 1:1). He was also according to Josephus a man of unusual acquirements (Ant., X, ix, 1). He might have risen to a high position and seemed conscious of this, but under Jeremiah's influence (see ²⁴⁸⁵Jeremiah 45:5) he repressed his ambition, being content to throw in his lot with the great prophet whose secretary and companion he became. Jeremiah dictated his prophecies to Baruch,

who read them to the people (Jeremiah 36). The king (Jehoiakim) was greatly angered at these prophecies and had Baruch arrested and the roll burnt. Baruch however rewrote the prophet's oracles. In the final siege of Jerusalem Baruch stood by his master, witnessing the purchase by the latter of his ancestral estate in Anathoth (Jeremiah 32). According to Josephus (Ant., X, ix, 1) he continued to reside with Jeremiah at Mizpah after the fall of Jerusalem. Subsequent to the murder of Gedaliah, he was accused of having unduly influenced Jeremiah when the latter urged the people to remain in Judah — a fact which shows how great was the influence which Baruch was believed to have had over his master (^{248B}Jeremiah 43:3). He was carried with Jeremiah to Egypt (^{248B}Jeremiah 43:6; Ant, X, ix, 6), and thereafter our knowledge of him is merely legendary. According to a tradition preserved by Jerome (on ^{230B}Isaiah 30:6 f) he died in Egypt soon after reaching that country. Two other traditions say that he went, or by Nebuchadnezzar was carried, to Babylon after this king conquered Egypt. The high character of Baruch and the important part he played in the life and work of Jeremiah induced later generations still further to enhance his reputation, and a large number of spurious writings passed under his name, among them the following:

- (a) The *APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH* (which see);
 - (b) the Book of Baruch;
 - (c) the Rest of the Words of Baruch;
 - (d) the Gnostic Book of Baruch;
 - (e) the Latin Book of Baruch, composed originally in Latin;
 - (f) a Greek Apocalypse of Baruch belonging to the 2nd century of our era;
 - (g) another Book of Baruch belonging to the 4th or 5th century.
- (2) A son of Zabbai who aided Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (^{248B}Nehemiah 3:20).
 - (3) One of the priests who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (10:6).
 - (4) The son of Colhozeh, a descendant of Perez, the son of Judah (^{248B}Nehemiah 11:5).

BARUCH, APOCALYPSE OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

BARUCH, BOOK OF

One of the Apocryphal or Deutero-canonical books, standing between Jeremiah and Lamentations in the Septuagint, but in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) after these two books.

1. NAME.

See under *BARUCH* for the meaning of the word and for the history of the best-known Biblical. personage bearing the name. Though Jewish traditions link this book with Jeremiah's amanuensis and loyal friend as author, it is quite certain that it was not written or compiled for hundreds of years after the death of this Baruch. According to ~~2481~~ Jeremiah 45:1 it was in the 4th year (604 BC) of the reign of Jehoiakim (608-597 BC) that Baruch wrote down Jeremiah's words in a book and read them in the ears of the nobles (English Versions, "princes," but king's sons are not necessarily meant; Jeremiah 36). The Book of Baruch belongs in its present form to the latter half of the 1st century of our era; yet some modern Roman Catholic scholars vigorously maintain that it is the work of Jeremiah's friend and secretary.

2. CONTENTS.

This book and also the Epistle of Jeremy have closer affinities with the canonical Book of Jeremiah than any other part of the Apocrypha. It is probably to this fact that they owe their name and also their position in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) The book is apparently made up of four separate parts by independent writers, brought together by an editor, owing it is very likely to a mere accident — each being too small to occupy the space on one roll they were all four written on one and the same roll. The following is a brief analysis of the four portions of the book:

1. Historical Introduction:

Historical Introduction, giving an account of the origin and purpose of the book (Baruch 1:1-14). Baruch 1:1 f tell us that Baruch wrote this book at Babylon “in the fifth month (not “year” as the Septuagint) in the seventh day of the month, what time as the Chaldeans took Jerusalem, and burnt it with fire” (see ~~12918~~ 2 Kings 25:8 ff). Fritzsche and others read: “In the fifth year, in the month Sivan (see 1:8), in the seventh day of the month,” etc. Um gives the date of the feast Pentecost, and the supposition is that the party who made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem did so in order to observe that feast. According to 1:3-14, Baruch read his book to King Jehoiachin and his court by the (unidentified) river Sud. King and people on hearing the book fell to weeping, fasting and praying. As a result money was collected and sent, together with Baruch’s book, to the high priest Jehoiakim, (NOTE: So spelled in the canonical books; but it is Joacim or Joachim in Apocrypha the King James Version, and in the Apocrypha the Revised Version (British and American) it is invariably Joakim.) to the priests and to the people at Jerusalem. The money is to be used in order to make it possible to carry on the services of the temple, and in particular that prayers may be offered in the temple for the king and his family and also for the superior lord King Nebuchadnezzar and his son Baltasar (= the Belshazzar of Daniel 5).

2. Confession and Prayer:

Confession and prayer (Baruch 1:15 through 3:8) (1) of the Palestinian remnant (Baruch 1:15 through 2:15). The speakers are resident in Judah not in Babylon (Baruch 1:15; compare 2:4), as J. T. Marshall and R. H. Charles rightly hold. This section follows throughout the arrangement and phraseology of a prayer contained in ~~27007~~ Daniel 9:7-15. It is quite impossible to think of Daniel as being based on Baruch, for the writer of the former is far more original than the author or authors of Baruch. But in the present section the original passage in Daniel is altered in a very significant way. Thus in ~~27007~~ Daniel 9:7 the writer describes those for whom he wrote as ‘the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem and all Israel(ites): those near and those far off, in all the lands (countries) whither thou hast driven them on account of their unfaithfulness toward thee.’ The italicized words are omitted from Baruch 1:15, though the remaining part of ~~27007~~ Daniel 9:7 is added. Why this difference? It is evident, as Marshall has ably pointed out, that the editor of the section intends to put the

confession and prayer of Baruch 1:15 through 2:5 into the mouths of Jews who had not been removed into exile. Ewald (History, V, 208, 6) holds that ~~2005~~ Daniel 9:7-9 is dependent on Baruch 1:15 through 2:17. The section may thus be analyzed:

(a) Baruch 1:15-22:

Confession of the sins of the nation from the days of Moses down to the exile. The principle of solidarity (see Century Bible, "Psalms," II, 21, 195, 215) so governed the thoughts of the ancient Israelites that the iniquities of their forefathers were in effect their own.

(b) Baruch 2:1-5:

God's righteous judgment on the nation in humbling and scattering them.

Confession and prayer (2) of the exiles in Babylon Baruch 2:16 through 3:8. That the words in this section are supposed to be uttered by Babylonian exiles appears from 2:13 f; 3:7 f and from the general character of the whole. This portion of the book is almost as dependent on older Scriptures as the foregoing. Three sources seem in particular to have been used.

(a) The Book of Jeremiah has been freely drawn upon.

(b) Deuteronomic phrases occur frequently, especially in the beginning and end. These are perhaps taken second-hand from Jeremiah, a book well known to the author of these verses and deeply loved by him.

(c) Solomon's prayer as recorded in 1 Kings 8 is another quarry from which our author appears to have dug.

This section may be thus divided:

(i.) Baruch 2:6-12: Confession, opening as the former (see 1:15) with words extracted from ~~2005~~ Daniel 9:7.

(ii.) Baruch 2:13 through 3:8: Prayer for restoration.

Baruch 3:1-8 shows more independence than the rest, for the author at this point makes use of language not borrowed from any original known to us. As such these verses are important as a clue to the writer's position, views and character.

In Baruch 3:4 we have the petition: “Hear now the prayer of the dead Israelites,” etc., words which as they stand involve the doctrine that the dead (Solomon, Daniel, etc.) are still alive and make intercession to God on behalf of the living. But this teaching is in opposition to 2:17 which occurs in the same context. Without making any change in the Hebrew consonants we can and should read for “dead ([methe]) Israelites” “the men of ([methe]) Israel.” The Septuagint confuses the same words in ~~2353~~ Isaiah 5:13.

3. The Praise of Wisdom:

The praise of “Wisdom,” for neglecting which Israel is now in a strange land. God alone is the author of wisdom, and He bestows it not upon the great and mighty of this world, but upon His own chosen people, who however have spurned the Divine gift and therefore lost it (Baruch 3:9 through 4:4).

The passage, Baruch 3:10-13 (Israel’s rejection of “Wisdom” the cause of her exile), goes badly with the context and looks much like an interpolation. The dominant idea in the section is that God has made Israel superior to all other nations by the gift of “wisdom,” which is highly extolled. Besides standing apart from the context these four verses lack the rhythm which characterize the other verses. What is so cordially commended is described in three ways, each showing up a different facet, as do the eight synonyms for the Divine word in each of the 22 strophes in Psalm 119 (see Century Bible, “Psalms,” II, 254).

(1) It is called most frequently “Wisdom.”

(2) In Baruch 4:1 it is described as the Commandments of God and as the Law or more correctly as authoritative instruction. The Hebrew word for this last ([torah]) bears in this connection, it is probable, the technical meaning of the Pentateuch, a sense which it never has in the Old Testament. Compare ~~1846~~ Deuteronomy 4:6, where the keeping of the commandments is said to be “wisdom” and understanding.

4. The Dependence of This Wisdom Section:

(1) The line of thought here resembles closely that pursued in Job 28, which modern scholars rightly regard as a later interpolation. Wisdom, the most valuable of possessions, is beyond the unaided reach of man. God only can give it — that is what is taught in these parts of both Baruch and

Job with the question “Where shall wisdom be found?” (~~1882~~ Job 28:12; compare Baruch 3:14 f, where a similar question forms the basis of the greater portion of the section of Job 38 f). Wisdom is not here as in Proverbs hypostatized, and the same is true of Job 28. This in itself is a sign of early date, for the personifying of “wisdom” is a later development (compare Philo, John 1).

(2) The language in this section is modeled largely on that of Deuteronomy, perhaps however through Jeremiah, which is also especially after chapter 10 Deuteronomic in thought and phraseology. See ante II, 2 (2 1b).

The most original part of this division of the book is where the writer enumerates the various classes of the world’s great ones to whom God had not given “wisdom”: princes of the heathen, wealthy men, silversmiths, merchants, theologians, philosophers, etc. (Baruch 3:16 ff).

See WISDOM.

5. Words of Cheer to Israel:

The general thought that pervades the section, Baruch 4:5 through 5:9, is words of cheer to Israel (i.e. Judah) in exile, but we have here really, according to Rothstein, a compilation edited so skillfully as to give it the appearance of a unity which is not real. Earlier Biblical writings have throughout been largely drawn upon. Rothstein (Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen, etc., 213-15) divides the section in the following manner:

(1) Baruch 4:5-9a:

Introductory section, giving the whole its keynote — “Be of good cheer,” etc.; 4:7 f follows ~~1825~~ Deuteronomy 32:15-18.

(2) Baruch 4:9b-29:

A song, divisible into two parts.

(a) Personified Jerusalem deplores the calamities of Israel in exile (Baruch 4:9b-16).

(b) She urges her unfortunate children to give themselves to hope and prayer, amending their ways so that God may bring about their deliverance (Baruch 4:17-29).

(c) Baruch 4:30 through 5:9: A second song, beginning as the first with the words, “Be of good cheer,” and having the same general aim, to comfort exiled and oppressed Israel.

In all three parts earlier Scriptures have been largely used, and in particular Deutero-Isaiah has had much influence upon the author. But there do not seem to the present writer reasons cogent enough for concluding, with Rothstein, that these three portions are by as many different writers. There is throughout the same recurring thought “Be of good cheer,” and there is nothing in the style to suggest divergent authorship.

(3) The Relation between Baruch 4:36 through 5:9 and Psalter of Solomon 11.

It was perhaps Ewald (*Geschichte*, IV, 498) who first pointed out the similarity of language and viewpoint between Baruch 4:36 through 5:9 and Psalter of Solomon 11, especially 11:3-8. The only possible explanation is that which makes Baruch 4:36 ff an imitation of Psalter of Solomon 11. So Ewald (*op. cit.*); Ryle and James (*Psalm Sol*, lxx, ii ff).

Psalm Sol were written originally in Hebrew, and references to Pompey (died 48 BC) and to the capture of Jerusalem (63 BC) show that this pseudepigraphical Psalter must have been written in the first half of the 1st century BC. Bar, as will be shown, is of much later date than this. Besides it is now almost certain that the part of Baruch under discussion was written in Greek (see below, IV) and that it never had a Hebrew original. Now it is exceedingly unlikely that a writer of a Hebrew psalm would copy a Greek original, though the contrary supposition is a very likely one.

On the other hand A. Geiger (*Psalt. Sol.*, XI, 137-39, 1811), followed by W. B. Stevenson (*Temple Bible*), and many others argue for the priority of Baruch, using this as a reason for giving Baruch an earlier date than is usually done. It is possible, of course, that the Pseudo-Solomon and the Pseudo-Baruch have been digging in the same quarry; and that the real original used by both is lost.

3. LANGUAGE.

For our present purpose the book must be divided into two principal parts:

(1) Baruch 1 through 3:8;

(2) 3:9 through 5:9.

There is general agreement among the best recent scholars from Ewald downward that the first portion of the book at least was written originally in Hebrew.

(1) In the Syro-Hex. text there are margin notes to 1:17 and 2:3 to the effect that these verses are lacking in the Hebrew, i.e. in the original Hebrew text.

(2) There are many linguistic features in this first part which are best explained on the supposition that the Greek text is from a Hebrew original. In Baruch 2:25 the Septuagint English Versions of the Bible [*apostole*] at the end of the verse means “a sending of.” The English Versions of the Bible (“pestilence”) renders a Hebrew word which, without the vowel signs (introduced late) is written alike for both meanings ([d-b-r]). The mistake can be explained only on the assumption of a Hebrew original. Similarly the reading “dead Israelites” for “men of Israel” (= Israelites) in 3:4 arose through reading wrong vowels with the same consonants, which last were alone written until the 7th and 8th centuries of our era.

Frequently, as in Hebrew, sentences begin with Greek [*kai*] (= “and”) which, without somewhat slavish copying of the Hebrew, would not be found. The construction called parataxis characterizes Hebrew; in good Greek we meet with hypotaxis.

The Hebrew way of expressing “where” is put literally into the Greek of this book (Baruch 2:4,13,29; 3:8). Many other Hebrew idioms, due, it is probable, to the translator’s imitations of his original, occur: in “to speak in the ears of” (Baruch 1:3); the word “man” ([*anthropos*]) in the sense “everyone” (Baruch 2:3); “spoken by thy servants the prophets” is in Greek by “the hand of the servants,” which is good Hebrew but bad Greek. Many other such examples could be added.

There is much less agreement among scholars as to the original language or languages of the second part of the book (Baruch 3:9 through 5:9). That this part too was written in Hebrew, so that in that case the whole book appeared first in that language, is the position held and defended by Ewald (op. cit.), Kneucker (op. cit.), Konig (Ein), Rothstein (op. cit.) and Bissell (Lange). It is said by these writers that this second part of Baruch equally with the first carries with it marks of being a translation from the Hebrew. But one may safely deny this statement. It must be admitted by anyone who has examined the text of the book that the most striking Hebraisms

and the largest number of them occur in the first part of the book. Bissell writes quite fully and warmly in defense of the view that the whole book was at first written in Hebrew, but the Hebraisms which he cites are all with one solitary exception taken from the first part of the book. This one exception is in Baruch 4:15 where the Greek conjunction [*hoti*] is used for the relative [*ho*], the Hebrew [*'asher*] having the meaning of both. There seems to be a Hebraism in 4:21: "He shall deliver thee from the hand of your enemies," and there are probably others. But there are Hebraisms in Hellenistic Greek always — the present writer designates them "Hebraisms" or "Semiticisms" notwithstanding what Deismann, Thumb and Moulton say. In the first part of this book it is their overwhelming number and their striking character that tell so powerfully in favor of a Hebrew original.

(3) The following writers maintain that the second part of the book was written first of all in Greek: Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Schurer, Gifford, Cornill and R. H. Charles, though they agree that the first part had a Hebrew original. This is probably the likeliest view, though much may be written in favor of a Hebrew original for the whole book and there is nothing quite decisively against it. J. Turner Marshall (*Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, I, 253) tries to prove that Baruch 3:9 through 4:4 was written first in Aramaic, the rest of the book (4:5 through 5:9) in Greek. But though he defends his case with great ability he does not appear to the present writer to have proved his thesis. Ewald (op. cit.), Hitzig (*Psalmen* 2, II, 119), Dillmann, Ruetschi, Fritzsche and Bissell were so greatly impressed by the close likeness between the Greek of Baruch and that of the Septuagint of Jeremiah, that they came to the conclusion that both books were translated by the same person. Subsequently Hitzig decided that Baruch was not written until after 70 AD, and therefore abandoned his earlier opinion in favor of this one — that the translator of Baruch was well acquainted with the Septuagint of Jeremiah and was strongly influenced by it.

4. DATE OR DATES.

It is important to distinguish between the date of the completion of the entire book in its present form and the dates of the several parts which in some or all cases may be much older than that of the whole as such.

1. The Historical Introduction:

Baruch 1:1-14 was written after the completion of the book expressly to form a prologue or historical explanation of the circumstances under which the rest of the book came to be written. To superficial readers it could easily appear that the whole book was written by one man, but a careful examination shows that the book is a compilation. One may conclude that the introduction was the last part of the book to be composed and that therefore its date is that of the completion of the book. Reasons will be given (see below) for believing that 4:5 through 5:9 belongs to a time subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in 70 AD. This is still more true of this introduction intended as a foreword to the whole book.

2. Confession and Prayer:

The following points bear on the date of the section Baruch 1:15 through 3:8, assuming it to have one date:

- (1) The generation of Israelites to which the writer belonged were suffering for the sins of their ancestors; see especially Baruch 3:1-8.
- (2) The second temple was in existence in the writer's day. Baruch 2:26 must (with the best scholars) be translated as follows: "And thou hast made the house over which thy name is called as it is this day," i.e. the temple — still in being — is shorn of its former glory. Moreover though ~~2016~~ Daniel 9:7-14 is largely quoted in Baruch 1:15 through 2:12, the prayer for the sanctuary and for Jerusalem in ~~2016~~ Daniel 9:16 is omitted, because the temple is not now in ruins.
- (3) Though it is implied (see above II, 2, (1)) that there are Jews in Judah who have never left their land there are a large number in foreign lands, and nothing is said that they were servants of the Babylonian king.
- (4) The dependence of Baruch 2:13 through 3:8 on Deuteronomy, Jeremiah and 1 Kings 8 (Solomon's prayer) shows that this part of the book is later than these writings, i.e. later than say 550 BC. Compare Baruch 2:13 with ~~1582~~ Deuteronomy 28:62 and ~~2016~~ Jeremiah 42:2.
- (5) The fact that ~~2016~~ Daniel 9:7-14 has influenced Baruch 1:15 through 2:12 proves that a date later than Daniel must be assumed for at least this portion of Baruch. The temple is still standing, so that the book belongs

somewhere between 165 BC, when Daniel was written, and 71 AD, when the temple was finally destroyed.

Ewald, Gifford and Marshall think that this section belongs to the period following the conquest of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I (320 BC). According to Ewald the author of Baruch 1:1 through 3:8 (regarded as by one hand) was a Jew living in Babylon or Persia. But Daniel had not in 320 BC been written. Fritzsche, Schrader, Keil, Toy and Charles assign the section to the Maccabean age — a quite likely date. On the other hand Hitzig, Kneucker and Schurer prefer a date subsequent to 70 AD. The last writer argues for the unity of this section, though he admits that the middle of chapter 1 comports ill with its context.

3. The Wisdom Section Baruch 3:9 through 4:4:

It has been pointed out (see above, II, 3) that Baruch 3:10-13 does not belong to this section, being manifestly a later interpolation. The dependence of this Wisdom portion on Job 28 and on Deuteronomy implies a post-exilic date. The identification of Wisdom with the Torah which is evidently a synonym for the Pentateuch, argues a date at any rate not earlier than 300 BC. But how much later we have no means of ascertaining. The reasons adduced by Kneucker and Marshall for a date immediately before or soon after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD have not convinced the present writer.

4. Words of Cheer Baruch 4:5 through 5:9:

The situation implied in these words may be thus set forth:

- (1)** A great calamity has happened to Jerusalem (Baruch 4:9 f). Nothing is said proving that the whole land has shared the calamity, unless indeed this is implied in Baruch 4:5 f.
- (2)** A large number of Jerusalemites have been transported (Baruch 4:10).
- (3)** The nation that has sacked Jerusalem and carried away many of its inhabitants is “shameless,” having “a strange language, neither reverencing old men nor pitying children” (Baruch 4:15).
- (4)** The present home of the Jerusalemites is a great city (Baruch 4:32-35), not the country.

Now the above details do not answer to any dates in the history of the nation except these two:

(a) 586 BC, when the temple was destroyed by the Babylonians;

(b) 71 AD, when the temple was finally destroyed by the Romans. But the date 586 BC is out of the question, and no modern scholar pleads for it. We must therefore assume for this portion of the book a date soon after 70 AD. In the time of Pompey, to which Graetz assigns the book, neither Jerusalem nor the temple was destroyed. Nor was there any destruction of either during the Maccabean war. In favor of this date is the dependence of Baruch 4:36 ff on Psalter of Solomon 11 (see above, II, 5, (3)).

Rothstein (in Kautzsch) says that in this section there are at least three parts by as many different writers. Marshall argues for four independent parts. But if either of these views is correct the editor has done his work exceedingly well, for the whole harmonizes well together.

Kneucker, author of the fullest Commentary, endeavors to prove that the original book consisted of Baruch 1:1 f plus 3a (the heading) plus 3:9 through 5:9, and that it belongs to the reign of Domitian (81-96 AD). The confession and prayer in 1:15 through 3:8 were written, he says, somewhat earlier and certainly before 71 AD, and as a separate work, being inserted in the book by the scribe who wrote 1:4-14.

5. VERSIONS.

The most important versions are the following. It is assumed in the article that the Greek text of the book up to Baruch 3:8 is itself a translation from a Hebrew text now lost. The same remark may be true of the rest of the book or of a portion of it (see above, III).

1. Latin:

There are two versions in this language:

(1) The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) which is really the Old Latin, since Jerome's revision was confined to the Hebrew Scriptures, the Apocrypha being therefore omitted in this revision. This version is a very literal one based on the Greek. It is therefore for that reason the more valuable as a witness to the Greek text.

(2) There is a later Latin translation, apparently a revision of the former, for its Latinity is better; in some cases it adopts different readings and in a general way it has been edited so as to bring it into harmony with the Vatican uncial (B).

This Latin version was published in Rome by J. Maria Caro (died circa 1688) and was reprinted by Sabatier in parallel columns with the pre-Jeromian version noticed above (see *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, I, 1873).

2. Syriac:

There are also in this language two extant versions:

(1) The Peshitta, a very literal translation, can be seen in the London (Walton's) Polyglot and most conveniently in Lagarde's *Libr. Apocrypha. Syriac.*, the last being a more accurate reproduction.

(2) The Hexapla Syriac translation made by Paul, bishop of Telle, near the beginning of the 7th century AD. It has been published by Ceriani with critical apparatus in his beautiful photograph-lithographed edition of the Hexapla Syriac Bible.

3. Arabic:

There is a very literal translation to be found in the London Polyglot, referred to above.

LITERATURE.

For editions of the Greek text see under *APOCRYPHA*. Of commentaries the fullest and best is that by Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch* (1879), who gives an original German rendering based on a restored Hebrew original. Other valuable commentaries are those by Fritzsche (1851); Ewald, *Die Propheten*², etc. (1868), III, 251-82 (Eng. translation); *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, V, 108-37, by Reusch (1855); Zockler (1891) and Rothstein (op. cit.); and in English, Bissell (in Lange's series edited by D. S. Schaff, 1880); and Gifford (*Speaker's Comm.*, 1888). The S.P.C.K. has a handy and serviceable volume published in the series of popular commentaries on the Old Testament. But this commentary, though published quite recently (my copy belongs to 1894, "nineteenth thousand"), needs strengthening on the side of its scholarship.

Arts. dealing with introduction occur in the various Bible Dictionaries (Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Westcott and Ryle; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), J. T. Marshall, able and original; Encyclopedia Biblica, Bevan, rather slight). To these must be added excellent articles in Jewish Encyclopedia (G. F. Moore), and Encyclopedia Biblica (R. H. Charles).

T. Witton Davies

BARZILLAI

<bar-zil'-a-i>, <bar-zil'-i> (יִכְזַרְזָר B; [barzillay]; Βερζελλί, Berzelli], "man of iron" (BDB, but compare Cheyne, Encyclopedia Biblica)):

(1) A Gileadite of Rogelim who brought provisions to David and his army to Mahanaim, in their flight from Absalom (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 17:27-29). When David was returning to Jerusalem after Absalom's defeat, Barzillai conducted him over Jordan, but being an old man of 80 years of age, he declined David's invitation to come to live in the capital, and sent instead his son Chimham (^{<1068>}2 Samuel 19:31-39). David before his death charged Solomon to "show kindness unto the sons of Barzillai." (^{<1007>}1 Kings 2:7). Cheyne in Encyclopedia Biblica, without giving any reason, differentiates this Barzillai from Barzillai the Gileadite (^{<1061>}Ezra 2:61 = ^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:63). See (2) below.

(2) The father of a family of priests who in Ezra's time, after the return of the exiles, could not trace their genealogy. "Therefore were they deemed polluted and put from the priesthood." This Barzillai had taken "a wife of the daughters of Barzillai the Gileadite," and had adopted his wife's family name (^{<1061>}Ezra 2:61,62 = ^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:63,64). His original name is given as Jaddus (the King James Version Addus) (1 Esdras 5:38). (*See ZORZELLEUS*; the Revised Version, margin "Phaezeldaeus.")

(3) Barzillai the Meholathite, whose son Adriel was married to Saul's daughter, either Michal (^{<1078>}2 Samuel 21:8) or Merab (^{<089>}1 Samuel 18:19). — *T. Rees*

BASALOTH

<bas'-a-loth> (A, [Βααλώθ, Baaloth]; B, [Βασαλέμ, Basalem]; 1 Esdras 5:31 = Bazluth (^{<1072>}Ezra 2:52) and Bazlith (^{<1074>}Nehemiah 7:54)): The

descendants of Basaloth (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BASCAMA

<bas'-ka-ma> ([Βασκαμά, Baskama] (1 Macc 13:23)): A town located in the country of Gilead, where Tryphon slew Jonathan, the son of Absalom. Compare *JONATHAN* (Apocrypha).

BASE

<bas>:

(1) Substantive from Latin basis, Greek [βάσις, basis], a foundation.

(a) (hnnwQm) [mekhonah]: the fixed resting-place on which the lavers in Solomon's temple were set (<1072>1 Kings 7:27-43; <2167>2 Kings 16:17; 25:13,16; <14014>2 Chronicles 4:14; <21719>Jeremiah 27:19; 52:17,20; compare <1818>Ezra 3:3; <3851>Zechariah 5:11 the American Revised Version, margin).

(b) (^Kek) [ken]: pedestal in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) (<1079>1 Kings 7:29,31) and in the Revised Version (British and American) only (<1203>Exodus 30:18,28; 31:9; 35:16; 38:8; 39:39; 40:11; <1881>Leviticus 8:11) of the base of the laver of the tabernacle (the King James Version "foot").

(c) (fy) [yarekh]: "base of candlestick" (the Revised Version (British and American) of <1251>Exodus 25:31; 37:17) the King James Version "shaft."

(d) (dwy) [yecodh]: the Revised Version (British and American) "base of altar"; the King James Version "bottom" (<1292>Exodus 29:12; 38:8; <1847>Leviticus 4:7,18,25,30,34; 5:9; 8:15; 9:9).

(e) (bg) [gabh]: the Revised Version (British and American) "elevation," i.e. basement of altar; the King James Version "higher place" (<2613>Ezekiel 43:13).

(2) Adjective from French bas — low, or Welsh bas — "shallow": of lowly birth or station, of voluntary humility and of moral depravity.

(a) (לִּפְנֵי;[shaphal], לִּפְנֵי;[shephal]): of David's self-humiliation (<1072>2 Samuel 6:22): "a modest unambitious kingdom" (<5174>Ezekiel 17:14; 29:14,15 (BDB); <2047>Daniel 4:17 (the American Standard Revised Version "lowest")): compare [shephelah] = "lowland."

(b) (הַלְּקָלָה;[qalah]): men of humble birth and station as opposed to the nobles (<2385>Isaiah 3:5).

(c) (מְבֵלִי בִּלְשֵׁם;[beli-shem]): "nameless," "of no account": "children of fools, yea, children of base men" (<1808>Job 30:8).

(d) the King James Version men, sons, daughters, children of Belial; literally "worthless persons"; in the American Standard Revised Version "base," except <9016>1 Samuel 1:16 "wicked woman"; also the English Revised Version of <5133>Deuteronomy 13:13, "base," which elsewhere retains the King James Version rendering.

(e) ([ταπεινός, tapeinos]): "lowly," "humble or abject" (2 Cor 10:1); the Revised Version (British and American), "lowly"; so Paul's enemies said he appeared when present in the church at Corinth.

(f) ([ἀγενής, agenes]): "of low birth," "of no account" (1 Cor 1:28): "base things of the world."

(g) ([ἀγοραῖος, agoraios]): "belonging to the market-place," loafers, worthless characters (<4176>Acts 17:5): "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort"; the Revised Version (British and American) "certain vile fellows of the rabble."

T. Rees

BASEMATH; BASHEMATH; BASMATH

<bas'-e-math>, <bash'-e-math>, <bas'-math> (תִּמְרֵי בַשֵּׁם;[basemath], "fragrant"):

(1) Basemath, one of the wives of Esau, a daughter of Elon, the Hittite (<1254>Genesis 26:34; the King James Version Bashemath), probably identical with or a sister of Adah whom he also married (<1382>Genesis 36:2). Compare *ADAH*.

(2) Basemath (the King James Version Bashemath), another wife of Esau, a daughter of Ishmael and a sister of Nebaioth (^{<0808>}Genesis 36:3,4,10,13,17). This wife is also called Mahalath (^{<0808>}Genesis 28:9), and is of the house of Abraham. Esau married her because his father was not pleased with his other wives who were daughters of Canaan. Compare *MAHALATH*.

(2) Basemath (the King James Version Basmath), the daughter of Solomon, and wife of Ahimaaz, a commissariat-officer in the service of Solomon (^{<1045>}1 Kings 4:15).

A. L. Breslich

BASHAN

^{<ba'-shan>} (^{ˆvBh}" [ha-bashan], "the Bashan"; [^{Basóv}, Basan]): This name is probably the same in meaning as the cognate Arabic bathneh, "soft, fertile land," or bathaniyeh (batanaea), "this land sown with wheat" ("wheatland").

1. BOUNDARIES:

It often occurs with the article, "the Bashan," to describe the kingdom of Og, the most northerly part of the land East of the Jordan. It stretched from the border of Gilead in the South to the slopes of Hermon in the North. Hermon itself is never definitely included in Bashan, although Og is said to have ruled in that mountain (^{<0825>}Joshua 12:5; 13:11). In ^{<0880>}Deuteronomy 3:10 Salecah and Edrei seem to indicate the East and West limits respectively. This would agree with ^{<0825>}Joshua 12:5; 13:11, which seem to make Geshur and Maacath the western boundary of Bashan. If this were so, then these unconquered peoples literally "dwelt in the midst of Israel." On the other hand ^{<0847>}Deuteronomy 4:47 may mean that the Jordan formed the western boundary; while ^{<0832>}Deuteronomy 33:22 makes Bashan extend to the springs of the Jordan. If Golan lay in the district in which its name is still preserved (el Jaulan), this also brings it to the lip of the Jordan valley (^{<0843>}Deuteronomy 4:43). "A mountain of summits," or "protuberances" (^{<0815>}Psalms 68:15,16: Hebrew), might describe the highlands of the Jaulan, with its many volcanic hills as seen from the West. "A mountain of God" however does not so well apply to this region. Perhaps we should, with Wetzstein (Das batanaische Giebelgebirge) take

these phrases as descriptive of Jebel Chauran, now usually called Jebel ed-Druze, with its many striking summits. This range protected the province from encroachment by the sands of the wilderness from the East. On the South Bashan marched with the desert steppe, el-Chamad, and Gilead. Of the western boundary as we have seen there can be no certainty. It is equally impossible to draw any definite line in the North.

2. CHARACTERISTICS:

Bashan thus included the fertile, wooded slopes of Jebel ed-Druze, the extraordinarily rich plain of el-Chauran (en-Nuqrah — *see HAURAN*), the rocky tract of el-Leja', the region now known as el-Jedur, resembling the Chauran in character, but less cultivated; and, perhaps, the breezy uplands of el-Jaulan, with its splendid reaches of pasture land. It was a land rich in great cities, as existing ruins sufficiently testify. It can hardly be doubted that many of these occupy sites of great antiquity. We may specially note Ashtaroth and Edrei, the cities of Og; Golan, the city of refuge, the site of which is still in doubt; and Salecah (Calkhad), the fortress on the ridge of the mountain, marking the extreme eastern limit of Israel's possessions.

The famous oaks of Bashan (^{<2013>}Isaiah 2:13; ^{<2076>}Ezekiel 27:6) have their modern representatives on the mountain slopes. It seems strange that in Scripture there is no notice of the wheat crops for which the country is in such repute today. Along with Carmel it stood for the fruitfulness of the land (^{<2319>}Isaiah 33:9 etc.); and their languishing was an evident mark of God's displeasure (Nah 1:4). The "bulls of Bashan" represent blatant and brutal strength (^{<1072>}Psalms 22:12, etc.). It is long since the lion deserted the plateau (^{<1532>}Deuteronomy 33:22); but the leopard is still not unknown among the mountains (Song 4:8).

3. HISTORY:

In pre-Israelite days Bashan was ruled by Og the Amorite. His defeat at Edrei marked the end of his kingdom (^{<0213>}Numbers 21:33 ff; ^{<1631>}Joshua 13:11), and the land was given to the half tribe of Manasseh (^{<1633>}Joshua 13:30, etc.). In the Syrian wars Bashan was lost to Israel (^{<1213>}1 Kings 22:3 ff; ^{<1338>}2 Kings 8:28; 10:32 f), but it was regained by Jeroboam II (^{<1425>}2 Kings 14:25). It was incorporated in the Assyrian empire by Tiglath-pileser III (^{<1219>}2 Kings 15:29). In the 2nd century BC it was in the hands of the Nabateans. It formed part of the kingdom of Herod the Great, and then belonged to that of Philip and Agrippa II.

BASHAN-HAVVOTH-JAIR

<ba'-shan-hav'-oth-ja'-ir> (ryaj: tWp" ^vB;[bashan chawwoth ya'ir]).

See HAVVOTH-JAIR.

BASHEMATH

<bash'-e-math>.

See BASEMATH.

BASILISK

<baz'-i-lisk> ([p" x,[tsepha`], yniwOp̄ki[tsiph`oni], from obsolete root [p" x,[tsapha`], “to hiss”: ^{<2108>}Isaiah 11:8; 14:29; 59:5; ^{<2487>}Jeremiah 8:17; ^{<1232>}Proverbs 23:32 m. In ^{<1232>}Proverbs 23:32, the King James Version has “adder,” margin “cockatrice”; in the other passages cited the King James Version has “cockatrice,” margin “adder” (except ^{<2487>}Jeremiah 8:17, no margin)): The word is from [βασιλίσκος, basiliskos], “kinglet,” from [basileus], “king,” and signifies a mythical reptile hatched by a serpent from a cock’s egg. Its hissing drove away other serpents. Its look, and especially its breath, was fatal. According to Pliny, it was named from a crown-like spot on its head. It has been identified with the equally mythical *COCKATRICE* (which see). In all the passages cited, it denotes a venomous serpent (see *ADDER*; *SERPENTS*), but it is impossible to tell what, if any, particular species is referred to. It must be borne in mind that while there are poisonous snakes in Palestine, there are more which are not poisonous, and most of the latter, as well as some harmless lizards, are commonly regarded as deadly. Several of the harmless snakes have crownlike markings on their heads, and it is quite conceivable that the basilisk myth may have been founded upon one of these.

Alfred Ely Day

BASIN; BASON

<ba'-s'-n>.

1. THE TERMS USED AND THEIR MEANING:

The American Standard Revised Version has “basin,” the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “bason,” the preferred spelling of the English revisers. In the Appendix to the Revised Old Testament the American Revisers (section viii) say, “The modern spelling is preferred for the following words”; then follow among others “basin” for “bason”; but no similar statement appears in the Appendix to the Revised New Testament. The Hebrew word so rendered in English Versions of the Bible is chiefly used for the large bowl of bronze (the King James Version “brass”) employed by the priests to receive the blood of the sacrificial victims (^{<12718>}Exodus 27:3; compare 29:16; ^{<10745>}1 Kings 7:45, etc.). It is found only once in secular use (^{<3106>}Amos 6:6, “drink wine in bowls”), if the text there is correct; the Septuagint has it otherwise. *See BOWL*. The “basins” of ^{<12722>}Exodus 12:22; ^{<10728>}2 Samuel 17:28 were probably of earthenware.

2. OF VARIOUS MATERIALS AND FORMS:

While the priests’ bowls were of bronze, similar bowls or basins of silver were presented by the princes of the congregation, according to ^{<10713>}Numbers 7:13 ff; and those spoken of in ^{<10751>}1 Kings 7:50 as destined for Solomon’s temple were of gold (compare ^{<13817>}1 Chronicles 28:17).

3. THE TYPICAL EWER OF THE EAST:

(1) The well-known eastern mode of washing the hands was and is by pouring water on the hands, not by dipping them in water, an act, of course, calling for the aid of an attendant. Elisha “poured water on the hands of Elijah” (^{<12811>}2 Kings 3:11; see Kitto’s note in Pictorial Bible 2, II, 330). A disciple came to be known as “one who poured water on the hands of another.” Such was beyond question the prevailing custom among the ancient Hebrews, as it was, and is, among eastern peoples in general. They incline to look with disgust, if not with horror, upon our western practice of washing face and hands in water retained in a basin.

(2) The typical vessel of the East used in such ablutions has a long spout, not unlike our large coffee-pot (see Kitto, *Pict. Biblical*, II, 331, note). While the English Versions of the Bible unfortunately often suggests nothing like such pouring, the Hebrew expresses it, e.g. in ^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:41, where we have the Qal of [rachats] compare Kennedy in 1-vol HDB, and HDB, articles “Bath,” “Bathing.” Kennedy shows that “affusion,” “pouring on” of water, was meant in many cases where we read “bathe” or “wash” in English Versions. Lane (*Mod. Egypt*, chapter v) says: “A servant brings him a basin and ewer (called Tsisht and ibreek) of tinned copper or brass. The first has a cover with holes, with a raised receptacle for the soap; and the water is poured upon the hands and passes through the ewer into the space below; so that when the basin is brought to a second person the water with which the former has washed is not seen.”

4. A BASIN OF A UNIQUE SORT:

(1) A wash-basin of a special sort was used by Jesus for washing the disciples’ feet (see ^{<015>}John 13:5). The Greek is [νιπτήρ, *nip̄ter eita ballei hudor eis ton nip̄tera*], translated the Revised Version (British and American), “then he poureth water into the basin.” This word [*nip̄ter*] is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, nor in the Septuagint, nor, indeed, in Greek profane literature. But fortunately the general sense is here made plain by the context and by comparison of the cognate verbs [*nip̄tein*] and [*nizein*]. It evidently denotes an article, not necessarily a vessel, specifically suited to the use of washing a part of the body, e.g. the hands or the feet, and hence is used with the article, “the basin,” the Revised Version (British and American). It is doubtful, therefore, if “basin,” or “bason,” conveys a true idea of either the oriental article here meant or the scene portrayed. The fact that, according to the custom of the day, the position of the disciples here was reclining, precludes the possibility of the use of a “basin” of our sort, in the way we are accustomed to, i.e. for immersing the feet in the water, in whole or in part.

(2) So it is likely that the [*nip̄ter*] was a jug, or ewer, with a dish, saucer, or basin placed under it and combined with it to catch the dripping water. We know from other sources that such a vessel was kept in the Jewish house regularly for ordinary handwashings, etc. (see ^{<015>}Matthew 15:2; ^{<008>}Mark 7:3), and for ceremonial ablutions. Hence, it would naturally be ready here in the upper room as a normal part of the preparation of the

“goodman of the house” for his guests (the King James Version ^{<1414>}Mark 14:14; ^{<2212>}Luke 22:12), and so it is distinguished by the Greek article [*ton*]. Jesus Himself used the [*nip̄ter*], standing, doubtless, to impress upon His disciples the lessons of humility, self-abasement and loving service which He ever sought to impart and illustrate.

(3) Our conclusion, we may say with George Farmer in DCG, article “Bason,” is that [*nip̄ter*] was not simply one large basin, but the set of ewer and basin combined, such a set as was commonly kept in the Jewish house for the purpose of cleansing either the hands or the feet by means of affusion. The Arabic Tisht, authorities tell us, is the exact rendering of [*nip̄ter*], and it comes from a root which means “to pour,” or “rain slightly.” (See Anton Tien, reviser of the Arabic prayer-book, author of Arabic and Mod. Greek Grammars, etc., quoted in DCG, article “Bason.”)

George B. Eager

BASKET

<bas'-ket>: Four kinds of “baskets” come to view in the Old Testament under the Hebrew names, [dudh], [Tene’], [cal] and [kelubh]. There is little, however, in these names, or in the narratives where they are found, to indicate definitely what the differences of size and shape and use were. The Mishna renders us some help in our uncertainty, giving numerous names and descriptions of “baskets” in use among the ancient Hebrews (see Kreugel, Dasse Hausgerat in der Mishna, 39-45). They were variously made of willow, rush, palm-leaf, etc., and were used for various purposes, domestic and agricultural, for instance, in gathering and serving fruit, collecting alms in kind for the poor, etc. Some had handles, others lids, some both, others neither.

1. MEANING OF OLD TESTAMENT TERMS:

(1) [Dudh] was probably a generic term for various kinds of baskets. It was probably the “basket” in which the Israelites in Egypt carried the clay for bricks (compare ^{<1306>}Psalms 81:6, where it is used as a symbol of Egyptian bondage), and such as the Egyptians themselves used for that purpose (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, I, 379), probably a large, shallow basket, made of wicker-work. It stood for a basket that was used in fruit-gathering (see ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 24:1), but how it differed from Amos’ “basket of summer fruit” (^{<3101>}Amos 8:1) we do not know. [Dudh] is used for the

“pot” in which meat was boiled (~~0024~~ 1 Samuel 2:14), showing probably that a pot-shaped “basket” was known by this name. Then it seems to have stood for a basket tapering toward the bottom like the calathus of the Romans. So we seem forced to conclude that the term was generic, not specific.

(2) The commonest basket in use in Old Testament times was the cal. It was the “basket” in which the court-baker of Egypt carried about his confectionery on his head (~~0406~~ Genesis 40:16). It was made in later times at least of peeled willows, or palm leaves, and was sometimes at least large and flat like the canistrum of the Romans, and, like it, was used for carrying bread and other articles of food (~~0406~~ Genesis 40:16; ~~0069~~ Judges 6:19). Meat for the meat offerings and the unleavened bread, were placed in it (~~0298~~ Exodus 29:3; ~~0880~~ Leviticus 8:2; ~~0465~~ Numbers 6:15). It is expressly required that the unleavened cakes be placed and offered in such a “basket.” While a “basket,” it was dish-shaped, larger or smaller in size, it would seem, according to demand, and perhaps of finer texture than the [dudh].

(3) The [Tene’] was a large, deep basket, in which grain and other products of garden or field were carried home, and kept (~~0585~~ Deuteronomy 28:5,17), in which the first-fruits were preserved (~~0580~~ Deuteronomy 26:2), and the tithes transported to the sanctuary (~~0580~~ Deuteronomy 26:2 f). It has been thought probable that the [chabya], the basket of clay and straw of the Palestine peasantry of today, is a sort of survival or counterpart of it. It has the general shape of a jar, and is used for storing and keeping wheat, barley, oats, etc. At the top is the mouth into which the grain is poured, and at the bottom is an orifice through which it can be taken out as needed, when the opening is again closed with a rag. The Septuagint translates [Tene’] by kartallos, which denotes a basket of the shape of an inverted cone.

(4) The term [kelubh], found in ~~0880~~ Amos 8:1 for a “fruit-basket,” is used in ~~0467~~ Jeremiah 5:27 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “cage”) for a bird-cage. But it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that a coarsely woven basket with a cover would be used by a fowler to carry home his feathered captives.

2. MEANING OF NEW TESTAMENT TERMS:

In the New Testament interest centers in two kinds of “basket,” distinguished by the evangelists in their accounts of the feeding of the 5,000 and of the 4,000, called in Greek [*kophinos*] and [*sphuris*] (Westcott-Hort [*sphuris*]).

(1) The [*kophinos*] (~~<0141>~~ Matthew 14:20; ~~<0163>~~ Mark 6:43; ~~<0197>~~ Luke 9:17; ~~<0183>~~ John 6:13) may be confidently identified with the [kuphta'] of the Mishna which was provided with a cord for a handle by means of which it could be carried on the back with such provisions as the disciples on the occasions under consideration would naturally have with them (of Kreugel, and Broadus, Commentary in the place cited.). The Jews of Juvenal's day carried such a specific “provision-basket” with them on their journeys regularly, and the Latin for it is a transliteration of this Greek word, *cophinus* (compare Juvenal iii.14, and Jastrow, Dictionary, article “Basket”). Some idea of its size may be drawn from the fact that in CIG, 1625, 46, the word denotes a Beotian measure of about two gallons.

(2) The [*sphuris*] or [*spuris*] (~~<0157>~~ Matthew 15:37; ~~<0188>~~ Mark 8:8) we may be sure, from its being used in letting Paul down from the wall at Damascus (~~<0125>~~ Acts 9:25, etc.), was considerably larger than the [*kophinos*] and quite different in shape and uses. It might for distinction fitly be rendered “hamper,” as Professor Kennedy suggests. Certainly neither the Greek nor ancient usage justifies any confusion.

(3) The sargane (2 Cor 11:33) means anything plaited, or sometimes more specifically a fish-basket.

George B. Eager

BASMATH

<bas'-math>.

See BASEMATH.

BASON

<ba'-s'-n>.

See BASIN.

BASSA

<bas'-a>.

See *BASSAI*.

BASSAI

<bas'-a-i>, <bas'-i> ([**Βασσαί**, Bassai], [**Βασσα**, Bassa]; the King James Version Bassa; 1 Esdras 5:16; Bezai (<1527> Ezra 2:17; <1672> Nehemiah 7:23)): The sons of Bassai returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BASTAI

<bas'-ta-i>.

See *BASTHAI*.

BASTARD

<bas'-tard> (**רְצֵחַן** [mamzer]; [**νόθος**, nothos]): In <1231> Deuteronomy 23:2 probably the offspring of an incestuous union, or of a marriage within the prohibited degrees of affinity (<1816> Leviticus 18:6-20; 20:10-21). He and his descendants to the tenth generation are excluded from the assembly of the Lord. (See Driver, at the place). Zechariah (9:6), after prophesying the overthrow of three Philistine cities, declares of the fourth: “And a bastard (the Revised Version, margin “a bastard race”) shall dwell in Ashdod,” meaning probably that a “mixed population” (BDB) of aliens shall invade and settle in the capital of the Philistines. In Hebrews (12:8) in its proper sense of “born out of wedlock,” and therefore not admitted to the privileges of paternal care and responsibility as a legitimate son.

T. Ress

BASTHAI

<bas'-tha-i>, <bas'-thi> ([**Βασθαί**, Basthai]; the King James Version Bastai; 1 Esdras 5:31 = Besai (<1524> Ezra 2:49; <1672> Nehemiah 7:52)): The descendants of Basthai (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BAT

(**11** **€"** [**] aTaleph**]; ^{<B119>}Leviticus 11:19; ^{<B148>}Deuteronomy 14:18; ^{<B121>}Isaiah 2:20): Bats are the most widely distributed of mammals, reaching even the oceanic islands, and modern science has revealed the existence of an astonishing number of species, nearly twenty being recorded from Palestine. These include both fruit-eating and insect-eating bats, the latter being the smaller. It has not always been realized that they are mammals, and so it is not surprising that they should be mentioned at the end of the list of unclean birds in ^{<B119>}Leviticus 11:19 and ^{<B148>}Deuteronomy 14:18. It may, however, be significant that they are at the end of the list and not in the middle of it. The fruit bats are a pest to horticulturists and often strip apricot and other trees before the fruit has ripened enough to be picked. On this account the fruit is often enclosed in bags, or the whole tree may be surrounded with a great sheet or net. They commonly pick the fruit and eat it on some distant perch beneath which the seeds and the ordure of these animals are scattered. The insect bats, as in other countries, flit about at dusk and through the night catching mosquitoes and larger insects, and so are distinctly beneficial.

The reference in ^{<B121>}Isaiah 2:20, "cast idols to the moles and to the bats" refers of course to these animals as inhabitants of dark and deserted places. As in the case of many animal names the etymology of [**] aTaleph**] is doubtful. Various derivations have been proposed but none can be regarded as satisfactory. The Arabic name, waTwaT, throws no light on the question.

Alfred Ely Day

BATANAEA

<*bat-a-ne'-a*>: The name used in Greek times for **BASHAN** (which see), Josephus, Life, II; Ant, XV, x, 1; XVII, ii, 1, "toparchy of Butanea."

BATH

(**tB"** [**bath**]): A liquid measure equal to about 9 gallons, English measure. It seems to have been regarded as a standard for liquid measures (^{<B510>}Ezekiel 45:10), as in the case of the molten sea and the lavers in Solomon's temple (^{<1025>}1 Kings 7:26,38), and for measuring oil and wine

(^{<4120>}2 Chronicles 2:10; ^{<1972>}Ezra 7:22; ^{<2150>}Isaiah 5:10; ^{<3514>}Ezekiel 45:14). Its relation to the homer is given in ^{<3511>}Ezekiel 45:11,14).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

BATH; BATHING

<bath>, <bath'-ing>.

1. ORDINARY BATHING:

Bathing in the ordinary, non-religious sense, public or private, is rarely met with in the Scriptures. We find, however, three exceptional and interesting cases:

- (1) that of Pharaoh's daughter, resorting to the Nile (^{<0015>}Exodus 2:5);
- (2) that of Bath-sheba, bathing on the house-top (^{<1012>}2 Samuel 11:2 the Revised Version (British and American));
- (3) the curious case mentioned in ^{<1228>}1 Kings 22:38. (To wash with royal blood was supposed to be beneficial to the complexion.)

The dusty, limestone soil of Palestine and the open foot-gear of the Orient on stockingless feet, called for frequent washing of the feet (^{<0242>}Genesis 24:32; 43:24; ^{<0752>}Judges 19:24; ^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:41; ^{<1018>}2 Samuel 11:8; Song 5:3, etc.), and bathing of the body for refreshment; but the chief concern of the writers of Scripture was with bathing of another sort. Indeed, something of the religious sense and aspect of bathing, in addition to that of bodily refreshment, seems to have entered into the ordinary use of water, as in the washing of the hands before meals, etc. (see ^{<0184>}Genesis 18:4; 19:2; ^{<0144>}Luke 7:44).

2. BATHING RESORTS:

The streams and ponds, when available, were the usual resorts for bathing (^{<0015>}Exodus 2:5; ^{<1150>}2 Kings 5:10, etc.), but the water-supply of large cities, stored up in great pools or large cisterns, was certainly available at times to some degree for bathing (^{<1012>}2 Samuel 11:2); though, as Benzinger says, no traces of bathrooms have been found in old Hebrew houses, even in royal palaces. In Babylon, it would seem from Susanna 15, there were bathing pools in gardens, though this passage may refer simply to bathing in the open air. Certainly public baths as now known, or plunge-baths of

the Greek type, were unknown among the Hebrews until they were brought in contact with the Greek civilization. Such baths first come into view during the Greek-Roman period, when they are found to be regularly included in the gymnasia, or “places of exercise” (1 Macc 1:14). Remains of them, of varying degrees of richness and architectural completeness, may be seen today in various parts of the East, those left of the cities of the Decapolis, especially at Gerash and Amman, being excellent examples (compare also those at Pompeii). A remarkable series of bath-chambers has recently been discovered by Mr. R. A. S. Macalister at Gezer in Palestine, in connection with a building supposed to be the palace built by Simon Maccabeus. For an interesting account of it see PEFS, 1905, 294 f.

3. GREEK VERSUS SEMITIC IDEAS:

When we consider that in Palestine six months of the year are rainless, and how scarce and priceless water is during most of the year, and in many places all the year round; and when we recall how the Bedouin of today looks on the use of water for cleansing in such times and places of scarcity, viewing it as a wanton waste (see Benzinger, Hebrew. Arch., 108, note), the rigid requirement of it for so many ritual purposes by the Mosaic law is, to say the least, remarkable (*see ABLUTION; CLEAN AND UNCLEAN*, etc.). Certainly there was a marked contrast between the Greek idea of bathing and that of the Hebrews and Asiatics in general, when they came in contact. But when Greek culture invaded Palestine under Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 168 BC), it brought Greek ideas and Greek bathing establishments with it; and under Herod (40-44 BC) it was given the right of way and prevailed to no mean degree (see Anecdote of Gamaliel II in Schurer, HJP, II, i, 18, 53).

4. CEREMONIAL PURIFICATION:

But “bathing” in the Bible stands chiefly for ritual acts — purification from ceremonial uncleanness, from contact with the dead, with defiled persons or things, with “holy things,” i.e. things “devoted,” or “under the ban,” etc. (*see CLEAN AND UNCLEAN*, etc.). The Hebrew of the Old Testament does not sharply distinguish between bathing and partial washing — both are expressed by [rahats], and the Revised Version (British and American) rightly renders “wash” instead of “bathe” in some cases. Talmudic usage simply codified custom which had been long in vogue, according to Schurer. But Kennedy grants that the “bath” at last became, even for the

laity, “an important factor in the religious life of Israel.” We read of daily bathing by the Essenes (Josephus, BJ, II, viii, 5). Then later we find John, the Baptizer, immersing, as the record clearly shows the apostles of Christ did also (~~4188~~ Acts 8:38; ~~4188~~ Romans 6:3 f); compare ~~2118~~ Luke 11:38 where [βαπτίζω, baptizo], in passive = “washed.”

5. BATHING FOR HEALTH:

In ~~4188~~ John 5:2-7 we have an example of bathing for health. There are remains of ancient baths at Gadara and at Callirrhoe, East of the Jordan, baths which were once celebrated as resorts for health-seekers. There are hot baths in full operation today, near Tiberias, on the southwestern shore of the Lake of Galilee, which have been a health resort from time immemorial. It is probably true, however, as some one has said, that in Old Testament times and in New Testament times, the masses of the people had neither privacy nor inclination for bathing.

George B. Eager

BATH KOL

<bath'-kol>, <bath kol> (l wQ tB" [bath qol], “the daughter of the voice”): Originally signifying no more than “sound,” “tone,” “call” (e.g. water in pouring gives forth a “sound,” [bath qol], while oil does not), sometimes also “echo.” The expression acquired among the rabbis a special use, signifying the Divine voice, audible to man and unaccompanied by a visible Divine manifestation. Thus conceived, [bath qol] is to be distinguished from God’s speaking to Moses and the prophets; for at Sinai the voice of God was part of a larger theophany, while for the prophets it was the resultant inward demonstration of the Divine will, by whatever means effected, given to them to declare (*see VOICE*). It is further to be distinguished from all natural sounds and voices, even where these were interpreted as conveying Divine instruction. The conception appears for the first time in ~~2708~~ Daniel 4:28 (English Versions 31) — it is in the Aramaic portion — where, however, [qal] = [qol], “voice” stands without berath = bath, “daughter”: “A voice fell from heaven.” Josephus (Ant., XIII, x, 3) relates that John Hyrcanus (135-104 BC) heard a voice while offering a burnt sacrifice in the temple, which Josephus expressly interprets as the voice of God (compare Babylonian [SoTah] 33a and Jerusalem [SoTah] 24b, where it is called [bath qol]). In the New Testament mention of “a voice from heaven” occurs in the following passages: ~~4187~~ Matthew 3:17;

^{<1011>}Mark 1:11; ^{<1022>}Luke 3:22 (at the baptism of Jesus); ^{<1075>}Matthew 17:5; ^{<1097>}Mark 9:7; ^{<1085>}Luke 9:35 (at His transfiguration); ^{<1028>}John 12:28 (shortly before His passion); ^{<1010>}Acts 9:4; 22:7; 26:14 (conversion of Paul), and 10:13,15 (instruction of Peter concerning clean and unclean). In the period of the Tannaim (circa 100 BC-200 AD) the term [bath qol] was in very frequent use and was understood to signify not the direct voice of God, which was held to be supersensible, but the echo of the voice (the bath being somewhat arbitrarily taken to express the distinction). The rabbis held that [bath qol] had been an occasional means of Divine communication throughout the whole history of Israel and that since the cessation of the prophetic gift it was the sole means of Divine revelation. It is noteworthy that the rabbinical conception of [bath qol] sprang up in the period of the decline of Old Testament prophecy and flourished in the period of extreme traditionalism. Where the gift of prophecy was clearly lacking — perhaps even because of this lack — there grew up an inordinate desire for special Divine manifestations. Often a voice from heaven was looked for to clear up matters of doubt and even to decide between conflicting interpretations of the law. So strong had this tendency become that Rabbi Joshua (circa 100 AD) felt it to be necessary to oppose it and to insist upon the supremacy and the sufficiency of the written law. It is clear that we have here to do with a conception of the nature and means of Divine revelation that is distinctly inferior to the Biblical view. For even in the Biblical passages where mention is made of the voice from heaven, all that is really essential to the revelation is already present, at least in principle, without the audible voice.

LITERATURE.

F. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palastinischen Theologie*, 2nd edition, 1897, 194 ff; J. Hamburger, *Real-Enc des Judentums*, II, 1896; W. Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten und Agada der palast. Amoraer* (see Index); *Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, 588 ff; “Bath Kol” in *TSBA*, IX, 18; P. Fiebig, *Rel. in Gesch. und Gegenwart*, I, under the word

J. R. Van Pelt

BATH-RABBIM, THE GATE OF

^{<bath-rab'-im>}, (μyBrAtB" r[ʋ" [sha`ar bath-rabbim];

Septuagint [ἐν πύλαις θυγατρὸς πολλῶν en pulais thugatros pollon], literally “in the gates of the daughter of the many.” The gate of Heshbon

near which were the pools compared to the Shulammite's eyes (Song 7:4). Guthe would translate "by the gate of the populous city." Cheyne would amend the passage and read

*"Thine eyes are like Solomon's pools,
By the wood of Beth-cerem,"*

and transfer the scene to the pools of Solomon, S. of Bethlehem (EB, under the word). But this is surely very violent. One of the pools of Heshbon still survives, measuring 191 ft. X 139 ft., and is 10 ft. deep. The walls however have been rent by earthquakes, and now no longer retain the water.

W. Ewing

BATH-SHEBA

< bath-she'-ba >, < bath'-she-ba > ([b" vAtB" [bath-shebha`], "the seventh daughter," or "the daughter of an oath," also called Bathshua [WvAtB" [bath-shua`], "the daughter of opulence" (<336>1 Chronicles 3:5); the Septuagint however reads [Bersabee] everywhere; compare *BATHSHUA*; HPN, 65, 67, 77, 206 for Bath-sheba, and 67, 69, note 3, for Bathshua): Bath-sheba was the daughter of Eliam (<1008>2 Samuel 11:3) or Ammiel (<336>1 Chronicles 3:5); both names have the same meaning. She was the beautiful wife of Uriah the Hittite, and because of her beauty was forced by David to commit adultery (<1010>2 Samuel 11:2 ff; Psalm 51). Her husband Uriah was treacherously killed by the order of David (<1016>2 Samuel 11:6 ff). After the death of her husband David made her his wife and she lived with him in the palace (<1017>2 Samuel 11:27). Four sons sprang from this marriage (<1054>2 Samuel 5:14; <336>1 Chronicles 3:5), after the first child, the adulterine, had died (<1024>2 Samuel 12:14 ff). With the help of the prophet Nathan she renders futile the usurpation of Adonijah and craftily secures the throne for her son Solomon (<1011>1 Kings 1:11 ff). Later Adonijah succeeds in deceiving Bath-sheba, but his plan is frustrated by the king (<1023>1 Kings 2:13 ff). According to Jewish tradition, Proverbs 31 is written by Solomon in memory of his mother. In the genealogy of Jesus (Matthew 16) Bath-sheba is mentioned as the former wife of Uriah and the mother of Solomon by David.

*See ADONIJAH; AMMIEL; BATHSHUA; DAVID; ELIAM;
NATHAN; SOLOMON.*

BATHSHUA

<batʰ-shu-a> ([~~W~~vAtB" [bath-shua`], “the daughter of opulence” or “the daughter of Shua”; compare *BATH-SHEBA*; for derivation see HPN, 67, 69, note 3):

- (1) In ~~<QRP>~~Genesis 38:2 and ~~<RWB>~~1 Chronicles 2:3, where the name is translated “Shua’s daughter,” the wife of Judah.
- (2) In ~~<RWB>~~1 Chronicles 3:5, the daughter of Ammiel and wife of David.

See *BATH-SHEBA*.

BATH-ZACHARIAS

<batʰ-zak-a-ri'-as>.

See *BETH-ZACHARIAS*.

BATTERING-RAM

<bat'-er-ing-ram>.

See *SIEGE*.

BATTLE

See *WAR*.

BATTLE-AXE

<bat'-'-l-ax>.

See *ARMOR, ARMS, III, I; AX (AXE)*.

BATTLE-BOW

<bat'-'-l-bo>: Found in the striking Messianic prophecy: “The battle bow shall be cut off” (~~<RWB>~~Zechariah 9:10). The prophet is predicting the peace that shall prevail when Zion’s king cometh, “just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass.” The

words convey their full significance only when read in the light of the context: “I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem; and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the nations” (compare ^{<3800>}Zechariah 10:4). The battle-bow was sometimes made of tough wood, sometimes of two straight horns joined together (Hom. II. iv.105-11), and sometimes of bronze. In ^{<1983>}Psalms 18:34 the Revised Version (British and American) we find “bow of brass,” but it probably should be of “bronze” (**tvj nš** [nechosheth]), a metal very different from our brass, which is a mixture of copper and zinc. The point of the passage in this connection (“He teacheth my hands to war; so that mine arms do bend a bow of bronze”), as well as of that in ^{<1924>}2 Kings 9:24 (“And Jehu drew his bow with his full strength”) is that it required great strength to bend the battle-bow.

See ARCHERY; ARMOR.

George B. Eager

BATTLEMENT

^{<bat' -'l-ment>}.

See FORTIFICATION; HOUSE.

BAVAI

^{<bav' -a-i>}.

See BAVVAI.

BAVVAI

^{<bav' -a-i>} (**yB**” [bawway]; Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus, Benei; Codex Vaticanus, [**Beδeí**, Bedei]; the King James Version Bavai, “wisher” (?)) (^{<1488>}Nehemiah 3:18): Perhaps identical with or a brother of Binnui (^{<1484>}Nehemiah 3:24). *See BINNUI.* Bavvai, “the son of Henadad, the ruler of half the district of Keilah,” was of a Levitical family. He is mentioned as one of those who repaired the wall of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (^{<1487>}Nehemiah 3:17 f).

BAY (1)

<ba>.

See *COLORS*.

BAY (2)

<ba> (^W𐤁𐤀 ;[lashon], literally “tongue”; [κόλπος, kolpos]): The word occurs in the sense of inlet of the sea in the Old Testament only in ^{<1651>}Joshua 15:2,5; 18:19, and in New Testament only in ^{<4073>}Acts 27:39 (of Malta, the King James Version “creek”).

BAYITH

<ba’-yith> (^{tyB}𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤔 [bayith]; the King James Version Bajith, “house” (^{<2819>}Isaiah 15:2)): A town in the country of Moab. The reading of the Revised Version, margin, “Bayith and Dibon are gone up to the high places to weep,” seems to be the proper rendering of this passage. Duhamel et al., by changing the text, read either “house of” or “daughter of.” The construct of this word beth is frequently used in compound words.

See *BETH*.

BAY TREE

<ba’-tre’> (the King James Version only; ^{<18735>}Psalm 37:35; ^{j rz}𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤔 𐤀, [’ezrach]): The word means “native,” “indigenous,” and the Revised Version (British and American) translations “a green tree in its native soil.”

BAZLITH; BAZLUTH

<baz’-lith>, <baz’-luth> (^{tyl xB}𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤔 [batslith], ^{<41754>}Nehemiah 7:54; ^{twl xB}𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤔 [batsluth], ^{<41152>}Ezra 2:52; Basaloth, 1 Esdras 5:31, “asking”): The descendants of Bazlith (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BDELLIUM

<del'-i-um> (j l " dB)[bedholach]): The word occurs twice in the Pentateuch:

(1) in ^{<04102>}Genesis 2:12, in conjunction with gold and onyx, as a product of the land of **HAVILAH** (which see), and

(2) in ^{<04102>}Numbers 11:7, where the manna is likened to this substance in appearance: "The appearance thereof as the appearance of bdellium." The latter comparison excludes the idea of [bedholach] being a precious stone, and points to the identification of it with the fragrant resinous gum known to the Greeks as [bdellion], several kinds being mentioned by Dioscorides and Pliny. It was a product of Arabia, India, Afghanistan, etc.

James Orr

BEACH

<bech> ([αἰγαλός, aigialos]): The part of the shore washed by the tide on which the waves dash (^{<0032>}Matthew 13:2,48; ^{<0204>}John 21:4; ^{<4205>}Acts 21:5; 27:39,40).

BEACON

<be'-k'-n>. The translation of the Hebrew [^]r[^]ṭ[^] (toren), which usually means "mast" (compare ^{<2323>}Isaiah 33:23; ^{<4205>}Ezekiel 27:5), but in ^{<2307>}Isaiah 30:17 being used in parallelism with "ensign" the meaning may be "signal-staff" (^{<2307>}Isaiah 30:17 the American Revised Version, margin "pole").

BEALIAH

<be-a-li'-a> (hyI [B][be`alyah], "Yahweh is Lord," compare HPN, 144, 287): Bealiah, formerly a friend of Saul, joined David at Ziklag (^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 12:5).

BEALOTH

<be'-a-loth> (twD[B][be`aloth]; [Βαλώθ, Baloth]): An unidentified city of Judah in the Negeb (^{<0654>}Joshua 15:24).

BEAM

<be>: The word is used to translate various Old Testament terms:

(1) **gēbh** [gebh] (<106> 1 Kings 6:9), **l xētsela`**, “a rib” (<108> 1 Kings 7:3), **qurah** (<148> 2 Chronicles 3:7; 34:11; Song 1:17), all refer to constructional beams used in buildings for roofing and upper floors, main beams being carried on pillars generally of wood. The last term is used in <102> 2 Kings 6:2,5 (“as one was felling a beam”) of trees which were being cut into logs. A related form is **qarah** (used of the Creator, <948> Psalm 104:3; of building, <108> Nehemiah 2:8; 3:3,6). Yet another term, **kaphim**, is used in <821> Habakkuk 2:11: “The stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it” — a protest against sin made by inanimate things. The Douay version, in translating, “the timber that is between the joints of the building,” suggests the use of bond timbers in buildings, similar to that used at one time in English brickwork. It probably refers to its use in mud brick buildings, although bond timbers might also be used in badly built stone walls. The Arabs of the present day use steel joints to strengthen angles of buildings.

(2) Beam, in weaving, represents two words, **eregh** (<1764> Judges 16:14, the beam of a loom to which Samson’s hair was fastened; used in <806> Job 7:6 of a weaver’s shuttle), and **manor** (<970> 1 Samuel 17:7; <1219> 2 Samuel 21:19; <3123> 1 Chronicles 11:23; 20:5), of a spear-staff.

(3) In the New Testament Jesus uses the word [**dokos**, dokos], “a rafter,” in bidding the censorious person first cast the “beam” out of his own eye before attempting to remove the “mote” from another’s eye (<408> Matthew 7:3; <164> Luke 6:41,42).

See **ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE**.

Arch. C. Dickie

BEAN

<be’-an>.

See **BAEAN**.

BEANS

<benz> (I wP [pol]; Arabic ful): A very common product of Palestine; a valuable and very ancient article of diet. The Bible references are probably to the *Faba vulgaris* (N.D. Leguminosae) or horsebean. This is sown in the autumn; is in full flower — filling the air with sweet perfume — in the early spring; and is harvested just after the barley and wheat. The bundles of black bean stalks, plucked up by the roots and piled up beside the newly winnowed barley, form a characteristic feature on many village threshing-floors. Beans are threshed and winnowed like the cereals. Beans are eaten entire, with the pod, in the unripe state, but to a greater extent the hard beans are cooked with oil and meat.

In ^{<2610>}Ezekiel 4:9, beans are mentioned with other articles as an unusual source of bread and in ^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:28 David receives from certain staunch friends of his at Mahanaim a present, which included “beans, and lentils, and parched pulse.”

E. W. G. Masterman

BEAR

<bar> (bDobh]; compare Arabic dubb): In ^{<9173>}1 Samuel 17:34-37, David tells Saul how as a shepherd boy he had overcome a lion and a bear. In ^{<1024>}2 Kings 2:24 it is related that two she bears came out of the wood and tore forty-two of the children who had been mocking Elisha. All the other references to bears are figurative; compare ^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:8; ^{<1072>}Proverbs 17:12; 28:15; ^{<2310>}Isaiah 11:7; 59:11; ^{<2810>}Lamentations 3:10; ^{<2105>}Daniel 7:5; ^{<2838>}Hosea 13:8; ^{<3159>}Amos 5:19; ^{<6610>}Revelation 13:2. The Syrian bear, sometimes named as a distinct species, *Ursus Syriacus*, is better to be regarded as merely a local variety of the European and Asiatic brown bear, *Ursus arctos*. It still exists in small numbers in Lebanon and is fairly common in Anti-Lebanon and Hermon. It does not seem to occur now in Palestine proper, but may well have done so in Bible times. It inhabits caves in the high and rugged mountains and issues mainly at night to feed on roots and vegetables. It is fond of the [chummuc] or chick-pea which is sometimes planted in the upland meadows, and the fields have to be well guarded. The figurative references to the bear take account of its ferocious nature, especially in the case of the she bear robbed of her whelps (^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:8; ^{<1072>}Proverbs 17:12; ^{<2838>}Hosea 13:8). It is with this

character of the bear in mind that Isaiah says (11:7), “And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together.”

Alfred Y. Day

BEAR, THE (ARCTURUS)

<bar>. A great northern constellation.

See ASTRONOMY, II, 13.

BEAR; BORN

<bar>, <born> (vb.), (**dl " y**[yaladh]): Occurs frequently in its literal sense, alluding to motherhood (**0161** Genesis 16:11; 17:17,19,21; 18:13; 22:23; 30:3; **0175** Leviticus 12:5; **0713** Judges 13:3; 5:7; **0012** Ruth 1:12; **1002** 1 Kings 3:21; **2005** Jeremiah 29:6); in the New Testament [**γεννάω**, gennao], in the same sense (**0113** Luke 1:13).

Figurative: It is often used with reference to the beginning of the spiritual life or regeneration (**0013** John 1:13; 3:3-8; **0129** 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1,4,18 the King James Version).

See REGENERATION.

BEAR; BORNE

<bar>, <born> (**αϛη**[nasa’]; [**λαμβάνω**, lambano], [**ἄναφέρω**, anaphero], [**βαστάζω**, bastazo]): In English Versions of the Bible the physical sense is familiar, of supporting or carrying any weight or burden. The translation of the Revised Version (British and American) is to be preferred in **0513** Psalm 75:3 (“have set up”); **2133** Lamentations 3:28 (“hath laid it upon him”); Zeph 1:11 (“were laden with silver”); **0107** Luke 18:7 (“he is longsuffering over them”); **0116** John 12:6 (“took away what was put therein”); **0275** Acts 27:15 (“could not face the wind”).

Figurative: The words are used in the figurative sense of enduring or taking the consequences of, be it for oneself or as representative for others: one’s own iniquity (**0857** Leviticus 5:17 and often); chastisement (**1351** Job 34:31); reproach (**0607** Psalm 69:7; 89:50); or the sins of others (**2504** Isaiah 53:4,11,12; **0187** Matthew 8:17; **3023** Hebrews 9:28; **0124** 1 Peter 2:24). In **2401** Isaiah 46:1-7 a striking contrast is presented between the idols of Babylon whom their worshippers had carried (borne) about and which

would be borne away by the conquerors, and Yahweh who had carried (borne) Israel from the beginning. “Jacob and Israel borne by me from their birth and I will bear; yea, I will carry.” “They bear it upon the shoulder,” etc.

M. O. Evans

BEARD

<berd>:

(1) Western Semites in general, according to the monuments, wore full round beards, to which they evidently devoted great care. The nomads of the desert, in distinction from the settled Semites, wore a clipped and pointed beard (see ^{<4926>}Jeremiah 9:26: “all that have the corners of their hair cut off, that dwell in the wilderness”; and compare 25:23; 49:32, etc.).

(2) Long beards are found on Assyrian and Babylonian monuments and sculptures as a mark of the highest aristocracy (compare Egyptian monuments, especially representations by W. Max Muller, *Asien und Europa*, 140). It is not clear that it was ever so with the Jews. Yet it is significant that the Hebrew “elder” ([zaqen]) seems to have received his name from his long beard (compare *bene barbatus*).

(3) The view of some that it was customary among the Hebrews to shave the upper lip is considered by the best authorities as without foundation. The mustache (Hebrew [sapham], “beard”), according to ^{<1024>}2 Samuel 19:24, received regular “trimming” (thus English Versions of the Bible after the Vulgate, but the Hebrew is generic, not specific: “He had neither dressed his feet, nor trimmed his beard”).

(4) In one case (^{<9213>}1 Samuel 21:13,14) the neglect of the beard is set down as a sign of madness: “(He) let his spittle fall down upon his beard. Then said Achish, Lo, ye see the man is mad.”

(5) It was common. Semitic custom to cut both hair and beard as a token of grief or distress. ^{<2352>}Isaiah 15:2, describing the heathen who have “gone up to the high places to weep,” says “Moab waileth over Nebo, and over Medeba; on all their heads is baldness, every beard is cut off.” Jeremiah (41:5), describing the grief of the men of Samaria for their slain governor, Gedaliah, says, “There came men from Samaria (his sorrowing subjects)

even four score men, having their beards shaven and their clothes rent,” etc. And Amos, in his prophecy of the vision of the “basket of summer fruit” (8:1 ff), makes Yahweh say to His people: “I will turn your feasts into mourning; I will bring sackcloth upon all loins, and baldness upon every head” (8:10). On the other hand it was even more significant of great distress or fear to leave the beard untrimmed, as did Mephibosheth, the son of Saul, when he went to meet King David, in the crisis of his guilty failure to go up with the king according to his expectation: “He had neither dressed his feet, nor trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, from the day the king departed until the day he came home in peace.” (Compare ^{<0213>}1 Samuel 21:13,14; ^{<1092>}2 Samuel 19:24.)

(6) Absalom’s hair was cut only once a year, it would seem (^{<1048>}2 Samuel 14:26; compare rules for priests, Levites, etc., ^{<540>}Ezekiel 44:20). But men then generally wore their hair longer than is customary or seemly with us (of Song 5:2,11, “His locks are bushy, and black as a raven”). Later, in New Testament times, it was a disgrace for a man to wear long hair (1 Cor 11:6-15). To mutilate the beard of another was considered a great indignity (see ^{<1004>}2 Samuel 10:4; compare ^{<2816>}Isaiah 50:6, “plucked off the hair”). The shaving of the head of a captive slave-girl who was to be married to her captor marked her change of condition and prospects (^{<0212>}Deuteronomy 21:12; W. R. Smith, Kinship, 209).

LITERATURE.

Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, II, 324, 349; Herod. i.195; ii.36; iii.12; Josephus, Antiquities, VIII, viii, 3; XVI, viii, 1; W. R. Smith, Kinship, 209; RS, 324; Wellhausen, Skizzen, III, 167,

George B. Eager

BEAST

<best>: This word occurs often in both Old and New Testaments and denotes generally a mammal (though sometimes a reptile) in distinction to a man, a bird, or a fish. In this distinction the English is fairly in accord with the Hebrew and Greek originals. The commonest Hebrew words [behemah] and [chai] have their counterpart in the Arabic as do three others less often used, [be`ir] (^{<0457>}Genesis 45:17; ^{<0215>}Exodus 22:5; ^{<0218>}Numbers 20:8 the King James Version), [nephesh] (^{<0248>}Leviticus 24:18), and [Tebhach] (^{<1002>}Proverbs 9:2). [Behemah] and Arabic bahimah

are from a root signifying vagueness or dumbness and so denote primarily a dumb beast. [Chai] and Arabic chaiwan are from the root [chayah] (Arabic chaya), “to live,” and denote primarily living creatures. [Be`ir], “cattle,” and its root-verb, [ba`ar], “to graze,” are identical with the Arabic [ba`ir] and [ba`ara], but with a curious difference in meaning. [Ba`ir] is a common word for camel among the Bedouin and the root-verb, [ba`ara], means “to drop dung,” [ba`rah] being a common word for the dung of camels, goats, and sheep. [Nephesh] corresponds in every way with the Arabic nephs, “breath,” “soul” or “self” [Tebhach] from [Tabhach], “to slaughter,” is equivalent to the Arabic dhibch from dhabacha, with the same meaning. Both [θηρίον, therion] (“wild beast”), and [ζῷον, zoon] (“living thing”), occur often in the Apocalypse. They are found also in a few other places, as mammals (^{<3831>}Hebrews 13:11) or figuratively (^{<3012>}Titus 1:12). [*Therion*] is used also of the viper which fastened on Paul’s hand, and this has parallels in classic al Greek. Beasts of burden and beasts used for food were and are an important form of property, hence, [κτήνος, ktenos] (“possession”), the word used for the good Samaritan’s beast (^{<2178>}Luke 10:34) and for the beasts with which Lysias provided Paul for his journey to Caesarea (^{<423>}Acts 23:24). For “swift beast,” [kirkaroth], “dromedary” (^{<2761>}Isaiah 66:20 the King James Version), *see* **CAMEL**. For “swift beast,” rekhes, *see* **HORSE** (^{<3100>}Micah 1:13 the King James Version; ^{<1028>}1 Kings 4:28 the King James Version, margin; compare Est 8:10,14).

See also **WILD BEAST**.

Alfred Ely Day

BEAST-FIGHT

<best'-fit>.

See **GAMES**.

BEATEN GOLD

See **GOLD (BEATEN)**.

BEATEN OIL

See **OIL (BEATEN)**.

BEATING

<bet'-ing>.

See *PUNISHMENTS*.

BEATITUDES

<be-at'-i-tudes>:

1. THE NAME:

The word “beatitude” is not found in the English Bible, but the Latin *beatitudo*, from which it is derived, occurs in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) version of ^{<406>}Romans 4:6 where, with reference to ^{<401>}Psalms 32:1,2, David is said to pronounce the “beatitude” of the man whose transgressions are forgiven. In the Latin church *beatitudo* was used not only as an abstract term denoting blessedness, but in the secondary, concrete sense of a particular declaration of blessedness and especially of such a declaration coming from the lips of Jesus Christ. Beatitudes in this derivative meaning of the word occur frequently in the Old Testament, particularly in the Psalms (32:1,2; 41:1; 65:4, etc.), and Jesus on various occasions threw His utterances into this form (^{<406>}Matthew 11:6; 13:16; 16:17; 24:46, with the Lukan parallels; ^{<417>}John 13:17; 20:29). But apart from individual sayings of this type the name Beatitudes, ever since the days of Ambrose, has been attached specifically to those words of blessing with which, according to both Matthew and Luke, Jesus began that great discourse which is known as the Sermon on the Mount.

2. THE TWO GROUPS:

When we compare these Beatitudes as we find them in ^{<418>}Matthew 5:3-12 and ^{<419>}Luke 6:20-23 (24-26), we are immediately struck by the resemblances and differences between them. To the ordinary reader, most familiar with Matthew’s version, it is the differences that first present themselves; and he will be apt to account for the discrepancy of the two reports, as Augustine did, by assigning them to two distinct occasions in the Lord’s ministry. A careful comparative study of the two narratives, however, with some attention to the introductory circumstances in each case, to the whole progress of the discourses themselves, and to the parabolic sayings with which they conclude, makes this view improbable, and points rather to the conclusion that what we have to do with is two

varying versions given by the Evangelists of the material drawn from an underlying source consisting of Logia of Jesus. The differences, it must be admitted, are very marked.

(a) Matthew has 8 Beatitudes; Luke has 4, with 4 following Woes.

(b) In Matthew the sayings, except the last, are in the 3rd person; in Luke they are in the 2nd.

(c) In Matthew the blessings, except the last, are attached to spiritual qualities; in Luke to external conditions of poverty and suffering. Assuming that both Evangelists derived their reports from some common Logian source, the question arises as to which of them has adhered more closely to the original. The question is difficult, and still gives rise to quite contrary opinions. One set of scholars decides in favor of Matthew, and accounts for Luke's deviation from the Matthean version by ascribing to him, on very insufficient grounds, an ascetic bias by which he was led to impart a materialistic tone to the utterances of Jesus. Another set inclines to theory that Luke's version is the more literal of the two, while Matthew's partakes of the nature of a paraphrase. In support of this second view it may be pointed out that Luke is usually more careful than Matthew to place the sayings of Jesus in their original setting and to preserve them in their primitive form, and further that owing to the natural tendency of the sacred writers to expand and interpret rather than to abbreviate an inspired utterance, the shorter form of a saying is more likely to be the original one. It may be noted, further, that in ⁴⁰¹⁵¹Matthew 5:11,12 the Beatitude takes the direct form, which suggests that this may have been the form Matthew found in his source in the case of the others also. On the whole, then, probabilities appear to favor the view that Luke's version is the more literal one. It does not follow, however, that the difference between the two reports amounts to any real inconsistency. In Luke emphasis is laid on the fact that Jesus is addressing His disciples (6:20), so that it was not the poor as such whom He blessed, but His own disciples although they were poor. It was not poverty, hunger, sorrow or suffering in themselves to which He promised great rewards, but those experiences as coming to spiritual men and thus transformed into springs of spiritual blessing. And so when Matthew, setting down the Lord's words with a view to their universal application rather than with reference to the particular circumstances in which they were uttered, changes "the poor" into "the poor in spirit," and those that "hunger"

into those that “hunger and thirst after righteousness,” he is giving the real purport of the words of Jesus and recording them in the form in which by all men and through all coming time they may be read without any chance of misunderstanding.

As regards the Beatitudes of the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, which are given by Matthew only, they may have been spoken by Jesus at the same time as the rest and have been intended by Him in their association with the other four to fill out a conception of the ideal character of the members of the Kingdom of God. In view, however, of their omission from Luke’s list, it is impossible to affirm this with certainty. That they are all authentic utterances of Jesus Himself there is no reason to doubt. But they may have been originally scattered through the discourse itself, each in its own proper place. Thus the Beatitude of the meek would go fitly with ~~and~~ Luke 6:38 ff, that of the merciful with 6:43 ff, that of the pure in heart with 6:27 ff, that of the peacemakers with 6:23 ff. Or they may even have been uttered on other occasions than that of the Sermon on the Mount and have been gathered together by Matthew and placed at the head of the Sermon as forming along with the other four a suitable introduction to our Lord’s great discourse on the laws and principles of the Kingdom of God.

3. NUMBER, ARRANGEMENT, STRUCTURE:

With regard to the number of the Beatitudes in Matthew’s fuller version, some have counted 7 only, making the list end with ~~and~~ Matthew 5:9. But though the blessing pronounced on the persecuted in 5:10-12 differs from the preceding Beatitudes, both in departing from the aphoristic form and in attaching the blessing to an outward condition and not to a disposition of the heart, the parallel in Luke (6:22 f) justifies the view that this also is to be added to the list, thus making 8 Beatitudes in all. On the arrangement of the group much has been written, most of it fanciful and unconvincing. The first four have been described as negative and passive, the second four as positive and active. The first four, again, have been represented as pertaining to the desire for salvation, the second four as relating to its actual possession. Some writers have endeavored to trace in the group as a whole the steadily ascending stages in the development of the Christian character. The truth in this last suggestion lies in the reminder it brings that the Beatitudes are not to be thought of as setting forth separate types of Christian character, but as enumerating qualities and experiences that are

combined in the ideal character as conceived by Christ — and as exemplified, it may be added, in His own life and person.

In respect of their structure, the Beatitudes are all alike in associating the blessing with a promise — a promise which is sometimes represented as having an immediate realization (^{<00B>}Matthew 5:3,10), but in most cases has a future or even (compare ^{<00B2>}Matthew 5:12) an eschatological outlook. The declaration of blessedness, therefore, is based not only on the possession of the quality or experience described, but on the present or future rewards in which it issues. The poor in spirit are called blessed not merely because they are poor in spirit, but because the kingdom of heaven is theirs; the mourners because they shall be comforted; those that hunger and thirst after righteousness because they shall be filled; those who are persecuted because a great reward is laid up for them in heaven. The Beatitudes have often been criticized as holding up an ideal of which limitation, privation and self-renunciation are the essence, and which lacks those positive elements that are indispensable to any complete conception of blessedness. But when it is recognized that the blessing in every case rests on the associated promise, the criticism falls to the ground. Christ does demand of His followers a renunciation of many things that seem desirable to the natural heart, and a readiness to endure many other things from which men naturally shrink. But just as in His own case the great self-emptying was followed by the glorious exaltation (^{<00B6>}Philippians 2:6 ff), so in the case of His disciples spiritual poverty and the bearing of the cross carry with them the inheritance of the earth and a great reward in heaven.

LITERATURE.

Votaw in HDB, V, 14 ff; Adeney in Expositor, 5th series, II, 365 ff; Stanton, The Gospels as Historical Documents, II, 106 ff, 327 f; Gore, Sermon on the Mount, 15 ff; Dykes, Manifesto of the King, 25-200.

J. C. Lambert

BEAUTIFUL; GATE

^{<bu'-ti-fool>}, ^{<gat>}.

See TEMPLE.

BEAUTY

<bu'-ti>: The space allotted to this topic allows liberty only for the statement of two problems to students of the Bible. They should give distinct attention to the interblending of aesthetics with ethics in the Scripture. They should observe the extent and meaning of aesthetics in Nature.

1. AESTHETICS IN SCRIPTURE:

That the Bible is an ethical book is evident. Righteousness in all the relations of man as a moral being is the key to its inspiration, the guiding light to correct understanding of its utterance. But it is everywhere inspired and writ in an atmosphere of aesthetics. Study will bring out this fact from Genesis to Revelation. The first pair make their appearance in a garden where grew “every tree that is pleasant to the sight” (~~<GEN>~~Genesis 2:9), and the last vision for the race is an abode in a city whose gates are of pearl and streets of gold (~~<REV>~~Revelation 21:21). Such is the imagery that from beginning to end is pictured as the home of ethics — at first in its untried innocence and at last in its stalwart righteousness. The problem will be to observe the intermingling of these two elements — the beautiful and the good — in the whole Scripture range. A few texts will set before us this kinship and then the Bible student can detect it as he reads.

“One thing have I asked of Yahweh, that will I seek after: That I may dwell in the house of Yahweh all the days of my life, To behold the beauty of Yahweh, And to inquire in his temple” (~~<PSA>~~Psalm 27:4).

“For all the gods of the peoples are idols; But Yahweh made the heavens. Honor and majesty are before him: Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary” (~~<PSA>~~Psalm 96:5,6).

If we catch the spirit set forth in such and similar Psalms, we can use it as a magnetic needle to detect its like wherever we shall read: and we shall find that like in abundance. It is only necessary to turn to the directions given for making the Ark of the Covenant and its encircling tabernacle, and the decorations of the priests that were to minister in the worship of Yahweh in the ceremonies described, as given in Exodus 25 ff, to see that every resource of Israel was brought to bear to render ark and tabernacle and their service beautiful. One will find in a concordance half a column of

references under the word “Ark” and a column and a half under the word “Tabernacle.” By looking up these references one can realize how much care was spent to give and preserve to these aids to worship the attractiveness of beauty.

In 1 Chronicles 15 and 16 we have an account of David’s bringing in the Ark of the Covenant into his own city to rest in a tent he had provided for it. On this occasion a demonstration was made with all the aesthetics of which the music of that day was capable. “And David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren the singers, with instruments of music, psalteries and harps and cymbals, sounding aloud and lifting up the voice with joy.” And David himself gave to the celebration the aesthetics of one of the noblest of his psalms (~~1348~~ 1 Chronicles 16:8-36).

It is almost idle to refer to Solomon and his temple (1 Kings 6 ff; 2 Chronicles 3 ff). It is a common understanding that the civilization of Solomon’s day was drawn upon to its utmost in every department of aesthetics, in the building of that house for Yahweh and in the appointments for the worship there to be conducted. Beauty of form and color and harmony of sound were then and there integrated — made one — with worship in holiness. The propriety of that association has been seen and felt through the ages.

There is beauty in speech. It is a fact that the supreme classics in the literature of the tongues of two of the dominant nations of the earth, the English and the German, are translations of the Bible. There is no explanation of such fact except that the original justified the translations. You can read indifferently from one translation to the other and catch the same aesthetic gleam. Nobility and poetry of thought lay in what was to be translated. Here is proof that cannot be gainsaid that the Scripture authors sought the aid of aesthetics as garb for the ethics they taught. So they wrote in poetry. So they used allegory, illustration, figure, metaphor that would charm and hold. The parables of Jesus are examples of this method of clothing thought. They do their ethical work because they have swept into it figure and imagery from familiar aesthetic perceptions. “The sower went forth to sow” (~~4018~~ Matthew 13:3). That is a glad sight — always has been and always will be. That is why a picture of “The Sower” hangs on the walls of a Christian home. Just the painting — and every beholder remembers the parable and cannot forget its ethics. The intensity of thought concentrated upon ethics in the New Testament has drawn away

attention from the partnership between these two principles in religion. But it is there, and we shall see it when once we look for it.

It is something to which we do not wake up till late in life — to wit, the measurelessness of the provision in Nature for beauty. Common consent awards beauty to the rainbow.

2. AESTHETICS IN NATURE:

Reflect that every drop of water in the ocean, or in the hydrated rocks, or in the vapor floating over Saturn, has in it the possibility of rainbow coloring. In fact all matter has color of which the rainbow is only specimen. Any element incandescent has a spectrum partially coincident with that of water and ranging above and below it in the infinite capacity it has to start ether undulations. As apparently the larger part of the matter of the universe is incandescent, we can see that the field for expression in color is infinite. No one but the infinite God can see it all.

If we come down to this plain, plodding earth, cultivation of aesthetic sense will bring out beauty everywhere, from the grandeur of mountain scenery to aesthetic curves and colors revealed only by the microscope. We say the butterfly is beautiful. But the larva from which it is derived often carries as much beauty in mottling of color and of the fineness of finish of spine and mandible. Looking across the scale in this way the evidence of theism from beauty itself becomes convincing. Beauty becomes a messenger of and from God — as Iris was to the Greek and the rainbow to the Hebrew (~~2011~~ Ecclesiastes 3:11).

This from Amiel's *Journal Intime*, 1, 233, sets forth the radical, inexpugnable position of beauty in Nature and in philosophy thereof correctly interpretative: "To the materialist philosopher the beautiful is a mere accident, and therefore rare. To the spiritualist philosopher the beautiful is the rule, the law, the universal foundation of things, to which every form returns as soon as the force of accident is withdrawn."

As we accustom ourselves to make larger and larger synthesis in the department of aesthetics, what diapason of theistic message may we not hear? Beauty wherever and however expressed is a medium of revelation. It is a bush ever burning, never consumed. Before it "put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."

That beauty should be — to that intent, for that end, from everlasting hath wrought the Ancient of Days.

C. Caverno

BEAUTY AND BANDS

<bu'-ti>, *<bandz>* (μ[¹¹⁰no`am], and μyl b] ¹¹⁰chobhelim]): The names given in ^{<810>}Zechariah 11:7,14 to two symbolical staves, the first signifying Yahweh's covenant of grace with the peoples, and the second representing the brotherhood of Judah and Israel. The breaking of the two staves is symbolic of the breaking of Yahweh's covenant and of the union between Judah and Israel.

BEBAI

<be'-ba-i>, *<beb'-a-i>* (yb" Be¹¹⁰bebhay]; Septuagint [Βηβαί, Bebai], “fatherly”):

(1) Descendants of B: returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (^{<1381>}Ezra 8:11 called Babi; 1 Esdras 8:37); one of these is Zechariah, the son of Bebai (^{<1381>}Ezra 8:11, Zaeharias; 1 Esdras 8:37). 623 returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (^{<1381>}Ezra 2:11; 1 Esdras 5:13; ^{<1376>}Nehemiah 7:16 gives the number 628); some of these had married “strange wives” (^{<1308>}Ezra 10:28; 1 Esdras 9:29).

(2) A chief of the people who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1305>}Nehemiah 10:15).

(3) An unknown town (Judith 15:4). Omitted in Codex Vaticanus and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

BECAUSE

<be-kos'> ([¹¹⁰α, hina], “in order that”): “The multitude rebuked them, because (AV; the Revised Version (British and American) “that”) they should hold their peace” (^{<1381>}Matthew 20:31).

BECHER

<be'-ker> (rkB,[bekher], “the firstborn”; compare HPN, 88):

(1) Son of Benjamin (~~<0462>~~Genesis 46:21; ~~<1306>~~1 Chronicles 7:6,8).

(2) Son of Ephraim whose family is called Becherites (the King James Version “Bachrites”), ~~<0455>~~Numbers 26:35 (~~<1302>~~1 Chronicles 7:20 called Bered). Compare *BERED*.

BECHORATH

<be-kor’-ath>.

See *BECORATH*.

BECK; BECKON

<bek>, *<bek’-’-n>* ([~~<ve0μa>~~, neuma]): This word from [*neuo*], “to nod,” “beckon,” “make a sign” by moving the head or eyes (~~<0487>~~Luke 5:7; ~~<0134>~~John 13:24; ~~<0244>~~Acts 21:40; 24:10), occurs only in 2 Macc 8:18, “Almighty God who at a beck can cast down both them that come against us, and also all the world,” the Revised Version (British and American), “able at a beck.” So Shak, “troops of soldiers at their beck”; “nod” is now generally used.

BECOME

<be-kum’>:

(1) Greek [*ginomai*], used in New Testament for a change of state, corresponding to Hebrew [*hayah*] of Old Testament. Compare ~~<0488>~~Matthew 18:3 with ~~<0579>~~Deuteronomy 27:9.

(2) For what is fitting, suitable, proper, in New Testament: “prepei” (~~<0485>~~Matthew 3:15; ~~<0488>~~Ephesians 5:3; ~~<0420>~~1 Timothy 2:10); in Old Testament, *hwaḡ*: [na’awah], *han*: [na’ah], ~~<0985>~~Psalms 93:5: “Holiness becometh thy house.” in this sense, the adverb “becomingly” must be interpreted: “Walk becomingly toward them that are without” (1 Thess 4:12), i.e. in a way that is consistent with your profession.

BECORATH

<be-ko’-rath> (~~<trwQB>~~[bekhorath], “the first birth”; the King James Version Bechorath): A forefather of Saul of the tribe of Benjamin (~~<0901>~~1 Samuel 9:1).

BECTILETH

<bek'-ti-leth> ([τὸ πεδίον Βαικτηιλαίθ, to pedion Baikteilaith]): A plain which is defined as “near the mountain which is at the left hand of the upper Cilicia” (Judith 2:21). The name in Syriac is Beth QeTilath, “house of slaughter.” So far there is no clue to its identification.

BED; BEDCHAMBER; BEDSTEAD

For the very poor of the East, in ancient times as now, the “bed” was and is, as a rule, the bare ground; and the bedclothes, the gown, [*simlah*], or “outer garment,” worn during the day (“For that is his only covering, it is his garment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep?” (^{<1227>}Exodus 22:27); compare ^{<1243>}Deuteronomy 24:13, “Thou shalt surely restore to him the pledge when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his garment”).

When one was on a journey, or watching his flock by night as a shepherd, such a “bed” was the most natural, and often a stone would serve as a pillow. (See ^{<1281>}Genesis 28:11, where Jacob “took one of the stones of the place, and put it under his head, and lay down in that place to sleep.”)

An advance on this custom, which came in due course of time, or under change of circumstances, was the use of a mat on the floor as a bed, with or without covering. At first it was literally laid on the floor, which was generally of one common level, in some convenient place near the wall; but later it was put on an elevation, either a raised part of the floor on one side, or a bedstead, which gave rise to the expression “going up to the bed” (compare ^{<1443>}Genesis 49:33 English Versions of the Bible, “He gathered up his feet into the bed,” and ^{<1418>}Psalms 132:3, “go up into my bed”).

1. OLD TESTAMENT TERMS FOR BED, AND SLEEPING CUSTOMS OF THE HEBREWS:

With a later development and civilization, “beds” came to be built upon supports and constructed in different forms, which fact is reflected in the variety of names given the “bed” in the Hebrew and related languages.

(1) The following Hebrew words are used in the Bible for “bed,” and, though it is impossible at this remove of time and place and custom to differentiate them sharply, they will repay study: **hFmi**[miTTah]

(^{<1482>}Genesis 48:2, “And Israel strengthened himself and sat upon the bed”;

Exodus 8:3, “frogs shall come into thy bedchamber, and upon thy bed”); **bKvini** [mishkabh], compare (Genesis 49:4, Jacob to Reuben: “Because thou wentest up to thy father’s bed; then defiledst thou it”); **crĕ** [ĕres] (Proverbs 7:16, the “strange woman” says: “I have spread my couch with carpets of tapestry”; compare Psalm 41:3, “Thou makest all his bed in his sickness”); **[Xm]** [matstva] (once only, Isaiah 28:20, “For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it”); and **[Wxy]** [yetsua] (Job 17:13, “I have spread my couch in the darkness”; 1 Chronicles 5:1, “He defiled his father’s couch”; compare Genesis 49:4 where the same “father’s bed” is [mishkabh]; Psalm 63:6, “when I remember thee upon my bed”; Psalm 132:3, “nor go up into my bed”).

(2) It is a far cry from the simple sleeping customs of Deuteronomy 24:13 to the luxurious arts and customs of the post-exilic days, when beds of fine wood and ivory are found in use among the Hebrews, as well as pillows of the most costly materials elaborately embroidered (see Judith 10:21; Est 1:6; compare Song 3:10); but it all came about as a natural, as well as artificial development, with changed conditions and contacts and increasing civilization and luxury. As marking the several stages of that development, we find pictures of the poor, first sleeping upon the ground without mat or mattress, then in a single sleeping-room for the whole family, often without a separate bed, then with “beds” that were simply wadded quilts, or thin mattresses, and mats for keeping them off the ground; then with still better “beds” laid upon light portable, wooden frames, or upon more elevated bedsteads (compare Psalm 132:3 and Mark 4:21 the Revised Version (British and American) “under the bed”). The degree of richness depended, of course, upon time and place, in a measure, but more upon the wealth and station of the family and the style of the house or tent in which they lived, as it does even with the Bedouin of today. The prophet Amos gives a vivid and significant picture of the luxury of certain children of Israel, “that sit in Samaria in the corner of a couch, and on the silken cushions of a bed” (Amos 3:12); and of certain children of luxury “that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief oils; but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph” (Amos 6:4-6; compare Revelation 18:10-13).

(3) We find that the poor, while sleeping for the most part in their ordinary clothing, often, in cold weather, made their beds of the skins of animals, old cloaks, or rugs, as they do still in the East. The “beds” and “bedding” now in ordinary use among Orientals are much the same, we may be sure, as they were in olden times. “Bedsteads” of any pretention were and are rare among the common people; but the richness of “beds” and “bedsteads” among Asiatics of wealth and rank was quite equal to that of the Greeks and Romans (compare ^{<0176>}Proverbs 7:16,17, “I have spread my couch with carpets of tapestry, with striped cloths of the yarn of Egypt. I have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon”); Song 1:16,17: “The beams of our house are cedars, and our rafters are firs also our couch is green.” Compare the “palanquin” of Solomon, “of the wood of Lebanon,” “the pillars thereof of silver,” “the bottom of gold,” and “the seat of purple” (3:9,10).

(4) As soon as any family could afford it, a special bedroom would be set apart, and the whole family would sleep in it (see ^{<0176>}Luke 11:5-8, “My children are with me in bed”). When the house had two stories the upper story was used for sleeping, or, during very hot weather, preferably the roof, or the room on the roof. *See HOUSE*. When morning came the “bed,” a wadded quilt or mattress, used with or without covering according to the season, was rolled up, aired and sunned, and then put aside on the raised platform, or packed away in a chest or closet.

The words [mishkabh] and [miTTah] came to have a figurative meaning signifying the final resting-place; and [˘eres] used of the “bedstead” of the King of Og (^{<0176>}Deuteronomy 3:11) is thought by some to mean his sarcophagus (Benzinger, Hebrew Arch., 123; Nowack, I, 143). ^{<0176>}Genesis 47:31, “And Israel bowed himself upon the bed’s head” is not rightly rendered (*see STAFF*, and Crit. Commentary in the place cited.).

2. NEW TESTAMENT TERMS FOR BED, THEIR MEANING, ETC.:

(1) We find several Greek words, [κλίνη, kline], [κράββατος, krabbatos], and [κοίτη, koitte], used in the New Testament somewhat indiscriminately and rendered English Versions of the Bible by “bed,” “couch,” etc.; but, as with the Hebrew words noted, there is little to indicate just exactly what they severally stand for, or how they are related to the Hebrew terms rendered “bed” or “couch” in the Old Testament. Of

one thing we can be sure, reasoning from what we know of “the unchanging East,” the “beds” and sleeping customs of the Hebrews in Christ’s time were in the main about what they were in later Old Testament times.

(2) An interesting case for study is that of the man “sick of the palsy” whom they brought to Jesus “lying on a bed,” and who when healed “took up the bed, and went forth before them all” (^{<400>}Matthew 9:2,6; ^{<400>}Mark 2:4,12; ^{<415>}Luke 5:18,19; compare ^{<415>}John 5:8-12). Here the “bed” on which the sick of the palsy lay was let down from the housetop “through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus” (^{<415>}Luke 5:18,19); and when the man was healed Jesus commanded him, as Luke says, to “take up (his) couch and go unto (his) house ,” and he “took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his house, glorifying God” (^{<415>}Luke 5:24,25). It seems, therefore, that this “bed” was a “pallet” and “couch” combined, a thin mattress upon a light portable frame, such as we have already seen was in use among the ancients. Another kindred case was that of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda (^{<415>}John 5:2 ff) whom Jesus healed and commanded to “take up his bed and walk,” and he “took up his bed and walked”; only in this case the “bed” is a “pallet” without the frame, it would seem.

(3) Jesus in His teaching (^{<400>}Mark 4:21; compare ^{<415>}Luke 8:16) asks, in language which is significant in this connection: “Is the lamp brought to be put under the bed?” (^{<415>}Luke 8:16: “No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bell”). Here, clearly, “the bed” is the “bedstead,” bedclothes, draperies and all, under which “the lamp” would be obscured and hindered in its function of “giving light to all in the room.” Again (^{<415>}Luke 17:34) Jesus says, “In that night there shall be two men on one bed,” which is incidental evidence that the “beds” of that day were not all “pallets” or “couches” for one only (compare ^{<415>}Luke 11:7, “My children are with me in bed”; Song 1:16; 3:10; ^{<415>}Proverbs 7:16,18).

(4) For figurative use in the prophets (e.g. ^{<427>}Ezekiel 23:17) and in the New Testament (e.g. “Let the bed be undefiled,” ^{<810>}Hebrews 13:4), see commentaries in the place cited

George B. Eager

BEDAD

<be'-dad> (**ddB**) [bedhadh], “alone”): Father of Hadad, king of Edom “before there reigned any king over the children of Israel” (^{<035>}Genesis 36:35; ^{<146>}1 Chronicles 1:46).

BEDAN

<be'-dan> (**dB**) [bedhan], “son of judgment” (?):

(1) One of the leaders in Israel who with Jerubbaal, Jephthah and Samuel is mentioned as a deliverer of the nation (^{<21>}1 Samuel 12:11). The text is questioned because the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic read “Barak” instead.

(2) A son of Ulam of the house of Manasseh (^{<17>}1 Chronicles 7:17).

BEDCHAMBER

<bed'-cham-ber>.

See BED.

BEDEIAH

<be-de'-ya> (**hyd** **Bē**) [bedheydh], “servant of Yah”): A son of Bani who had married a “strange wife” (^{<35>}Ezra 10:35).

BEDSTEAD

<bed'-stead>.

See BED.

BEE

<be> (**hrwDD**) [debhorah]; compare Arabic dabr, “a swarm of bees,” also Arabic debbur, “a wasp,” said to be a corruption of zunbur, “a wasp”; all are apparently from the Hebrew [dabhar], “to speak,” “arrange,” “lead,” “follow,” or from Arabic dabara, “follow” (compare Arabic dabbara, “arrange”), though the connection in meaning is not apparent): Honey is

mentioned many times in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, but the word “bee” occurs only four times, and only one of the four times in connection with honey in the story of Samson (^{<0748>}Judges 14:8). Both wild and domesticated bees are found today in Palestine, but it is not clear that bees were kept in Bible times, although it would seem very probable. The frequently recurring phrase, “a land flowing with milk and honey,” certainly suggests that the honey as well as the milk is a domestic product. The hives now in use are very primitive and wasteful as compared with hives that are made in Europe and America. Sometimes a large water jar is used. More frequently a cylinder about 3 or 4 ft. long and 6 inches in diameter is constructed of mulberry withes plaited together and plastered with mud or cow dung. A number of these cylinders are placed horizontally, being piled up together under some rude structure which serves as a protection from the direct rays of the sun. In the passage already cited it is related that Samson found a swarm of bees and honey in the carcass of the lion which he had killed on his previous visit. We are not told how much time had intervened, but it does not take long in the dry climate of Palestine for scavenging beasts and insects to strip the flesh from the bones and make the skeleton a possible home for a swarm of bees. The other three passages refer to the offensive power of bees. In ^{<0844>}Deuteronomy 1:44, in the speech of Moses he says, “The Amorites chased you, as bees do”; in ^{<1882>}Psalms 118:12, the psalmist says, “They compassed me about like bees”; in ^{<2078>}Isaiah 7:18, the bee is the type of the chastisement that the Lord will bring from the land of Assyria.

Alfred Ely Day

BEEF

<bef>.

See CATTLE.

BEELIADA

<be-e-li'-a-da> ([**dyl** [**B**] [be`elyadha`], “the Lord knows”; ELIADA, which see; compare HPN, 144, 192, note 1, 202): A son of David (^{<1347>}1 Chronicles 14:7).

BEELSARUS

<be-el'-sa-rus>, <be-el-sa'-rus> ([Βεελσάρως, Beelsaros]): One who accompanied Zerubbabel in the return from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:8), called Bilshan in ^{<1910>}Ezra 2:2 and ^{<1600>}Nehemiah 7:7.

BEELTETHMUS

<be-el-teth'-mus> ([Βεέλτεθμος, Beeltethmos]; Balthemus): One of the officers of King Artaxerxes in Palestine (1 Esdras 2:16,25). According to Professor Sayce, the name by etymology means “lord of official intelligence” or “postmaster.” Rendered “chancellor” in ^{<1908>}Ezra 4:8 and “story-writer” in 1 Esdras 2:17.

BEELZEBUB

<be-el'-ze-bub> (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) is an error (after the Vulgate) for Beelzebul (Revised Version margin) [Βεελζεβούλ, Beelzeboul]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, [Βεεζεβούλ, Beezeboul]): In the time of Christ this was the current name for the chief or prince of demons, and was identified with **SATAN** (which see) and the **DEVIL** (which see). The Jews committed the unpardonable sin of ascribing Christ's work of casting out demons to Beelzebul, thus ascribing to the worst source the supreme manifestation of goodness (^{<1905>}Matthew 10:25; 12:24,27; ^{<1872>}Mark 3:22; ^{<2115>}Luke 11:15,18,19). There can be little doubt that it is the same name as **BAALZEBUB** (which see). It is a well-known phenomenon in the history of religions that the gods of one nation become the devils of its neighbors and enemies. When the Aryans divided into Indians and Iranians, the Devas remained gods for the Indians, but became devils (daevas) for the Iranians, while the Ahuras remained gods for the Iranians and became devils (asuras) for the Indians. Why Baalzebub became Beelzebul, why the b changed into l, is a matter of conjecture. It may have been an accident of popular pronunciation, or a conscious perversion (Beelzebul in Syriac = “lord of dung”), or Old Testament [zebhubh] may have been a perversion, accidental or intentional of [zebhu] (= “house”), so that Baalzebul meant “lord of the house.” These are the chief theories offered (Cheyne in EB; Barton in Hastings, ERE).

T. Rees

BEER

<be'-er> (**raḅ**) [be'er]; [φρέαρ, phrear]; Latin puteus = “well”):

(1) A station on the march of the Israelites to the North of the Arnon (^{<0216>}Numbers 21:16). Here it was that they sang round the well this song:

Spring up O well; greet it with song, Well, that the princes have dug,
The nobles of the people have bored, With the scepter — with their staves' (^{<0216>}Numbers 21:16 ff).

The place is not identified.

(2) The town to which Jotham fled from his brother Abimelech after declaring his parable from Mt. Gerizim (^{<0721>}Judges 9:21). This may be identical with **BEEROTH**, which see.

BEERA

<be-e'-ra>, <be'-er-a> (**araḅi**) [be'era'], “expounder”): A descendant of Asher (^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 7:37).

BEERAH

<be-e'-ra>, <be'-er-a> (**hraḅi**) [be'erah]; “expounder”): A prince of the house of Reuben whom Tiglath-pileser carried away captive (^{<1386>}1 Chronicles 5:6). Compare ^{<2159>}2 Kings 15:29; 16:7.

BEER-ELIM

<be-er-e'-lim> (**ḡl̄ ḡeraḅ**) [be'er 'elim]; [φρέαρ τοῦ ἱλείμ, phrear tou Aileim], literally “well of Elim”): Probably lay to the North of Moab, answering to Eglaim in the South (^{<2358>}Isaiah 15:8). It may possibly be identical with **BEER** (1); but there is no certainty.

BEERI

<be-e'-ri> (**yraḅi**) [be'eri], “expounder”):

(1) Father of Judith, one of Esau's wives (^{<0254>}Genesis 26:34).

(2) The father of the prophet Hosea (~~2006~~Hosea 1:1).

BEER-LAHAI-ROI

<be-er-la-hi'-roi>, <be-er-la-hi-ro'-i> (yāroqj " l " raḅ)[be'er lachai ro'i], "well of the Living One that seeth me"): "A fountain of water in the wilderness," "the fountain in the way to Shur" (~~0167~~Genesis 16:7-14). It was the scene of Hagar's theophany, and here Isaac dwelt for some time (~~0167~~Genesis 16:7 f; 24:62; 25:11). The site is in The Negeb between Kadesh and Bered (~~0164~~Genesis 16:14). Rowland identifies the well with the modern `Ain Moilaihhi, circa 50 miles South of Beersheba and 12 miles West of `Ain Kadis. Cheyne thinks that Hagar's native country, to which she was fleeing and from which she took a wife for Ishmael, was not Egypt (mitsrayim), but a north Arabian district called by the Assyrians Mucri (Encyclopedia Biblica).

S. F. Hunter

BEEROTH

<be-e'-roth>, <be'-er-oth> (twōaḅ)[be'eroth]; [Βηρώθ, Beroth]): One of the cities of the Canaanites whose inhabitants succeeded in deceiving Israel, and in making a covenant with them (~~0698~~Joshua 9:3 ff). Apparently they were Hivites (~~0697~~Joshua 9:7). The occasion on which the Beerothites fled to Gittaim where they preserved their communal identity is not indicated. The town was reckoned to Benjamin (~~0042~~2 Samuel 4:2 f). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it under Gibeon, 7 Roman miles from Jerusalem on the way to Nicopolis (Amwas). If we follow the old road by way of Gibeon (el-Jib) and Bethhoron, Beeroth would lie probably to the Northwest of el-Jib. The traditional identification is with el-Bireh, about 8 miles from Jerusalem on the great north road. If the order in which the towns are mentioned (~~0697~~Joshua 9:17; 18:25) is any guide as to position, el-Bireh is too far to the Northwest. The identification is precarious. To Beeroth belonged the murderers of Ish-bosheth (~~0042~~2 Samuel 4:2), and Naharai, Joab's armor-bearer (~~0037~~2 Samuel 23:37; ~~1313~~1 Chronicles 11:39). It was reoccupied after the Exile (~~1525~~Ezra 2:25; ~~1672~~Nehemiah 7:29).

W. Ewing

BEEROTH BENE-JAAKAN

<ben'-e-ja'-a-kan> (^q[y'rnB]traB)[be'eroth bene ya`aqan]; the Revised Version, margin “the wells of the children of Jaakan”: A desert camp of the Israelites mentioned before Moserah (¹⁵⁰⁶Deuteronomy 10:6). In ¹⁴³¹Numbers 33:31,32 the name is given simply “Bene-jaakan,” and the situation after Moseroth.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

BEEROTHITE; BEROTHITE

<be-e'-roth-it>, <be'-er-oth-it> (y^twⁱ0aB)[be'erothi]; ¹⁰⁴⁵2 Samuel 4:5,9; ¹⁰³⁷2 Samuel 23:37; shortened form, ¹³¹³1 Chronicles 11:39).

See BEEROTH.

BEERSHEBA

<be-er-she'-ba> ([b" v,raB][be'er shebha`]; [Bηρσαβέε, Bersabee]): Allotted originally to Simeon (¹⁶⁹²Joshua 19:2), one of “the uttermost cities of the tribe of the children of Judah” (¹⁶⁵⁸Joshua 15:28).

1. THE MEANING OF THE NAME:

The most probable meaning of Beersheba is the “well of seven.” “Seven wells” is improbable on etymological grounds; the numeral should in that case be first. In ¹²¹³Genesis 21:31 Abraham and Abimelech took an oath of witness that the former had dug the well and seven ewe lambs were offered in sacrifice, “Wherefore he called that place Beer-sheba; because there they swore both of them.” Here the name is ascribed to the Hebrew root [b" V;[shabha`], “to swear,” but this same root is connected with the idea of seven, seven victims being offered and to take an oath, meaning “to come under the influence of seven.”

Another account is given (¹²²³Genesis 26:23-33), where Isaac takes an oath and just afterward, “the same day Isaac’s servants came, and told him concerning the well which they had digged (dug), and said unto him, We have found water. And he called it Shibah: therefore the name of the city is Beer-sheba unto this day.”

2. A SACRED SHRINE:

Beersheba was a sacred shrine. “Abraham planted a tamarisk tree in Beersheba, and called there on the name of Yahweh, the Everlasting God” Genesis (21:33). Theophanies occurred there to Hagar (21:17), to Isaac (26:24), to Jacob (46:2), and to Elijah (^{<1195>}1 Kings 19:5). By Amos (5:5) it is classed with Bethel and Gilgal as one of the rival shrines to the pure worship of Yahweh, and in another place (8:14) he writes “They shall fall, and never rise up again,” who swear, “As the way (i.e. cult) of Beersheba liveth.” The two unworthy sons of Samuel were Judges in Beersheba (^{<988>}1 Samuel 8:2) and Zibiah, mother of King Jehoash, was born there (^{<1271>}2 Kings 12:1; ^{<1401>}2 Chronicles 24:1).

3. ITS POSITION:

Geographically Beersheba marked the southern limit of Judah, though theoretically this extended to the “river of Egypt” (^{<0158>}Genesis 15:18) — the modern [Wady el`Avish] — 60 miles farther south. It was the extreme border of the cultivated land. From Daniel to Beersheba (^{<1071>}2 Samuel 17:11, etc.) or from Beersheba to Daniel (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 21:2; ^{<1415>}2 Chronicles 30:5) were the proverbial expressions, though necessarily altered through the changed conditions in later years to “from Geba to Beer-sheba” (^{<1238>}2 Kings 23:8) or “from Beer-sheba to the hill-country of Ephraim” (^{<1494>}2 Chronicles 19:4).

4. MODERN BEERSHEBA:

Today Beersheba is Bir es-Seba` in the Wady es Seba`, 28 miles Southwest of Hebron on “the southern border of a vast rolling plain broken by the torrent beds of Wady Khalil and Wady Seba” (Robinson). The plain is treeless but is covered by verdure in the spring; it is dry and monotonous most of the year. Within the last few years this long-deserted spot — a wide stretch of shapeless ruins, the haunt of the lawless Bedouin — has been re-occupied; the Turks have stationed there an enlightened [Kaimerkhan] (subgovernor); government offices and shops have been built; wells have been cleared, and there is now an abundant water supply pumped even to the separate houses. Robinson (BW, XVII, 247 ff) has described how he found seven ancient wells there — probably still more will yet be found. The whole neighborhood is strewn with the ruins of the Byzantine city which once flourished there; it was an episcopal see. It is probable that the city of Old Testament times stood where [Tell es Seba’]

now is, some 2 1/2 miles to the East; from the summit a commanding view can be obtained (PEF, III, 394, Sheet XXIV).

E. W. G. Masterman

BEESHTERAH

<*be-esh'-te-ra*> (^{<R27>}Joshua 21:27).

See ASHTAROTH.

BEETLE

<*be'-t'-l*> (the Revised Version (British and American) CRICKET;
 I Grj " [chargol]; *See LOCUST*): This name occurs only in ^{<R12>}Leviticus 11:22 as one of four winged Jumping insects ([sherets ha-`oph]) which may be eaten. It certainly is not a beetle and is probably not a cricket. Probably all four are names of locusts, of which more than 30 species have been described from Syria and Palestine, and for which there are at least 8 Arabic names in use, though with little distinction of species. Closely allied to [chargol] are the Arabic charjalet, a troop of horses or a flight of locusts, from [charjal], "to gallop," and [harjawan], "a wingless locust."

Alfred Ely Day

BEEVES

<*bevs*> (^{<R22>}Leviticus 22:21 the King James Version).

See CATTLE.

BEFORE

<*be-for'*>: The translation of a great variety of Hebrew and Greek words. "Haran died before (the English Revised Version "in the presence of," literally "before the face of") his father Terah" (^{<R12>}Genesis 11:28). To be "before" God is to enjoy His favor (^{<R22>}Psalms 31:22). "The Syrians before" (^{<R12>}Isaiah 9:12 the Revised Version, margin "on the east," as "behind," owing to the position of Canaan, relative to Syria, implies the west).

BEG; BEGGAR; BEGGING

1. NO LAW CONCERNING BEGGARS OR BEGGING IN ISRAEL:

It is significant that the Mosaic law contains no enactment concerning beggars, or begging, though it makes ample provision for the relief and care of “the poor in the land.” Biblical Hebrew seems to have no term for professional begging, the nearest approach to it being the expressions “to ask (or seek) bread” and “to wander.” This omission certainly is not accidental; it comports with the very nature of the Mosaic law, the spirit of which is breathed in this, among other kindred provisions, that a poor Hebrew who even sold himself for debt to his wealthy brother was allowed to serve him only until the Jubilee (*See JUBILEE*), and his master was forbidden to treat him as a slave (^{<1873>}Leviticus 25:39). These laws, as far as actually practiced, have always virtually done away with beggars and begging among the Jews.

2. BEGGING NOT UNKNOWN TO THE ANCIENT JEWS:

Begging, however, came to be known to the Jews in the course of time with the development of the larger cities, either as occurring among themselves, or among neighboring or intermingling peoples, as may be inferred from ^{<1895>}Psalm 59:15; compare 109:10, where Yahweh is besought that the children of the wicked may be cursed with beggary, in contradistinction to the children of the righteous, who have never had to ask bread (^{<1875>}Psalm 37:25, “I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed asking (English Versions, “begging”) bread.” For the Hebrew expression corresponding to “begging” see ^{<1895>}Psalm 59:15, “They shall wander up and down for food”; and compare ^{<1890>}Psalm 119:10, “Let me not wander,” etc.

3. BEGGING AND ALMS-TAKING DENOUNCED IN JEWISH LITERATURE:

The first clear denunciation of beggary and almstaking in Jewish literature is found in Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 40:28-30, where the Hebrew for “begging” is to “wander,” etc, as in ^{<1895>}Psalm 59:15, according to the edition of Cowley and Neubauer; Oxford, 1897. There as well as in Tobit, and in the New Testament, where beggars are specifically mentioned, the word [*eleemosune*] has assumed the special sense of alms given to the

begging poor (compare Tobit 4:7,16,17; 12:8-11; Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 3:14,30; 7:10; 16:14; ~~<40B>~~ Matthew 6:2-4; 20:30-34; ~~<4106>~~ Mark 10:46-52; ~~<2141>~~ Luke 11:41; 12:33; ~~<4001>~~ John 9:1-41; ~~<4028>~~ Acts 9:36; 10:2,4,31; 24:17).

4. PROFESSIONAL BEGGARS A DESPISED CLASS:

As to professional beggars, originally, certainly, and for a long time, they were a despised class among the Hebrews; and the Jewish communities are forbidden to support them from the general charity fund (BB, 9a; Yoreh De`ah, 250, 3). But the spirit of the law is evinced again in that it is likewise forbidden to drive a beggar away without an alms ([ha-Yadh ha-Chazaqah], in the place cited 7 7).

5. IN THE GOSPEL AGE:

Begging was well known and beggars formed a considerable class in the gospel age. Proof of this is found in the references to almsgiving in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5 through 7 and parallels), and in the accounts of beggars in connection with public places, e.g. the entrance to Jericho. (~~<4001>~~ Matthew 20:30 and parallels), which was a gateway to pilgrims going up to Jerusalem to the great festivals and in the neighborhood of rich men's houses (~~<2161>~~ Luke 16:20), and especially the gates of the Temple at Jerusalem (~~<4002>~~ Acts 3:2). This prevalence of begging was due largely to the want of any adequate system of ministering relief, to the lack of any true medical science and the resulting ignorance of remedies for common diseases like ophthalmia, for instance, and to the impoverishment of the land under the excessive taxation of the Roman government (Hausrath, History of New Testament Times, I, 188 (Eng. translation Williams and Norgate), compare Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, II, 178). That begging was looked down upon is incidentally evidenced by the remark of the unjust steward, "To beg I am ashamed" (~~<2163>~~ Luke 16:3); and that, when associated with indolence, it was strongly condemned by public opinion appears from Sirach (40:28-30).

The words used for "beg," "beggar" of English Versions of the Bible in the New Testament differ radically in idea: in those formed from [*aiteo*] (~~<4106>~~ Mark 10:46; ~~<2163>~~ Luke 16:3; 18:35; ~~<4008>~~ John 9:8 the Revised Version (British and American)) the root idea is that of "asking," while [*ptochos*] (~~<2161>~~ Luke 16:20,22) suggests the cringing or crouching of a beggar. But see ~~<4008>~~ Matthew 5:3 where the word for "humble" is [*ptochos*].

6. A CHANGE IN MODERN TIMES:

A marked change has come over Jewish life in modern times, in this as well as in other respect. Since the 17th century the Jewish poor in many parts of the world have made it a practice, especially on Fridays and on the eves of certain festivals, to go systematically from house to house asking alms. In parts of Europe today it is a full-grown abuse: crowds of Jewish beggars push their way and ply their trade about the synagogue doors (Abrahams, EB, article “Alms,” 310). So the Jewish beggar, in spite of the spirit of the law and ancient Jewish custom, has, under modern conditions too well known to require explanation here, become a troublesome figure and problem in modern Jewish society. For such beggars and begging, see Jew Encyclopedia, articles “Schnorrers,” “Alms,” etc., and for another kind of begging among modern Jews, and collections for poverty-stricken Jewish settlers in Palestine, see the articles “Chalukah,” “Charity,” etc.

LITERATURE.

Saalschiutz, Arch. der Hebraer, II, chapter xviii (Konigsberg, 1855-56); Riehm Handwörterbuch zu den Büchern des A T, under the word “Almosen “; compare Jew Encyclopedia, HDB, and Encyclopedia B, arts, “Alms”; and Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, chapters xvii, xviii (Philadelphia, 1896); Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs; Day, The Social Life of the Hebrews.

George B. Eager

BEGGARLY

<beg'-er-li> ([πτωχός, ptochos]): The word has the thought of “to crouch” or “cringe,” such as is common with professional beggars. It is used in <HB> Matthew 5:3 and <HB> Galatians 4:9, and in both cases means complete spiritual destitution. As used in Galatians it expresses the contrast between their present condition and the former estate, toward which he says they are again tending. Paul has in mind both the Jewish and heathen systems of religion with all their outward show. He therefore here emphasizes the immeasurable superiority of the riches and liberty in Christ. He further expresses this same thought of the law in <HB> Romans 8:3 and <HB> Hebrews 7:18. In view of the wretchedness of the condition indicated by the word “beggarly,” he states his astonishment that they should so little

appreciate the liberty and riches which they now enjoy as even to think of going back to the former condition.

Jacob W. Kapp

BEGIN

<be-gin'>: To make the first movement toward a given end (| l " j ; [chalal]; [ἄρχομαι, archomai]). Those who interpret it in many passages pleonastically mean by this, that in such passages as “began to teach” or “began to speak,” nothing more is intended than to express vividly and graphically the thought of the dependent infinitive. <4047> Matthew 4:17; <4023> Luke 3:23; <4000> Acts 1:1 are so understood. For contrary opinion, see Thayer’s Lexicon and Winer’s Grammar of New Testament Greek. The noun, [ἀρχή, arche], “beginning,” in the writings of John, is used sometimes in an abstract sense, to designate a previous stage (<4000> John 1:1,2; 8:25; <4000> 1 John 1:1; 3:8) and, sometimes, the Source or First Cause (<4084> Revelation 3:14; 21:6; 22:13). Often used also, not for the absolute beginning, but, relatively, for the starting-point of some important movement (<4007> 1 John 2:7,24; <4115> Acts 11:15; <4015> Philippians 4:15).

H.E. Jacobs

BEGINNING

<be-gin'-ing> (tyvare' -shith); [ἀρχή, arche]): The natural meaning of the word is with reference to time. The primitive Greek root means “to be long,” “to draw out.” Thus, it is used to refer to some point of time long drawn out, or long past (<0000> Genesis 1:1). It is used also to express the inauguration of a particular event (<0020> Exodus 12:2). The principal interest in the word centers in the use of it in <4000> John 1:1. It must be interpreted here by that which follows in the statement as to the relation of the Logos to the Eternal God and the use of the word “was.” It is true that the word [arche] cannot be separated from the idea of time, but when time began He already was, and therefore He was from eternity.

See TIME; ETERNITY.

Figurative: in a figurative sense it is used of that which is most excellent, the chief part (<2000> Proverbs 1:7); of the most eminent person (<4018> Colossians 1:18); the author (<4084> Revelation 3:14).

BEGOTTEN

<be-got'-n> (dl " y:[yaladh]; “to bear,” “bring forth,” “beget”; denotes the physical relation of either parent to a child, ^{<0016>}Genesis 3:16; 4:18): Used metaphorically of God’s relation to Israel (^{<0018>}Deuteronomy 32:18) and to the Messianic king (^{<0017>}Psalms 2:7); ([γεννάω, gennao], “to beget,” or “bear”): generally used of a father (^{<0001>}Matthew 1:1-16); more rarely of a mother (^{<0013>}Luke 1:13,57); used metaphorically of causing or engendering moral and spiritual relations and states (1 Cor 4:15; Philem 1:10); of the new birth of the Holy Spirit (^{<0018>}John 3:3 ff). Men who obey and love God as sons are begotten of Him (^{<0013>}John 1:13; ^{<0029>}1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1,4,18; compare ^{<0023>}1 Peter 1:23). Used especially of God’s act in making Christ His Son: “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee” (^{<0017>}Psalms 2:7) quoted in ^{<0033>}Acts 13:33 in reference to His resurrection (compare ^{<0004>}Romans 1:4). The same passage is cited (^{<0005>}Hebrews 1:5) as proving Christ’s filial dignity, transcending the angels in that “he hath inherited a more excellent name than they,” i.e. the name of son; and again (^{<0005>}Hebrews 5:5) of God conferring upon Christ the glory of the priestly office.

Commentators differ as to whether the act of begetting the Son in these two passages is

(a) the eternal generation, or

(b) the incarnation in time, or

(c) the resurrection and ascension. The immediate context of ^{<0005>}Hebrews 1:5 (see ^{<0003>}Hebrews 1:3) seems to favor the last view (Westcott). The first view would not be foreign to the author’s thought: with ^{<0005>}Hebrews 5:5 compare ^{<0003>}Hebrews 6:20, “a high priest forever” (Alford). The author of Hebrews thinks of the eternal and essential sonship of Christ as realized in history in His ascension to the “right hand of the Majesty” (^{<0003>}Hebrews 1:3). And what is emphatic is the fact and status of sonship, rather than the time of begetting.

T. Rees

BEGUILE

<be-gil'>: In ^{<5014>}2 Peter 2:14 the King James Version (compare ^{<5014>}James 1:14) the word [δελεάζω, deleazo], is translated “beguile,” and means particularly to “entice,” “catch by bait.” Doubtless Peter got this idea from his old business of fishing, baiting the hook to beguile the fish. In ^{<5011>}Romans 7:11; 16:18; ^{<4818>}1 Corinthians 3:18 the word is [ἐξαπατάω, exapatao], and means “to cheat” or “to thoroughly deceive.” The thought is to be so completely deceived as to accept falsehood for the truth, believing it to be the truth. In ^{<5018>}Colossians 2:4,18 the King James Version; ^{<5012>}James 1:22 the word is [παρalogίζομαι, paralogizomai], and means “to miscalculate,” “to be imposed upon.” It refers particularly to being beguiled by mere probability.

See *DECEIT; DELUSION*.

Jacob W. Kapp

BEHALF

<be-haf'>: “On the part of” (^{<4971>}Exodus 27:21, i.e. so far as it affects them); “on the side of” (^{<4812>}Job 36:2). For [*huper*], “over,” in the sense of furnishing assistance, as in ^{<4761>}2 Corinthians 5:20, “in the interest of Christ” (verse 21); “for our good,” “in his cause” (^{<5019>}Philippians 1:29); also, often in 2 Cor, in general sense of “concerning” (5:12; 7:4; 8:24; 9:2; 12:5). [*Huper*] does not of itself indicate substitution, although one who shelters (“is over”) another, suffers “in his stead” (the King James Version ^{<4761>}2 Corinthians 5:20), as well as “in his behalf.”

BEHAVIOR

<be-hav'-yer> (μ[f" [Ta`am], “taste,” “flavor,” hence, “intellectual taste,” i.e. judgment, reason, understanding): Of significance as referring to David’s feigning madness before Achish, king of Gath, being “sore afraid.” Gesenius renders it “changed his understanding,” i.e. his mental behavior and outward manner (^{<4913>}1 Samuel 21:13, and title to Psalm 34).

Twice used in the New Testament (the King James Version) of the well-ordered life of the Christian ([κόσμιος kosmios], “well-arranged,” “modest,” i.e. living with decorum: ^{<5012>}1 Timothy 3:2), defining the blameless life expected of a minister (overseer), “A bishop must be. of good behavior,” the Revised Version (British and American) “orderly”

([κατάστημα katastema], “demeanor,” “deportment”), including, according to Dean Alford, “gesture and habit” as the outward expression of a reverent spirit (1 Pet 3:1,2). “Aged women in behavior as becometh holiness” (^{<5018>}Titus 2:3; the Revised Version (British and American) “reverent in demeanor”).

Dwight M. Pratt

BEHEADING

<be-hed'-ing>.

See PUNISHMENTS.

BEHEMOTH

<be'-he-moth>, *<be-he'-moth>* (**tw@h@**)[behemoth]: ^{<18015>}Job 40:15): Apparently the plural of [behemah], “a beast,” used of domestic or wild animals. The same form, [behemoth], occurs in other passages, e.g. ^{<15326>}Deuteronomy 28:26; 32:24; ^{<23816>}Isaiah 18:6; ^{<31217>}Habakkuk 2:17, where it is not rendered “behemoth” but “beasts.” According to some, the word [behemoth], occurring in ^{<18015>}Job 40:15, is not a Hebrew word, the plural of [behemah], but a word of Egyptian origin signifying “water ox.” This etymology is denied by Cheyne and others. The word has by various writers been understood to mean rhinoceros and elephant, but the description (^{<18015>}Job 40:15-24) applies on the whole very well to the hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) which inhabits the Nile and other rivers of Africa. Especially applicable are the references to its great size, its eating grass, the difficulty with which weapons penetrate its hide, and its frequenting of streams.

*“He lieth under the lotus-trees,
In the covert of the reed, and the fen.
The lotus-trees cover him with their shade;
The willows of the brook compass him about.”*

The remains of a fossil hippopotamus of apparently the same species are found over most of Europe, so that it may have inhabited Palestine in early historical times, although we have no record of it. There is a smaller living species in west Africa, and there are several other fossil species in Europe

and India. The remains of *Hippopotamus minutus* have been found in enormous quantities in caves in Malta and Sicily.

For an elaborate explanation of behemoth and leviathan (which see) as mythical creatures, see Cheyne, EB, under the word

Alfred Ely Day

BEHOLDING

<be-hold'-ing>: Many Hebrew and Greek words are so rendered in English Versions of the Bible, but [**ἐποπτεύσαντες**, *epopteusantes*], “your good works, which they behold” (1 Pet 2:12); “beholding your chaste behavior” (1 Pet 3:2), and [**ἐπόπται**, *epoptai*], “We were eyewitnesses of his majesty” (2 Pet 1:16) are peculiar to Peter. The fact that this word is used only by Peter and is used in both epistles is an argument for identity of authorship. The word [*epoptes*] denotes one who had been initiated into the innermost secrets of his faith and who enjoyed the highest religious privileges; but now in contradiction to the secrecy of all pagan “mysteries” (Eleusinian, etc.) the apostles would share with all the faithful every spiritual vision which they enjoyed (“we made known unto you”).

In ~~<R18>~~ 2 Corinthians 3:18, for [**κατοπτριζόμενοι**, *katoptrizomenoi*], the English Revised Version gives “reflecting (as a mirror) the glory of the Lord,” the American Standard Revised Version “beholding (as in mirror,” etc.). [*Katoptron*] was a mirror of polished metal. We cannot clearly and fully behold the outshining of spiritual grandeur in Christ Jesus, but in the gospel God accommodates and adjusts the vision as we are able to bear it, and the glory beheld becomes glory imparted to (and reflected by) the beholder.

John’s Gospel gives us [**θεάομαι**, *theaomai*] (“to look closely at”), and [**θεωρέω**, *theoreo*] (“to discern”). “We beheld ([*etheasametha*]) his glory” (~~<R14>~~ John 1:14), “that they may behold ([*theorosin*]) my glory” (~~<R12>~~ John 17:24). In classic literature, the former word is closely associated with theatrical spectacles, and the latter with athletic games, and they both convey the idea of unceasing interest, deepening in this connection into love and joy.

M. O. Evans

BEHOOVE

<*be-hoov'*>: Used in the New Testament for two Greek words [*dei*] (<^{Q205}Luke 24:26; <^{447B}Acts 17:3) and [*opheilo*] (<⁸⁰²⁷Hebrews 2:17); the former referring to a physical, and the latter to a moral, necessity (Bengelton, <⁶¹¹⁰1 Corinthians 11:10). The former means “must,” that is, it is required by the order which God has ordained; the latter, “ought,” that is, it is required as a debt.

BEIRUT

<*ba'-root'*>.

See *BERYTUS*.

BEKA

<*be'-ka*> ([*q*” B,_[beqa`], “half”): Half a shekel, the amount contributed by each male of the Israelites for the use of the Sanctuary (<^{Q286}Exodus 38:26). Its value varied according to the standard used, but on the ordinary, or Phoenician, standard it would represent about 122 grams.

See *WEIGHTS AND MEASURES*.

BEL

<*bel*>, <*bal*> (*I Bel* [bel]): Appellative name of a Bah god (compare *BAAL*), in the Old Testament and Apocrypha identified with Marduk or Merodach, the tutelary deity of Babylon (compare <²³⁴⁰Isaiah 46:1; <²⁵⁴⁴Jeremiah 51:44; Baruch 6:41).

See *BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, THE RELIGION OF*.

BEL AND THE DRAGON

See *DANIEL BOOK OF, X*.

BEL, AND THE DRAGON

<*bel*>, <*bal*>, <*drag'-un*> (Greek words: [*δράκων*, drakon], “dragon,” “serpent”; [*ἐκτός*, ektos], “except”; [*ὁρασις*, horasis] “vision,” “prophecy”; [*ὄφις*, ophis], “serpent”; [*σφραγισάμενος*, sphragisamenos],

“having sealed”; [ξωρίς, choris], “except,” Hebrew or Aramaic words: **μτ" j** [chatham], “to seal”; **apyzē** [ezepha’], “pitch”; **ap[ʔ]** [za`apha’], “storm,” “wind”; **vj n:** [nachash], “snake”; **^yNIT** [tannin], “serpent,” “sea monster”):

Little in this work that is distinctly Jewish. God is great, absolute and ever-living; angels intervene for special ends; the absurdity of idol-worship

Probably not in Babylon; perhaps the Hebrew text originated in Palestine about 146 BC or later. The Septuagint version produced in Egypt about 100 BC, which may be the date and language of the Book. Theta (Theodotion’s version) was produced probably at Ephesus about 180 AD

Accepted as canonical by the Jews of Egypt but rejected by the Jews of Palestine Accepted as part of the Bible by Greek and Latin church Fathers, by the Council of Trent and therefore by the Roman church; denied by Protestants to be canonical

1. INTRODUCTORY.

Bel and the Dragon is the third of the three Apocryphal additions to Daniel, The *SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN* and *SUSANNA* (which see) being the other two. In the Greek and Latin versions (see below, “IV. Textual Authorities”) these “additions” form an integral part of the canonical Book of Daniel, and they are recognized as such and therefore as themselves canonical by the Council of Trent. But the Song of the Three Children is the only piece having a necessary connection with the Hebrew canonical Book of Daniel; in the Greek and Latin texts it follows ~~203b~~ Daniel 3:24. The other two are appended and appear to have an origin independent of the book to which they are appended and also of each other, though in all three as also in the Hebrew Book of Daniel the name and fame of Daniel stand out prominently.

2. NAME OF BEL AND THE DRAGON.

Since in the Greek and Latin recensions or versions Bel and the Dragon forms a portion of the Book of Daniel it does not bear a special name. But in the only two known manuscripts of the Septuagint in Syro-Hexaplar (see below, “IV. Textual Authorities”) these words stand at the head of the “addition” now under consideration: “From (or “a part of”) the prophecy of Habakkuk son of Joshua of the tribe of Levi.” That the Biblical writing

prophet of that name is meant is beyond question. In Theta (Theodotian) this fact is distinctly stated (see Bel and the Dragon verse 33); and it is equally beyond question that these tales could never have come from the prophet so called (see below “VIII. Canonicity and Authenticity”).

In codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus of Theodotian (Theta) the title is: Horasis 12, i.e. Daniel 12, canonical Daniel being comprised in 11 chapters. In the Vulgate, Bel and the Dragon forms chapter 14, but, as in the case of the earlier chapters, it has no heading.

In the Syriac Peshitta (W) the story of Bel and the Dragon is preceded by “Bel the idol,” and that of the Dragon by “Then follows the Dragon.” Bel and the Dragon is the title in all Protestant versions of the Apocrypha, which rigidly keep the latter separate from the books of the Hebrew canon.

3. CONTENTS.

The stories of Bel and of the Dragon have a separate origin and existed apart: they are brought together because they both agree in holding up idolatry to ridicule and in encouraging Jewish believers to be true to their religion. The glorification of Daniel is also another point in which both agree, though while the Daniel of the Bel and the Dragon story appears as a shrewd Judge corresponding to the etymology of that name, he of the Dragon story is but a fearless puritan who will die rather than be faithless to his religion.

It is evident, however that the editor of the “additions” has fused both stories into one, making the Dragon story depend on that which precedes (See Bel and of the Dragon verses 23 f). It seems very likely that, in a Nestorian list mentioned by Churton (Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures, 391), Bel and the Dragon is comprised under the title, The Little Daniel.

The two stories as told in common by Septuagint and Theodotion may be thus summarized:

1. The Story of Bel: the God of Bel:

There is in Babylon an image of Bel which Daniel refuses to worship, though no form of worship is mentioned except that of supplying the god with food. The king (Cyrus according to Theodotion) remonstrates with the delinquent Hebrew, pointing Out to him the immense amount of food

consumed daily by Bel, who thus proves himself to be a living god. Daniel, doubting the king's statement as to the food, asks to be allowed to test the alleged fact. His request being granted, he is shown by expressed desire the e lectisternia, the sacred tables being covered by food which the god is to consume during the night. The doors are all sealed by arrangement, and after the priests have departed Daniel has the temple floor strewn with light ashes. When the morning breaks it is found that the doors are still sealed, but the food has disappeared. Upon examination the tracks of bare feet are found on the ash-strewn floor, showing that the priests have entered the temple by a secret way and removed the food. Angered by the trick played on him the king has the priests put to death and the image destroyed.

The word Bel, a short form of Baal, occurs in the Old Testament in ^{<341>}Isaiah 46:1; ^{<341D>}Jeremiah 50:2; 51:44, where it stands for Merodach or Marduk, chief of the Babylonian deities. Originally however it denotes any one of the Babylonian local deities, and especially the principal deity worshipped at Nippur (for similar use of the Hebrew "Baal" see the article on this word). In Theodotion Cyrus appears as an abettor of Bel-worship, which is quite in accordance with the practice of the early Persian kings to show favor to the worship of the countries they conquered. See Century Bible, "Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther," 40.

2. The Dragon Story; Meaning of "Dragon"; Serpent-Worship in Babylon:

There is in Babylon a great live dragon worshipped by a large number of the inhabitants, who lavishly feed it. In the present case the god is or is represented by a living creature which can be fed, and, indeed, needs feeding. Daniel refuses to bow down before the dragon and makes an offer to the king to kill it. Believing the god well able to care for himself, the king accepts Daniel's challenge. Daniel makes a mixture of which pitch forms the principal ingredient and thrusts it down the dragon's throat, so that "it bursts asunder and dies." The people are infuriated at the death of their god and demand that the king shall have the god-murderer put to death, a demand to which the royal master yields by having Daniel cast into a den of lions, as was done to other culprits found guilty of capital charges. But though the prophet remained in the company of 7 lions for 6 days he suffered no injury. On the last day when Daniel, without food, was naturally hungry, a miracle was performed by way of supplying him with food. Habakkuk (see above, "II. Name"), when cooking food for his

reapers, heard an angel's voice commanding him to carry the food he had prepared to Daniel in the lions' den in Babylon. Upon his replying that he did not know where the den, or even Babylon, was, the angel laid hold of his hair and by it carried the prophet to the very part of the den where Daniel was. Having handed the latter the meal intended for the reapers, he was safely brought back by the angel to his own home. It would seem that Habakkuk was protected from the lions as well as Daniel. Seeing all this the king worshipped God, set Daniel free, and in his stead east his accusers into the lions' den, where they were instantly devoured,

Zockler in his commentary (p. 215) speaks of the "fluidity" of the Dragon myth, and he has been followed by Marshall and Daubney. But what in reality does the Greek word [*drakon*], rendered "dragon," mean? In the Septuagint the word is used generally (15 times) to translate the Hebrew [tannin] which denotes a serpent or sea monster. It is this word ([tannin]) which in the Aramaic version of the Dragon story translates the Greek [*drakon*]. Now in ^{◀BDB}Exodus 4:3 and 7:9 the Hebrew [tannin] and [nachash] ("serpent") seem identified as are the Greek [*drakon*] and [*ophis*] in ^{◀BDB}Revelation 12:9. We may therefore take [*drakon*] in the present story to stand for a serpent. We know that in Babylon the god Nina was worshipped in the form of a serpent (see Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, 281 f), and it is more probable that it is the worship of this god or of some other serpent deity that is here meant, than that there is any allusion to the Babylonian story according to which Marduk the supreme deity of Babylon engaged in a conflict with Tiamat the monster — foe to light and order.

- (1) The dragon of the present story is a god and not as Tiamat, a kind of devil, and a male, not a female.
- (2) The dragon in the present story is a serpent, which is not true of Tiamat.
- (3) Apsu (male) and Tiamat (female) are Babylonian deities who give birth to the gods of heaven; these gods subsequently led by their mother Tiamat engaged in a fierce contest with Marduk.

Since Gunkel published his book, *Schopfung und Chaos* (1895), it has been the fashion to see reflections of the Marduk-Tiamat conflict throughout the Old Testament. But recent investigations tend to show that Babylonian mythology has not dominated Hebrew thought to the extent that was

formerly thought, and with this statement Gunkel himself now agrees, as the last edition of his commentary on Genesis proves.

4. TEXTUAL AUTHORITIES.

1. Manuscripts:

(1) Greek.

There exist in Greek two forms of the text (see below).

(a) The Septuagint text has been preserved in but one original MS, the codex Christianus (from the Chigi family who owned it, published in Rome in 1772). This belongs to about the 9th century. This text has been printed also in Cozza's *Sacrorum Bibliorum vestustissima fragmenta Graeca et Latina*, part iii, Romae, 1877, and in Swete's edition of the Septuagint side by side with Theodotion. In Tischendorf's Septuagint it occurs at the close of the ordinary text of the Septuagint.

(b) Of Theta (the text of Theodotion) we have the following important manuscripts: Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Q (codex Marchalianus), Gamma (verses 1,2-4 only) and Delta (from verse 21 to verse 41).

(2) Syriac.

There exists in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, a manuscript of the 8th century of the Syro-Hexaplar version made by Paul of Tella in 617 AD at Alexandria from col vi (Septuagint) of Origen's Hexapla. This most valuable manuscript has been edited and published by Ceriani.

2. Recensions or Versions:

(1) Greek.

(a) The Septuagint:

Of this we have but one manuscript (see above under "Manuscripts") and until its publication at Rome in 1772 what is now known as Theta was believed to be the real Septuagint version, notwithstanding hints to the contrary by early Christian writers.

(b) Theta, or the Version of Theodotion:

This version appears to be a revision of the Septuagint, with the help, perhaps, as in the case of the canonical Daniel, of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) original, now lost. It is much less pedantic than Aquila's Greek translation which preceded it, and its Greek is better. It is also a better translation than the Septuagint; yet it has many transliterations of Hebrew words instead of translations. This version of Daniel displaced that of the Septuagint at a very early time, for though Origen gave place to the Septuagint in his Hexapla, in his writings he almost always cites from Theta. In his preface to Daniel Jerome points to the fact that in his own time the church had rejected the Septuagint in favor of Theodotion, mentioning the defectiveness of the former as the ground. Even Irenaeus (died 202) and Porphyry (died 305) preferred Theodotion to the Septuagint. Field was the first to point out that it is the work of Theodotion (not the Septuagint) that we have in 1 Esdras, etc.

(2) Syriac.

In addition to the Syro-Hexaplar version (see above, under "Manuscript") the Peshitta version must be noted. It follows Theodotion closely, and is printed in Walton's Polyglot (in one recension only of Bel and the Dragon) and in a revised text edited by Lagarde in 1861; not as R. H. Charles (*Enc Brit*, VII, 807) erroneously says in *The Book of Tobit* by Neubauer.

(3) Latin.

(a) The old Latin version, which rests on Theodotion, fragments of which occur in Sabatier's work, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae* (1743, etc., II).

(b) The Vulgate, which follows Jerome's translation, is also based on Theodotion, and follows it closely.

(4) Aramaic.

For the Aramaic version published by M. Caster and claimed to be the text of the book as first written, see below, "V. Original Language."

5. THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE: PRINCIPAL OPINIONS.

It has been until recent years most generally maintained that Bel and the Dragon was composed and first edited in the Greek language. So Eichhorn, de Wette, Schrader, Fritzsche, Schurer and Konig. In favor of this the following reasons have been given:

(1) No Semitic original with reasonable claims has been discovered. Origen, Eusebius and Jerome distinctly say that no Hebrew (or Aramaic) form of this tract existed or was known in their time.

(2) The Hebraisms with which this work undoubtedly abounds are no more numerous or more crucial than can be found in works by Jewish authors which are known to have been composed in the Greek language, such as the continual recurrence of [*kai*] (= “and”), [*kai eipe*] (“and he said”), etc.

On the other hand, the opinion has been growing among recent scholars that this work was written first of all either in Hebrew or Aramaic. Some of the grounds are the following:

(1) It is known that Theodotion in making his translation of other parts of the Old Testament (Daniel) endeavored to correct the Septuagint with the aid of the Massoretic Text. A comparison of the Septuagint and of Theodotion of Bel and the Dragon reveal differences of a similar character. How can we account for them unless we assume that Theodotion had before him a Semitic original? A very weak argument, however, for the translator might have corrected on a priori principles, using his own Judgment; or there might well have been in his time different recensions of the Septuagint. Westcott (DB, I, 397a; 2nd edition, 714a) holds that some of Theodotion’s changes are due to a desire to give consistency to the facts.

(2) Much has been made of the Semiticisms in the work, and it must be admitted that they are numerous and striking. But are these Hebraisms or Aramaisms? The commonest and most undoubted Semiticism is the repeated use of [*kai*] and [*kai egeneto*] with the force of the waw-consecutive and only to be explained and understood in the light of that construction. But the waw-consecutive exists only in classical Hebrew; Aramaic and post-Biblical. Hebrew, including late parts of the Old Testament (parts of Ecclesiastes, etc.), know nothing of it. It must be assumed then that if the Semiticisms of this work imply a Semitic original, that original was Hebrew, not Aramaic.

The following Hebraisms found in the Septuagint and in Theodotion may briefly be noted:

(1) The use of the Greek [*kai*] with all the varied meanings of the waw-consecutive. (see below, under “VI. Teaching”). The beginning of a sentence with [*kai en*] (“and there was”) Bel and the Dragon (verses 1,3 in the Septuagint; 2 f, etc., in Theodotion) agrees with the Hebrew waw-consecutive construction, but makes poor Greek. In verse 15 [*kai egeneto*] can be understood only in the light of the Hebrew for which it stands.

(2) The syntactical feature called parataxy (coordination) presents itself throughout the Greek of this piece, and it has been reproduced in the English translations (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) as any English reader can see. In the classical languages it is hypotaxy that prevails. If, as seems likely, those responsible for Septuagint and Theodotion followed a Hebrew original, they failed to make sufficient allowance for the peculiar force of the waw-consecutive idiom, for this does not involve hypotaxy to an y considerable extent.

(3) The constant occurrence of [*Kurios*] (“Lord”) without the article implies the Hebrew [*Yahweh*]; and the phrase the “Lord God” is also Hebrew.

(4) There are difficulties and differences best explained by assuming a Hebrew origin. The Greek word [*sphragisamenos*] has no sense in verse 14 (Septuagint) for, retaining it, we should read of a sealing of the temple (of Bel) and also of a sealing with signet rings of the doors. The Hebrew word “shut” ([*catham*]) is written much like that for “seal” ([*chatham*]), and was probably, as Marshal suggests, mistaken for the latter. The temple was “shut” and the doors “sealed.” In verse 10 the Septuagint ([*choris*]) and Theodotion ([*ektos*]) have 2 words of similar sense, which are best explained as independent renderings of one Hebrew word.

Marshall, identifying this dragon story with the Babylonian creation-myth of Marduk and Tiamat, thinks that instead of “pitch” used in making the obolus with which Daniel destroyed the dragon, the original Aramaic document has “storm wind,” the two words being in Aramaic written much alike ([*za`apha`*] = “storm wind,” and [*zepha`*] = pitch). But the fact is quite overlooked that the obolus contained not only pitch, but also “fat” and “hair” (see Bel and the Dragon, verse 27). Besides, in the Aramaic version, published by Gaster, to which Marshall attaches great importance

as at least a real source, we have four ingredients, namely, pitch ([zepetha']), fat, flax ([kittan]) and hair. Dr. Marshall's suggestion involves therefore not only the confusion of two words spelled differently in Aramaic, but the substitution of 3 or 4 terms for one in the original draft. Moreover, in *Bel and the Dragon* the several ingredients are made up into a cake with which the dragon was gorged. Dr. Marshall's view assumes also an Aramaic original which is against the evidence. But the suggestion would not have been made but for a desire to assimilate the dragon story to the Babylonian creation-myth, though in motive and details both differ so essentially.

In favor of a Semitic original many writers have cited the fact that forms of the story have been found in Hebrew and Aramaic in the 13th century. Raymund Martini in his *Pugio Fidei* (written against the Jews) quotes *Bel and the Dragon* from a Hebrew Midrash on Genesis which Neubauer discovered and which is almost verbatim identical with the unique manuscript containing *Midrash Rabba de Rabba* (see Neubauer, *Tobit*, viii, and Franz Delitzsch, *de Habacuci*, 82). Still other Hebrew forms of these stories have been found. All the "additions" to Daniel "occur in Hebrew in the remains of *Yosippon*," the "Hebrew Josephus," as he has been called. He wrote in the 10th century.

But most important of all is the discovery by Dr. M. Gaster of the dragon story in Aramaic, imbedded in the *Chronicles of Yerahmeel*, a work of the 10th century. Dr. Gaster maintains that in this Aramaic fragment we have a portion of the original *Bel and the Dragon* (see PSBA, 1894, 280 ff (Introduction), 312 (Text) and 1895 (for notes and translation)). The present writer does not think Dr. Gaster has made out his case.

- (1) If such an Aramaic original did really exist at any time we should have learned something definite about it from early writers, Jewish and Christian.
- (2) Dr. Gaster has discovered an Aramaic form of only two of the three "additions," those of the *Song of the Three Children* and of the dragon story. What of the rest of the Aramaic document?
- (3) It has already been pointed out that the waw-consecutive constructions implied in the Greek texts go back to a Hebrew, not an Aramaic original.

(4) The Aramaic text of the Dragon story not seldom differs both from the Septuagint and Theodotion as in the following and many other cases: The two Greek versions have in *Bel and the Dragon*, verse 24 “The king (said),” which the Aramaic omits: in verse 35 the Aramaic after “And Habakkuk said” adds “to the angel,” which the Septuagint and Theodotion are without.

(5) The compiler of the *Yerahmeel Chronicle* says distinctly that he had taken the Song of the Three Children and the dragon story from the writings of Theodotion (see PSBA, 1895, 283), he having, it is quite evident, himself put them into Aramaic. Dr. Gaster lays stress on the words of the compiler, that what he gives in Aramaic is that which “Theodotion found” (*loc. cit.*). But the reference can be only to the Septuagint which this translator made the basis of his own version; it is far too much to assume that the Chronicler means an Aramaic form of the stories.

6. TEACHING.

The two stories teach the doctrine of the oneness and absoluteness of Yahwe, called throughout *Kurios* (“Lord”), a literal rendering of the Hebrew word [*’adonai*] (“Lord”) which the Jews substituted for Yahwe in reading the Hebrew as do now-a-day Jews. In the Greek and Latin versions it is the word read (the *Qere perpetuum*), not that written *Kethibh*), which is translated. It would have been more consonant with universal practice if the proper name Yahweh had been transliterated as proper names usually are.

But very little is said of the character of Yahweh. He is great and the only (true) God in *Bel and the Dragon* (verse 41), the living God in contrast with Bel (verse 57). Of the nature of His demands on His worshippers, ritualistic and ethical, nothing is said. There is no reference to any distinctly Jewish beliefs or practices; nothing about the torah or about any Divine revelation to men, about sacrifice or the temple or even a priesthood, except that in the Septuagint (not in Theodotion) Daniel the prophet is spoken of as a priest — strong evidence of the low place assigned by the writer to the external side of the religion he professed. We do however find mention of an angel, a sort of *deus ex machina* in the Dragon story (verses 34 ff); compare ²¹⁶²Daniel 6:22.

The incident of the transportation of Habakkuk to Babylon shows that the writer had strong faith in supernatural intervention on behalf of the pious. Apart from this incident the two stories steer fairly clear of anything that is supernatural. But Bel and the Dragon verses 33-39 are a late interpolation.

7. AUTHOR, PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION.

Nothing whatever is known of the author of the book and nothing definite or certain of the place or date of composition. It has been commonly felt, as by Bissell, etc., that it reflects a Babylonian origin. Clay (see Bel and the Dragon, verse 7) abounded in Babylon (but surely not only in Babylon); bronze (Bel and the Dragon, verse 7) was often used in that country for the manufacturing of images, and the lion, it is known, was native to the country (but that was the case also in Palestine in Biblical, and even post-Biblical times). None of the arguments for a Babylonian origin have much weight, and there are contrary arguments of considerable force.

The anachronisms and inconsistencies are more easily explained on the assumption of a non-Babylonian origin. Besides, the Judaism of Babylon was of a very strict and regulation kind, great attention being given to the law and to matters of ritual. There is nothing in Bel and the Dragon regarding these points (see above under "Teaching").

If we assume a Hebrew original, as there are good grounds for doing, it is quite possible that these legends were written in Palestine at a time when the Jewish religion was severely persecuted: perhaps when Antiochus VII (Sidetes, 139-128 BC) reconquered Judah for Syria and sorely oppressed the subject people. Yet nothing very dogmatic can be said as to this. We cannot infer much from the style of the Hebrew (or Aramaic?), since no Semitic original has come down to us. It is quite clear that these "additions" imply the existence of the canonical Book of Daniel and belong to a subsequent date, for they contain later developments of traditions respecting Daniel. The canonical Book of Daniel is dated by modern scholars about 160 BC, so that a date about 136 BC (see above) could not be far amiss.

If, on the other hand, we take for granted that the Septuagint is the original text of the book, the date of that recension is the date of the work itself. It seems probable that this recension of Daniel was made in Egypt about 150 BC (see 1 Macc 1:54; 2:59), and we have evidence that up to that date the "three additions" formed no part of the book, though they exist in all

Greek and Syriac manuscripts of Daniel, which have come down to us. Probably the “additions” existed as separate compositions for some time before they were joined to Daniel proper, but it is hardly too much to assume that they were united no later than 100 BC. Yet the data for reaching a conclusion are very slight. It may be added that the Greek of the Septuagint is distinctly Alexandrian in its character, as Westcott, Bissell and others have pointed out. Theodotion’s version is supposed to have been made at Ephesus toward the end of the 2nd century AD.

8. CANONICITY AND AUTHENTICITY.

The Alexandrian Jews, recognizing the Septuagint as their Bible, accepted the whole of the Apocrypha as canonical. The Palestine Jews, on the other hand, limited their canonical Scriptures to the Hebrew Old Testament. There is, of course, some uncertainty (largely no doubt because it was originally a translation from the Hebrew) as to whether the Septuagint at the first included the Apocrypha in its whole extent or not, but all the evidence points to the fact that it did, though individual books like Daniel existed apart before they formed a portion of the Greek or Egyptian canon.

In the early Christian church all the three “additions” are quoted as integral parts of Daniel by Greek and by Latin Fathers, as e.g. by Irenaeus (IV, 5, 2 f); Tertullian (Deuteronomy idololatria c.18); Cyprian (Ad fortunatum, c.11).

By a decree of the Council of Trent these “additions” were for the Roman church made as much a part of the Bible canon as the Hebrew Book of Daniel. Protestant churches have as a rule excluded the whole of the Apocrypha from their Bibles, regarding its books as either “Deuterocanonical” or “non-canonical.” In consequence of this attitude among Protestants the Apocrypha has until lately been greatly neglected by Protestant writers. But a great change is setting in, and some of the best commentaries by Protestant scholars produced in recent years deal with the Apocrypha and its teaching.

Julius Africanus (flourished about first half of 3rd century AD) was the first to impugn the truth of the stories embodied in the “additions” to Daniel. This he did in a letter to Origen to which the recipient vigorously replied.

The improbabilities and contradictions of these three pieces have often been pointed out from the time of Julius Africanus down to the present day. The following points may be set down as specimens:

- (1) Daniel is called a priest in the Septuagint (Bel and the Dragon, verse 1), and yet he is identified with the prophet of that name.
- (2) Habakkuk the prophet (he is so called in Theodotion (see Bel and the Dragon, verse 33), and no other can be intended) is made to be a contemporary of Daniel and also of the Persian king Cyrus (see Bel and the Dragon, verses 1 and 33 in the English Bible). Now Cyrus conquered Babylon in 538 BC, the principal Jews in Babylon returning to Palestine the following year. The events narrated in Bel and the Dragon could not have occurred during the time Cyrus was king of Babylon, but the Septuagint speaks of “the king” without naming him.
- (3) It was not Cyrus but Xerxes who destroyed the image of Bel, this being in 475 BC (see Herodotus i.183; Strabo xvi.1; Arrian, Exped. Alex., vii.1).
- (4) It is further objected that dragon-worship in Babylon, such as is implied in the dragon story, is contrary to fact. Star-worship, it has been said, did exist, but not animal-worship. So Eichhorn and Fritzsche. But there is every reason for believing that the worship of living animals as representing deity, and especially of the living serpent, existed in Babylon as among other nations of antiquity, including the Greeks and Romans (see Herzog, 1st edition, article “Drache zu Babylon,” by J. G. Muller). It has already been pointed out (see list of meanings) that the word “dragon” denotes a serpent.

LITERATURE.

Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apoc. Schriften des Alten Testaments (1795), 431 ff (remarkable for its time: compares the Septuagint and Theodotion); W. H. Daubney, The Three Additions to Daniel (Cambridge, 1906; contains much matter though rather uncritically treated); the commentaries of Fritzsche (Vol I: still very rich in material; it forms part of the Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch); Bissell (in Lange’s series, but not a translation); Ball Speaker’s Commentary (this is the best English commentary on the Apocrypha. See also Schurer, Geschichte, III, 333, and his article in RE3, I, 639; and the articles by Kamphausen in EB, I,

1014; Toy, in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, 650; R. H. Charles, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, VII, 807, and especially that by J. Turner Marshall in *HDB*, I, 267. Fritzsche *Libri Veteris Testamenti Graece* (1871), and Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, III, 1894, and later editions, give the Septuagint and Theodotion on parallel pages. In the edition of the Septuagint edited by Tischendorf, the Septuagint is given in the text and Theodotion in an appendix.

T. Witton Davies

BELA

<be'-la>.

See *ZOAR*.

BELA; BELAH

<be'-la> ([l " B_i[bela`], “destruction”; the King James Version Belah, ^{<0452>}Genesis 46:21):

(1) Bela, the son of Beor, was the first king of Edom previous to the kingdom of Israel and reigned in the city of Dinhabah (^{<0152>}Genesis 36:32 f; ^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 1:43 f). Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus, [Βαλάκ, Balak].

(2) Bela, the firstborn son of Benjamin (^{<0452>}Genesis 46:21; ^{<1306>}1 Chronicles 7:6 f; ^{<1301>}1 Chronicles 8:1). He was the head of the family of the Belaïtes (^{<0258>}Numbers 26:38), the father of Addar (called Ard, ^{<0250>}Numbers 26:40), Gera, Abihud, Abishua, Naaman, Ahoah, Gera, Shephuphan (compare Shephupham, ^{<0259>}Numbers 26:39), Hiram (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 8:3-5; ^{<0250>}Numbers 26:40).

(3) Bela, a son of Azaz, of the tribe of Reuben, was a man of great power and wealth. His possessions reached from Nebo to the Euphrates (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 5:8 ff). — *A. L. Breslich*

BELAİTES

<be'-la-its> (y[l B" [bal`i], “belonging to Bela”): The descendants of Bela (^{<0258>}Numbers 26:38). Compare *BELA* (2).

BELCH

<belsh>: The primary idea of this word is “to gush forth” as a fountain. As used in ^{<1807>}Psalm 59:7 the thought is that these enemies had so cherished these evil thoughts and bitter wrath that now the heart is a very fountain of evil, and has taught the tongue how to give utterance thereto. But the previous verse shows that the Psalmist also had in mind the howling and barking of the dogs about the city. The imprecations of his enemies are like the snarling, howling, barking of dogs which in an eastern city makes the night hideous with the noise, and is continued until the daybreak.

Jacob W. Kapp

BELEMUS

<bel'-e-mus> ([Βήλεμος, Belemos]; Balsamus): An officer of King Artaxerxes in Palestine associated with Beeltethmus in hindering the rebuilding of the temple (1 Esdras 2:16): called Bishlam in ^{<1540>}Ezra 4:7.

BELIAL

<be'-li-al>, <bel'-yal> (I [ΥΙ Β] [beliya`al]; [Βελίαρ, Beliar]): This name, occurring very frequently in the Old Testament, has the sense of “worthlessness” (compare ^{<1206>}2 Samuel 23:6 margin); accordingly in such phrases as “sons of Belial” (^{<0213>}Judges 20:13; ^{<0907>}1 Samuel 10:27, etc.), “men of Belial” (^{<0802>}1 Samuel 30:22; ^{<1213>}1 Kings 21:13, etc.), which the English Revised Version usually retains, the American Standard Revised Version more correctly renders, “base fellows” (so “daughter of Belial” ^{<0016>}1 Samuel 1:16, “wicked woman”). There is here no suggestion a proper name. Afterward, however, “Belial” became a proper name for Satan, or for Antichrist (thus frequently in the Jewish Apocalyptic writings, e.g. in XII the Priestly Code (P), Book Jubilees, Asc Isa, Sib Or). In this sense Paul used the word in ^{<0615>}2 Corinthians 6:15, “What concord hath Christ with Belial?” (Beliar). Bousset thinks that Paul’s “man of sin” in ^{<5118>}2 Thessalonians 2:3, where some authorities read “man of lawlessness,” is a translation of this term. The sense at least is similar.

See ANTICHRIST; MAN OF SIN.

James Orr

BELIE

<be-li'>: Is the translation of **ⲡⲓ ⲕⲓ**[kachash], “to be untrue” (^{<4152>}Jeremiah 5:12), “They have belied the Lord” (the American Standard Revised Version “denied Yahweh”), here used as synonym of “give the lie to.”

In The Wisdom of Solomon 1:11 “belle” translates [**κατα εὐδομαί**, katapseudomai] (the kata prefix referring to the kata in katalalia in the same verse), “A mouth that belieth destroyeth a soul.”

BELIEF

<be-lef'>.

See *FAITH*.

BELIEVERS

<be-lev'-ers> (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of ^{<4154>}Acts 5:14, for [**πιστεύοντες**, pisteuontes], the Revised Version, margin “believing”; in the King James Version of ^{<5042>}1 Timothy 4:12 for [**οἱ πιστοί**, hoi pistoi], the Revised Version (British and American) “them that believe”): Equivalent phrases, they (he, she) that believe (for [**οἱ πεπιστευκότες**, hoi pepisteukotes]; [**οἱ πιστεύοντες**, hoi, pisteuontes]; (adj.), [**πιστός**, pistos], etc.) occur frequently as a regular description of those who professed their faith in Christ, and attached themselves to the Christian church. The one essential condition of admission into the Christian community was, that men should believe in Jesus Christ (^{<4461>}Acts 16:31). The actual experiences of the men thus denoted varied with all the possible degrees and modifications of *FAITH* (which see). Believers are nowhere in the New Testament distinguished as a subordinate class from the “Christians who know” as in the Gnostic antithesis of [*pistikoi*] and [*gnostikoi*], “believers” and “knowers.” — *T. Rees*

BELL

(**ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲙ**)[metsilloth], **ⲡⲓ** [pa`amon]): The former of these terms occurs only once (^{<3840>}Zechariah 14:20) where it is thus translated. It is derived from a verb meaning “to tingle” or “dirl” (^{<4081>}1 Samuel 3:11), and

there is, therefore, no objection etymologically to rendering the noun by “bells.” But the little bell attached to the harness of horses would hardly be a suitable place for a fairly long inscription, and as buckles shaped exactly like cymbals (*see MUSIC*) were used as ornaments for horses, “cymbals” is probably a better rendering.

The other Hebrew word for bell is found only in ^{<0283>}Exodus 28:33 f; 39:25,26, where “bells of gold” are directed to be attached to the hem of Aaron’s official robe, that the people may hear him when he enters and quits the sanctuary. Bells were not employed by the Hebrews to summon the congregation to worship, nor do Mohammedans so use them at the present day. The church bell is a peculiarly Christian institution, said to have been introduced by Bishop Paulinus of Nola in Campania, who lived about the end of the 4th century. Little bells, however, like those attached to the hem of Aaron’s robe, frequently form part of the harness of horses, or are fastened to the necks of the he-goats or wethers that lead the flock in eastern lands.

James Millar

BELLOWS

^{<bel’-oz>}, ^{<bel’-us>}: The word occurs once only in English Versions of the Bible, in ^{<0103>}Jeremiah 6:29, where the prophet is predicting the coming of the destroyer (verse 26), “a great nation” from “the north country” (verse 22), down upon Israel, because “all of them deal corruptly” (verse 28). “The bellows blow fiercely; the leads is of the fire.” Here the imagery is drawn from the refiner’s art, and the “bellows” are those used to make the refiner’s fires burn fiercely.

See CRAFTS, II, 10.

BELLY

^{<bel’-i>}: ^{ˆwɔg}[gachon] = “the external abdomen” (^{<0034>}Genesis 3:14; ^{<0112>}Leviticus 11:42). ^{Hbqq}[qobhah] = “the abdominal cavity” (^{<0238>}Numbers 25:8 the American Standard Revised Version “body”). ^{ˆfB}, [beTen] = “the internal abdomen,” “the womb” (^{<1021>}1 Kings 7:20; ^{<0152>}Job 15:2,35 the King James Version; ^{<0015>}Job 20:15,23; 40:16; Psalm 17,14; ^{<0135>}Proverbs 13:25; 18:20; ^{<0005>}Jeremiah 1:5; ^{<0113>}Ezekiel 3:3); also

figuratively “the internal regions,” “the body of anything” (Jon 2:2). H[me [me`eh] = “intestines,” “abdomen” (^{<2702>}Daniel 2:32; Jon 1:17; 2:1,2). In the New Testament [κοιλία, koilia] = “a cavity,” especially the abdominal (^{<4024>}Matthew 12:40; 15:17; ^{<4079>}Mark 7:19); the seat of appetite and of the carnal affections (^{<5168>}Romans 16:18; ^{<4613>}1 Corinthians 6:13; ^{<4089>}Philippians 3:19; ^{<6619>}Revelation 10:9,10); the innermost of the soul (the American Revised Version, margin ^{<4078>}John 7:38).

Frank E. Hirsch

BELMAIM

^{<bel'-ma-im>}, the King James Version Belmen ([Βελμαίμ, Belmaim], Judith 7:3; [Βαιλμαίν, Bailmain], 4:4): A place in the neighborhood of Dothan (Judith 7:3), to which warning was sent to prepare for the invasion of Holofernes (Judith 4:4). It probably answers to the modern Bir Bil`ameh (Ibleam), a ruined site about half a mile South of Jenin.

BELMEN; BELMON

^{<bel'-men>}, ^{<bel'-mon>}.

See BELMAIM.

BELOMACY

^{<bel'-o-man-si>}.

See AUGURY, IV, 2.

BELOVED

^{<be-luv'-ed>}, ^{<be-luv'-d'>} ([ἀγαπητός, agapetos]): A term of affectionate endearment common to both Testaments; in the Old Testament found, 26 out of 42 times, in Solomon's Song of Love. Limited chiefly to two Hebrews words and their derivatives: bha;[ʾahebh], “to breathe” or “long for,” hence, to love, corresponding to the New Testament, [ἀγαπάω, agapao], “to prefer,” i.e. a love based on respect and benevolent regard; dwD [dodh], “love,” chiefly love between the sexes, based on sense and emotion, akin to [φιλέω, phileo] (Latin amare). Used occasionally, in their nobler sense, interchangeably, e.g. the former of a

husband's love for his wife (~~6215~~ Deuteronomy 21:15,16); twice of a lover (Song 1:14,16), thus lifting the affection of the Song of Solomon out of mere amorousness into the realm of the spiritual and possibly Messianic. Both words used of God's love for His chosen: e.g. Solomon, "beloved of his God" (~~4638~~ Nehemiah 13:26); Benjamin "beloved of Yahweh" (~~4832~~ Deuteronomy 33:12); so even of wayward Israel (~~2415~~ Jeremiah 11:15).

In the New Testament "beloved" used exclusively of Divine and Christian love, an affection begotten in the community of the new spiritual life in Christ, e.g. "beloved in the Lord" (~~5168~~ Romans 16:8). The beauty, unity, endearment of this love is historically unique, being peculiarly Christian. "Brethren" in Christ are "beloved" (1 Thess 1:4; ~~4638~~ 1 Corinthians 15:58; ~~5016~~ James 1:16; 2:5). Many individuals are specified by name: Timothy (2 Tim 1:2); Philemon (Philem 1:1); Amplias, Urbane, Stachys, Persis (~~5168~~ Romans 16:8,9,12), etc. The aged John is the conspicuous New Testament illustration of the depth and tenderness of Christian love. In his epistles alone he addresses his disciples 12 times as "beloved." Paul terms "God's elect" "holy and beloved" (~~5162~~ Colossians 3:12).

The term rises to still Diviner significance as an epithet of Christ, whom Paul, grateful for His "freely bestowed" grace, terms "the Beloved." This is the word used repeatedly to express God the Father's infinite affection for Jesus His "beloved Son" (~~4187~~ Matthew 3:17; 12:18; 17:5; ~~4011~~ Mark 1:11; 9:7; ~~4192~~ Luke 3:22; 20:13).

[*Agapetos*] rendered as above 47 times is 9 times "dearly beloved" (the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly omits "dearly") and 3 times "well beloved" (the Revised Version (British and American) omits "well"). The former rendering found only once in the Old Testament (**tWdydy** [yedhidhuth], "something beloved"), portraying God's tender love for His people: "dearly beloved of my soul" (~~2437~~ Jeremiah 12:7). Thrice is Daniel spoken of as "greatly beloved" of Gabriel and of God (**tWOWmj** [hamudhoth], "precious," i.e. delight = beloved; ~~2792~~ Daniel 9:23; 10:11,19). Through the apostles the word has become familiar in pastoral and sermonic address. Few New Testament words better illustrate the power and impress of the Christian spirit on succeeding centuries than this.

Dwight M. Pratt

BELSHAZZAR

<bel-shaz'-ar> (rX" avl Bēlshar' tstsar]; [Βαλτασάρ, Baltasar], Babylonian Bel-shar-usur): According to ⁽²⁸⁰⁾ Daniel 5:30, he was the Chaldean king under whom Babylon was taken by Darius the Mede. The Babylonian monuments speak a number of times of a Bel-shar-usur who was the "firstborn son, the offspring of the heart of" Nabunaid, the last king of the Babylonian empire, that had been founded by Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, at the time of the death of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, in 626 BC. There is no doubt that this Belshazzar is the same as the Belshazzar of Dnl. It is not necessary to suppose that Belshazzar was at any time king of the Babylonian empire in the sense that Nebuchadnezzar and Nabunaid were. It is probable, as M. Pognon argues, that a son of Nabunaid, called Nabunaid after his father, was king of Babylon, or Babylonian king, in Harran (Haran), while his father was overlord in Babylon. This second Nabunaid is called "the son of the offspring of the heart" of Nabunaid his father. It is possible that this second Nabundid was the king who was killed by Cyrus, when he crossed the Tigris above Arbela in the 9th year of Nabunaid his father, and put to death the king of the country (see the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle col. ii, 17); since according to the Eshki-Harran inscription, Nabunaid the Second died in the 9th year of Nabunaid the First. Belshazzar may have been the son of the king who is said in the same chronicle to have commanded the Babylonian army in Accad from the 6th to the 11th year of Nabunaid I; or, possibly longer, for the annals before the 6th and after the 11th year are broken and for the most part illegible. This same son of the king is most probably mentioned again in the same chronicle as having died in the night in which Babylon was captured by Gobryas of Gutium. As Nabunaid II, though reigning at Hatran under the overlordship of his father, is called king of Babylon on the same inscription on which his father is called by the same title; so Belshazzar may have been called king of Babylon, although he was only crown prince. It is probable also, that as Nabunaid I had made one of his sons king of Harran, so he had made another king of Chaldea. This would account for Belshazzar's being called in ⁽²⁸⁰⁾ Daniel 5:30 the Chaldean king, although, to be sure, this word Chaldean may describe his race rather than his kingdom. The 3rd year of Belshazzar spoken of in ⁽²⁸⁰⁾ Daniel 8:1, would then refer to his 3rd year as subking of the Chaldeans under his father Nabunaid, king of Babylon, just as Cambyses was later subking of Babylon, while his father Cyrus was king of the lands. From the Book of

Daniel we might infer that this subkingdom embraced Chaldea and Susiana, and possibly the province of Babylon; and from the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle that it extended over Accad as well. That the city of Babylon alone was sometimes at least governed by an official called king is highly probable, since the father of Nergal-har-ucur is certainly, and the father of Nabunaid I is probably, called king of Babylon, in both of which cases, the city, or at most the province, of Babylon must have been meant, since we know to a certainty all of the kings who had been ruling over the empire of Babylon since 626 BC, when Nabopolassar became king, and the names of neither of these fathers of kings is found among them.

In addition to Nabunaid II, Belshazzar seems to have had another brother named Nebuchadnezzar, since the two Babylonian rebels against Darius Hystaspis both assumed the name of Nebuchadnezzar the son of Nabunaid (see the Behistun Inscription, I, 85, 89, 95). He had a sister also named Ina-esagilaremat, and a second named probably Ukabu'shai'-na.

Belshazzar had his own house in Babylon, where he seems to have been engaged in the woolen or clothing trade. He owned also estates from which he made large gifts to the gods. His father joins his name with his own in some of his prayers to the gods, and apparently appointed him commander of the army of Accad, whose especial duty it was to defend the city of Babylon against the attacks of the armies of Media and Persia.

It would appear from the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle, that Belshazzar was de facto king of the Babylonian empire, all that was left of it, from the 4th to the 8th month of the 17th year of the reign of his father Nabunaid, and that he died on the night in which Babylon was taken by Gobryas of Gutium (that is, probably, *DARIUS THE MEDE* (which see)).

The objection to the historical character of the narrative of Daniel, based upon the fact that Belshazzar in 5:11,18 is said to have been the son of Nebuchadnezzar whereas the monuments state that he was the son of Nabunaid, is fully met by supposing that one of them was his real and the other his adoptive father; or by supposing that the queen-mother and Daniel referred to the greatest of his predecessors as his father, just as Omri is called by the Assyrians the father of Jehu, and as the claimants to the Medo-Pers throne are called on the Behistun Inscription the sons of Cyaxares, and as at present the reigning sheikhs of northern Arabia are all called the sons of Rashid, although in reality they are not his sons.

LITERATURE.

The best sources of information as to the life and times of Belshazzar for English readers are: The Records of the Past; Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia; Sayce. The Higher Criticism and the Monuments; and W. W. Wright's two great works, Daniel and His Prophecies and Daniel and His Critics.

R. Dick Wilson

BELT

See ARMOR; DRESS.

BELTESHAZZAR

<bel-te-shaz'-ar> (רִבְלִי בֶּלְשַׁצְצָר [rɪbˈli bɛlˈtʃɑˈtʃɑr] Babylonian BalaT-sharucur “protect his life”; ^{<2008>}Daniel 4:8): The Bah name given to Daniel (^{<2008>}Daniel 1:7; 2:26; 5:12). Not to be confounded with Belshazzar.

BELUS, TEMPLE OF

<be'-lus>.

See BABEL.

BEN-

Ben (prefix) (singular בֶּן [ben], “son of”; plural בָּנִים [bene], “sons of” = Aramaic רַבָּ [bar]): This word is used in the singular or plural to express relationship of almost any kind:

- (1) to a person; as such it is found as part of many compound names like Benjamin, Benhur, etc. (compare Bar);
- (2) to a clan; in this connection it is found in the plural only: “children of Israel,” “children of Ammon,” etc.;
- (3) to a town; perhaps as place of birth (“son of Jabesh”; ^{<1250>}2 Kings 15:10 ff);
- (4) to occupation, state of life, age, character, quality even of things;

(5) peculiarly employed in the sense of “scholar disciple” (“son of prophet”), or in phrases like “son of death,” etc.;

(6) in poetry, “sons of flame” for “sparks” (^{<1817>}Job 5:7 margin), etc. The frequent metaphorical use of the word indicates that it was rarely used to express the relation of father to son like the Arabic Ibn. Compare HPN, 64 ff.

A. L. Breslich

BEN

^{<ben>} (^{ben}), “son”): A Levite appointed to assist as musician in the temple service (^{<13518>}1 Chronicles 15:18). The text seems to be doubtful, since the name is omitted in ^{<1351>}1 Chronicles 15:20 and not mentioned at all in the Septuagint.

BEN-ABINADAB

^{<ben-a-bin'-a-dab>}, ^{<ben-ab-i-na'-dab>} (^{bdnybāʾB}), [ben ‘abhinadhabh], “son of Abinadab”): One of the “captains” of Solomon who provided for the king and his household, each for a month in the year (^{<1041>}1 Kings 4:11). His district was the region of Dor. In the King James Version he is called “the son of Abinadab.” His wife was Tappath, the daughter of Solomon.

BENAI AH

^{<be-na'-ya>}, ^{<be-ni'-a>} (^{hynB}), [benayah], ^{WhyB}), [benayahu], “Yahweh has built.” Compare HPN, 182, 265, 268):

(1) Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada of Kabzeel (compare ^{<1652>}Joshua 15:21), was a man of “mighty deeds” and was more honorable than any of the mighty men of David except the three chiefs. Therefore David made him his chief counselor (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 23:23 m; compare ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:34 where the order of names seems to be reversed) and set him over the Cherethites (compare Carites, ^{<2104>}2 Kings 11:4 ff and margin) and Pelethites and he was made the 3rd captain of the host and chief over the course of the 3rd month (^{<1376>}1 Chronicles 27:5 f; ^{<1188>}2 Samuel 8:18; 20:23; ^{<1387>}1 Chronicles 18:17; ^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:20 ff; 11:22 ff). Being a true friend

of David (compare ^{<1058>}2 Samuel 15:18) he did not take part in the usurpation of Adonijah (^{<1008>}1 Kings 1:8,10,26), and was therefore with others chosen by the king to proclaim Solomon king over Israel (^{<1002>}1 Kings 1:32 ff) and later by Solomon to execute Adonijah (^{<1025>}1 Kings 2:25), Joab (^{<1029>}1 Kings 2:29 ff), and Shimei (^{<1026>}1 Kings 2:46). In recognition of his services Solomon appointed him over the host in Joab's place (^{<1025>}1 Kings 2:35; 4:4).

(2) Benaiah, a Pirathonite (compare ^{<0723>}Judges 12:13,15), was one of David's 30 mighty men (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 23:30; ^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 11:31). He was captain over the course of the 11th month numbering 24,000 (^{<1274>}1 Chronicles 27:14).

(3) A ruler of the house of Simeon (^{<1046>}1 Chronicles 4:36).

(4) A Levite of second degree appointed as singer (^{<1358>}1 Chronicles 15:18) with "psalteries Set to Alamoth" (^{<1350>}1 Chronicles 15:20; 16:5).

(5) A priest appointed "to blow the trumpet before the ark of God" (^{<1353>}1 Chronicles 15:24; 16:6).

(6) The father of Jehoiada (^{<1374>}1 Chronicles 27:34), but see **(1)** above.

(7) An ancestor of Jahaziel of the house of Asaph (^{<1404>}2 Chronicles 20:14).

(8) An overseer in the service of Hezekiah (^{<1413>}2 Chronicles 31:13).

(9, 10, 11, 12) Four different men of Israel who had taken "strange wives" (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:25,30,35,43).

(13) The father of Pelatiah who was seen by Ezekiel in his vision (^{<2100>}Ezekiel 11:1,13).

A. L. Breslich

BEN-AMMI

<ben-am'-i> (yMi ["ben `ammi], "son of my kinsman," ^{<0188>}Genesis 19:38):

The progenitor of the Ammonites was a son of Lot's younger daughter, born after the destruction of Sodom. The account of his birth as well as that of Moab was commonly regarded as an expression of Israel's intense hatred and contempt toward these two nations. However, this idea is rather

unwarranted, in view of the fact that the origin of the tribe of Judah (which is held in especial honor by J) is accounted for in a similiar way (Genesis 38). Gunkel (Schopfung und Chaos, 190) suggests that the narrative (~~Q19B~~ Genesis 19:30-38) was originally a Moabitic account tracing the common origin of Moab and Ammon to Lot. It presupposes a universal catastrophe — such as the conflagration of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim suggests — in which all the human race, save Lot and his two daughters, perished. In order to avert the extinction of the race, his daughters resorted to incestuous practices. In this case we have here a Moabite parallel to the Deluge story (Skinner, Genesis, 313-14). While the common origin of the two brother tribes is undoubtedly a fact (~~Q10B~~ Judges 10:6; 11:15,18,25; ~~Q19B~~ Deuteronomy 2:19; 2 Chronicles 20, etc.), the folk-etymology of their names is rather suspicious. The name Ben-Ammi is probably derived from the deity “Emu,” which is the name for Nergal among the shuchites on the West of the Euphrates a land which corresponds to the position of the Bene-`Ammo, “children of his people” (~~Q21B~~ Numbers 22:5). The chief god of the Kataban Arabs was called Ammi (Hom., ZDMG, V, 95, 525, note 1). In cuneiform inscriptions this name appears as part of the title of the Ammonite rulers (HDB). Neubauer (Studia Biblica, 1-26) suggests that the name Balaam is a compound of Bel plus Am, that is, “Amos is Lord.” For other compounds with Ammi see Gray, HPN, 41-60.

S. Cohon

BENCH

(vrq,[qeresh]): Found only in English Versions of the Bible in ~~Q576~~ Ezekiel 27:6, in the prophet's “lamentation over Tyre”: “They have made thy benches of ivory inlaid in boxwood, from the isles of Kittim,” where the word evidently stands for the “benches” of the boat whose “mast” (verse 5) and “oars” (verse 6) have just been described, in the vivid figs. of speech in which the city itself is pictured as a merchantship. Compare verse 8, “Thy wise men, O Tyre, were in thee, they were thy pilots.”

See SEAT.

BEN-DEKER

<ben-de'-ker> (רָקֹדֶק, [ben-deker], “son of Deker,” the King James Version “son of Dekar”): The word is derived from a Hebrew root meaning “to pierce.” Compare HPN, 69. One of the 12 officers who provided victuals for King Solomon and his household (~~1019~~ 1 Kings 4:9).

BENEATH

<be-neth'>: The adverb for “under” (kato). In ~~4183~~ John 8:23, the words “ye are from beneath,” suggest hell in contrast to heaven. But the succeeding clause, “ye are of this world,” gives the key for the interpretation. Earth, not hell, is expressed, although “that more awful meaning surely is not excluded” (Alford).

BENE-BERAK

<ben-e-be'-rak> (קִרְבֵּינָא, [bene beraq]; [Βανηβαράκ, Banebarak]): A town in the territory of Daniel (~~6195~~ Joshua 19:45), represented by the modern village Ibn Ibraq, about an hour Southeast of Jaffa.

BENEDICTION

<ben-e-dik'-shun>: From the earliest times the records bear testimony that pronouncing the benediction or giving the blessing was a common practice. In the temple service, this duty was assigned to the Aaronites and was made an impressive part of the service. The form of the benediction used is given in ~~4012~~ Numbers 6:22-27. References to this practice may be found in ~~4012~~ Leviticus 9:22; ~~5108~~ Deuteronomy 10:8; ~~4417~~ 2 Chronicles 30:27. After a time, minute directions were given concerning it and careful preparation was made for this part of the service. All Aaronites, of proper age, were entitled to perform this service, except those who by previous conduct or on account of physical defect were disqualified. One who had killed another, whether intentionally or otherwise, or who had violated the marriage vows, had given himself excessively to wine drinking or other excesses, or indeed had been guilty of unrighteous conduct or life, was not only prohibited from pronouncing the blessing, but was required to withdraw before this part of the service was performed. If one was blind even of one eye, or had a defect in his hands or speech, or was a hunchback, he was also excluded. Before the priest could engage in this

service he was required to wash his hands. Then, with uplifted hands, while the people stood, he uttered the words of blessing. The main idea was that thus the name of Yahweh was put on the people. Later it came to be regarded as having some special blessing in and of itself, a result against which the more spiritual of the priests protested.

It was common not only to pronounce the benediction in the public worship but also in the family. We have such instances in ~~Genesis~~ Genesis 9:26,27; 27:27-30. This practice prevailed also on many other occasions not only in Israel, but among the heathen as well. We may readily see, therefore, that from the very beginning of the Christian church the use of the benediction was common. In the course of time an extensive liturgy developed on this subject and it may be said that there are now three distinct ideas in the church as to the benediction. That section of the church which regards the minister as clothed with sacerdotal powers, holds that the blessings pronounced are actually conferred in the act of the utterance of the words, because of the powers conferred upon him when he was set aside for the sacred office. On the other hand it is held that it is merely a prayer that God may bestow certain blessings on the people. From this position others dissent, and teach that it is the declaration of the special privileges and relations in which those stand who have entered into covenant fellowship with Christ; that the blessings now declared are theirs by right of that relation, and are conferred upon them by the Holy Spirit. The Greek and Roman Catholic churches take the first portion, and therefore we find among them much of detail and minutiae as to the manner in which it should be pronounced. In the Greek church the priest raises his hand with the thumb touching the third finger, signifying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone; or according to others to form the sacred name IHS. In the Roman church the form is, the thumb, first and second fingers are to be open, to symbolize the Trinity. In this church too, the benediction is pronounced in a multitude of cases and in each case the thing so blessed by the priest is made sacred. Crosses, church vessels, houses, paschal eggs, churchyards, are thus blessed. Every parish has a collection of these forms of blessing in what is known as the "Benedictionale." The authority for this is based on some documents claiming to reach back to early church history, but as they belong to the forged decretal class, the position of the Roman church on this subject is untenable.

Apostolic benedictions, as we find them in the epistles, present

considerable variety. One of the striking features is that in a number of cases there is the omission of the Holy Ghost. The best explanation seems to be that the Father and the Son effect the redemption of the world and the Holy Ghost applies the blessing so wrought out. “Grace, mercy and peace” may then be said to be sent from the Father and the Son through the Holy Ghost to be the possession of all who have come into the kingdom. The third person of the Trinity, being thus in the act of applying the blessing, is not mentioned. The fact that in other cases Father, Son and Holy Ghost are mentioned, proves that the writers knew the character and office of the Holy Ghost. The most common form used today is that in ^{<4734>}2 Corinthians 13:14. Occasionally some changes are introduced by ministers, but it would seem best to adhere strictly to the Scriptural forms.

See BLESSING; SALUTATION.

Jacob W. Kapp

BENEFACTOR

^{<ben-e-fak'-ter>} (Greek [*euergetes*], ^{<4725>}Luke 22:25): There is here a probable allusion to two kings of Egypt (Ptolemy III and VII), who had the surname “Euergetes,” of whom the period of the first was 247-242 BC, and of the second, 147-117 BC. Jesus draws the contrast between worldly kingdoms, in which the title “benefactor” is given those who rule with all the splendor of earthly display and luxury, and His kingdom, in which it belongs only to those whose work is that of humble, obscure and often menial service.

BENEFIT

^{<ben'-e-fit>} (**I WmG** [gemul] = “a deed,” ^{<4725>}2 Chronicles 32:25); **b f** ^y:[yaTabh] = (causat.) “to make well,” “to do good” (^{<2480>}Jeremiah 18:10). The plural of **I WmG** [gemul], is found in ^{<1942>}Psalms 103:2. ^{<1989>}Psalms 68:19 (the King James Version) should be translated “Blessed be the Lord. Day by day he sustains us; God is our salvation.” [**χάρις**, *charis*] = “gift”; “grace” (2 Cor 1:15, “a second benefit”: that is, two visits in the same journey). [**εὐεργεσία**, *euergesia*] = “good deed done” (1 Tim 6:2: “because they that partake of the benefit (of their service) are believing and beloved”); [**ἀγαθός**, *agathos*] = “good” (^{<5014>}Philemon 1:14, the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “goodness”).

BENE-JAAKAN

<ben-e-ja'-a-kan>, <be-ne-ja'-a-kan> (ʔq[ɣ'ynB][bene ya`aqan]:
^{<1083>}Numbers 33:31,32).

See BEEROTH BENE-JAAKAN.

BENEVOLENCE

<be-nev'-o-lens>: the King James Version translation of phrase in Textus Receptus of the New Testament of ^{<1078>}1 Corinthians 7:3, rejected by the Revised Version (British and American) which following Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek translates Greek [*opheile*], “due.” This reference to the marriage relation is explained in 7:4. Compare ^{<1210>}Exodus 21:10.

BEN-GEBER

<ben-ge'-ber> (rbGA^B,[ben-gebher], “son of Geber”; the King James Version son of Geber; the word is derived from a Hebrew root meaning “to be strong.” Compare HPN, 66, 69): One of the twelve commissariat officers in the service of Solomon (^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13).

BENHADAD

<ben-ha'-dad> (ddhA^B,[ben-hadhadh]; Septuagint [υἱὸς δέπ, huios Hader]):

THE NAME:

The name of three kings of Syria mentioned in the historical books. Hadad is the Syrian god of storms, and is apparently identical with Rimmon (^{<1278>}2 Kings 5:18), the Assyrian Rammanu, “the Thunderer,” whose temple was in Damascus. The name Benhadad, “son of Hadad,” accords with the custom which obtained in Semitic mythology of calling a king or a nation the son of the national god, as we have Mesha`, son of Chemosh, and the Moabites, children of Chemosh. Benhadad seems to have become a general designation for the kings of Syria (Amos 1:4; ^{<2427>}Jeremiah 49:27).

I. BENHADAD I

1. The Kingdom of Syria Founded:

Benhadad I was the son of Tabrimmon, who is called (~~<1158>~~ 1 Kings 15:18) “the son of Hezion, king of Syria, that dwelt at Damascus.” Hezion has been with some plausibility identified with Rezon (~~<11123>~~ 1 Kings 11:23,25) who founded the kingdom of Damascus and imparted to Syria that temper of hostility to Israel which became hereditary. Meanwhile the Arameans had shaken themselves free from the rule of the Hittites, and with Damascus for a center had planted strong settlements in the plains westward from the Euphrates. By the time that Benhadad entered into this succession, Syria was the strongest power in this region of Western Asia, and ready to take advantage of every opportunity of increasing her dominions.

2. Syria and Judah:

Such an opportunity presented itself in the appeal of Asa, king of Judah, for help against Baasha king of Israel. The two Hebrew kingdoms had been at feud ever since their disruption. Baasha had pushed his frontier southward to Ramah, within 5 miles of Jerusalem, and this commanding eminence he proceeded to fortify. The danger of a hostile fortress overlooking his capital, and the humiliation of his rival’s presence so near, were more than Asa could bear. It was at this juncture that he bethought him of Benhadad. Taking all the silver and the gold that were left in the treasury of the house of the Lord, and the treasury of the king’s house, he sent them to Benhadad with a request for an alliance begging him at the same time to break off the league he had with Baasha and thus enable Asa to dislodge his enemy. Benhadad saw an opening for the aggrandizement of his kingdom and broke off the alliance he had had with Jeroboam and Baasha. By an invasion of Northern Israel he obliged Baasha to withdraw from Ramah and confine himself to the neighborhood of his own capital (~~<11516>~~ 1 Kings 15:16 ff). Judah obtained relief, but the price paid for it was too great. Asa had surrendered his treasures, and very likely some of his independence.

3. Shortsightedness of Asa:

For his shortsightedness in laying himself under obligation to Benhadad and relying upon the help of Syria rather than upon the Lord his God, Asa was rebuked by the prophet Hanani (~~<14101>~~ 2 Chronicles 16:1 ff). Benhadad had

extended his territories by the transaction and seems to have exercised henceforward some sort of sovereignty over both the Hebrew kingdoms.

LITERATURE.

McCurdy HPM, I, 256; H. P. Smith, Old Testament History, 186.

2. BENHADAD II

1. Hadad-'idri of the Monuments:

Benhadad II was in all probability the son of Benhadad I. He is the Hadad-ezer, or Hadad-'idri, of the monuments. He comes first upon the scene of the Biblical history invading the land of Israel with a large host, in which were 32 tributary kings, and horses and chariots. He had penetrated as far as Samaria, the newly built city of Omri, now the capital of his son Ahab. Benhadad and his Syrian host had laid siege to Samaria and Ahab had been summoned to surrender. Ahab was disposed to come to terms, but the intolerable proposals made by Benhadad drove him to resistance. Encouraged by the elders of the people, and acting on the counsel of a prophet, Ahab made a sortie and falling upon the carousing Syrians put them so completely to rout that Benhadad himself only escaped on a horse with the horsemen.

2. Expeditions against Israel:

Next year the Syrians resolved to retrieve their defeat saying of the Israelites, "Their God is a god of the hills; therefore they were stronger than we: but let us fight against them in the plain, and surely we shall be stronger than they." Ahab had been warned to expect the return of the Syrians and was prepared for the fresh attack. For seven days the two armies faced each other, the Israelites "like two little flocks of kids" before a host that filled the country. On the seventh day they joined battle near to Aphek, and the Syrians met again an overwhelming defeat. Yahweh was proved to be God both of the plains and of the hills. Benhadad was taken prisoner, and appealing to the clemency of the victor, he persuaded Ahab to spare his life.

3. Alliance with Ahab:

A treaty was agreed upon between the two monarchs under which Ahab's people were to have bazaars of their own in Damascus, as it would appear

Benhadad I had had for his subjects before in Samaria (^{<1200>}1 Kings 20:1-34). The treaty was denounced by a prophet, and Ahab was warned that this man whom God had devoted to destruction would be the destruction of himself and his people. Under the treaty, however, there were three years without war between Syria and Israel.

4. Biblical History Confirmed by the Monuments:

The treaty and the resulting period of peace receive striking confirmation from the monuments. From the monolith inscription of Shalmaneser II we learn that this Assyrian king in the 6th year of his reign (854 BC) had crossed the Tigris and made his way across the Euphrates on boats of sheepskin into Syria to Chalman (Aleppo). At Karkar he encountered the combined forces of Damascus, Hamath, Israel and the states which had united to oppose his progress westward. Achabbu Sir-'lai, Ahab of Israel Damascus are Dad'idri Hadadezer (Benhadad II) of Damascus are named in the inscription with chariots, horsemen and infantry, making common cause against Shalmaneser and fighting on the same side. It was Benhadad, as we gather, that bore the brunt of the assault, but the result of the battle was the complete rout of the allies with the loss of 14,000 men. That the assistance of Israel on the occasion was the outcome of the treaty between Ahab and Benhadad, and that the combination against Shalmaneser took place during the three years of peace, are in the highest degree probable.

5. Alliance Broken Off:

The disaster to the allies, however, seems to have broken up the confederacy. When the king of Syria is next mentioned in Biblical history, it is defending the city of Ramoth-Gilead against the attack made upon it by Ahab, who is found now in alliance with Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, attempting unsuccessfully and with fatal results to himself, to recover this city of Israel from the weakened power of Damascus. At Ramoth-Gilead Benhadad is not said to have 32 tributary kings in his train, but 32 military commanders who have taken their place (^{<1220>}1 Kings 22:2,29-31).

6. Benhadad and Elisha:

The peace between Israel and Syria having been broken, there was frequent, if not continuous, war between the kingdoms, in which the prophet Elisha is a prominent figure. He healed of his leprosy Naaman, Benhadad's commander-in-chief. He disclosed to the king of Israel the places wherever Benhadad pitched his camp. He smote with blindness a

great host whom Benhadad had sent with horses and chariots to seize him at Dothan, and led them into Samaria where he saw them treated kindly and sent back to their master (~~2~~2 Kings 6:8-23).

7. Panic of Syrians at Samaria:

Some time after Benhadad again assembled all his host and laid siege to Samaria. So great was the famine that women ate their own children. The king of Israel sent one of his men to put Elisha to death, but Elisha closed his house against him and announced that on the morrow there would be great plenty in the city. And so it happened. Certain lepers, despairing of relief, had gone into the Syrian camp and learned that the Syrians had abandoned their camp in a panic, believing that the king of Israel had hired the kings of the Mucri and the northern Hittites to raise the siege (~~2~~2 Kings 6:24 through 7:20; compare Burney's note, 7:6).

8. Murder of Benhadad:

Still another notice of Benhadad II is found in the Annals of Shalmaneser, who records that in the 11th year of his reign he defeated a combination of 12 kings of the Hittites with Benhadad at their head, and slew 10,000 men. Of this, there is no record in Biblical history, but it must have been shortly before the tragedy which ended the career of the Syrian king. Benhadad had fallen sick and sent his commander-in-chief, Hazael, to inquire as to the issue of his sickness of the prophet Elisha, who was visiting Damascus. Elisha foretold the king's death, and wept as he read to Hazael the cruel purpose which the Syrian commander was even then maturing. Hazael professed to be incredulous, but he departed from Elisha and the very next day in cold blood put his master to death and ascended the throne (~~2~~2 Kings 8:7-15). Thus ingloriously ended the reign of one of the most powerful of the Syrian kings.

LITERATURE.

McCurdy, HPM, I, 267 ff; Schrader, COT, I, 179 if; Winckler, Geschichte Israels, Theil I, 133-55.

3. BENHADAD III

1. His Contemporaries:

Benhadad III was the son of the usurper Hazael, and though not in the dynastic succession, assumed on the death of his father the dynastic name. He was contemporary with Amaziah, king of Judah; Jehoahaz, the son of Jehu, king of Israel; and Ramman-Nirari III, king of Assyria. The fortunes of Israel had fallen low in the days of Jehoahaz, and Hazael and Benhadad III were the instruments of Yahweh's displeasure with the nation. At this time Jehoahaz had no more than 53 horsemen and 10 chariots and 10,000 footmen; for the king of Syria had destroyed them and made them like the dust in threshing (^{<1231>}2 Kings 13:7). It was when the fortunes of Israel were at the lowest ebb by reason of the oppression of the king of Syria — by this time Benhadad — that help came to them and Yahweh gave Israel a savior, so that Israel went out from under the hands of the Syrians, “and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents (in their homes) as beforetime” (^{<1235>}2 Kings 13:5).

2. The Assyrians in the West:

The “saviour” of the Biblical narrative is the one allusion in Scripture to the king of Assyria of that day, Ramman-Nirari III, whose inscriptions record his victorious expedition to the West. “From the Euphrates to the land of the Hittites,” runs an inscription, “the west country in its entire compass, Tyre, Zidon, the land Omri, Edom, Philistia as far as the Great Sea of the sunseting, I subjected to my yoke; payment of tribute I imposed upon them. Against Syria of Damascus I marched; Mari, the king of Syria, in Damascus his royal city I besieged.” He then proceeds to tell of the subjugation of the monarch and of the spoils obtained from his capital. That Mari which means in Aramaic “lord,” is Benhadad III, the son of Hazael, is now generally believed.

3. Downfall of Damascus before Ramman-Nirari III:

With the capture of Damascus and the collapse of the Syrian power under Marl (Benhadad III), an era of recuperation and prosperity became possible to Israel and Judah. So it came to pass that “Jehoash the son of Jehoahaz took again out of the hand of Benhadad the son of Hazael the cities which he had taken out of the hand of Jehoahaz by war. Three times did Joash smite him, and recovered the cities of Israel” (^{<1235>}2 Kings 13:25).

4. *Breathing Space for Israel:*

Israel was able to breathe freely for a time and Jeroboam II restored the Northern Kingdom to its former extent and glory. But the flame of war which had been sent into the house of Hazael and which devoured the palaces of Benhadad (Amos 1:4 ff) was only waiting the time when the Assyrians would be free to renew their expeditions to the West and carry Samaria and Israel “into captivity beyond Damascus” (~~<3182>~~ Amos 5:27).

LITERATURE.

McCurdy, HPM, I, 291 ff; Schrader, COT, I, 202-ff.

T. Nicol.

BEN-HAIL

<ben-ha’-il> (*l yj " A^B*_i[ben-chayil], “son of strength”; compare HPN, 65, 231): One of the princes who was sent by Jehoshaphat “to teach in the cities of Judah” (~~<4473>~~ 2 Chronicles 17:7).

BEN-HANAN

<ben-ha’-nan> (*^nj A^B*_i[ben-chanan], “son of grace”): A son of Shimon of the house of Judah (~~<1393>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:20).

BEN-HESED

<ben-he’-sed> (*dsj A^B*_i[ben-chechedh], “son of Hesed”; the King James Version son of Hesed; the word is derived from a Hebrew root meaning “to be kind”): A commissariat officer in the service of Solomon (~~<1090>~~ 1 Kings 4:10).

BEN-HUR

<ben-hur’> (*rWj A^B*_i[ben-chur], “son of Hur”; the King James Version son of Hur; from a Hebrew root meaning “to be white.” Compare HPN, 69, note 3): One of the twelve commissariat officers in the service of Solomon (~~<1008>~~ 1 Kings 4:8).

BENINU

<be-ni'-nu> (~~W~~~~nyn~~~~B~~)[beninu], “our son”): A Levite who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant (~~16003~~ Nehemiah 10:13).

BEN-JAAKAN

<ben-ja'-a-kan>.

See *BENE-JAAKAN*.

BENJAMIN

<ben'-ja-min> (~~^~~~~ymjn~~~~B~~)[binyamin], or [binyamin]; [~~B~~~~ev~~~~ia~~~~ε~~~~ί~~~~v~~, Beniaein], [~~B~~~~ev~~~~ia~~~~μ~~~~ί~~~~v~~, Benjamin]):

1. THE PATRIARCH:

The youngest of Jacob's sons. His mother Rachel died in giving him birth. As she felt death approaching she called him Benoni, “son of my sorrow.” Fearing, probably, that this might bode evil for the child — for names have always preserved a peculiar significance in the East — Jacob called him Benjamin, “son of the fight hand” (~~0357~~ Genesis 35:17 ff). He alone of Jacob's sons was born in Palestine, between Bethel and Ephrath. Later in the chapter, in the general enumeration of the children born in Paddan-ar am, the writer fails to except Benjamin (~~0354~~ Genesis 35:24). Joseph was his full brother. In the history where Benjamin appears as an object of solicitude to his father and brothers, we must not forget that he was already a grown man. At the time of the descent of Israel to Egypt Joseph was about 40 years of age. Benjamin was not much younger, and was himself the father of a family. The phrase in ~~0440~~ Genesis 44:20, “a little one,” only describes in oriental fashion one much younger than the speaker. And as the youngest of the family no doubt he was made much of. Remorse over their heartless treatment of his brother Joseph may have made the other brothers especially tender toward Benjamin. The conduct of his brethren all through the trying experiences in Egypt places them in a more attractive light than we should have expected; and it must have been a gratification to their father (Genesis 42 ff). Ten sons of Benjamin are named at the time of their settlement in Egypt (~~0442~~ Genesis 46:21).

2. THE TRIBE:

At the Exodus the number of men of war in the tribe is given as 35,400. At the second census it is 45,600 (^{<04157>}Numbers 1:37; 26:41). Their place in the host was with the standard of the camp of Ephraim on the west of the tabernacle, their prince being Abidan the son of Gideoni (^{<04122>}Numbers 2:22 f). Benjamin was represented among the spies by Palti the son of Raphu; and at the division of the land the prince of Benjamin was Elidad the son of Chislon (^{<04139>}Numbers 13:9; 34:21).

3. TERRITORY:

The boundaries of the lot that fell to Benjamin are pretty clearly indicated (^{<04381>}Joshua 18:11 ff). It lay between Ephraim on the North and Judah on the South. The northern frontier started from the Jordan over against Jericho, and ran to the north of that town up through the mountain westward past Bethaven, taking in Bethel. It then went down by Ataroth-addar to Beth-horon the nether. From this point the western frontier ran southward to Kiriath-jearim. The southern boundary ran from Kiriath-jearim eastward to the fountain of the waters of Netophah, swept round by the south of Jerrus and passed down through the wilderness northern by shore of the Dead Sea at the mouth of the Jordan. The river formed the eastern boundary. The lot was comparatively small. This, according to Josephus, was owing to "the goodness of the land" (Ant., V, i, 22); a description that would apply mainly to the plans of Jericho. The uplands are stony, mountainous, and poor in water; but there is much good land on the western slopes.

4. IMPORTANCE OF POSITION:

It will be seen from the above that Benjamin held the main avenues of approach to the highlands from both East and West: that by which Joshua led Israel past Ai from Gilgal, and the longer and easier ascents from the West, notably that along which the tides of battle so often rolled, the Valley of Aijalon, by way of the Beth-horons. Benjamin also sat astride the great highway connecting North and South, which ran along the ridge of the western range, in the district where it was easiest of defense. It was a position calling for occupation by a brave and warlike tribe such as Benjamin proved to be. His warriors were skillful archers and slingers, and they seem to have cultivated the use of both hands, which gave them a great advantage in battle (^{<07206>}Judges 20:16; ^{<1384>}1 Chronicles 8:40; 12:2,

etc.). These characteristics are reflected in the Blessing of Jacob (^{<0427>}Genesis 49:27). The second deliverer of Israel in the period of the Judges was Ehud, the left-handed Benjamite (^{<0085>}Judges 3:15).

5. HISTORY:

The Benjamites fought against Sisera under Deborah and Barak (^{<0054>}Judges 5:14). The story told in ^{<0721>}Judges 20:21 presents many difficulties which cannot be discussed here. It is valuable as preserving certain features of life in these lawless times when there was no details in Israel. Whatever may be said of the details, it certainly reflects the memory of some atrocity in which the Benjamites were involved and for which they suffered terrible punishment. The election of Saul as first king over united Israel naturally lent a certain prestige to the tribe. After the death of Saul they formed the backbone of Ish-bosheth's party, and most unwillingly conceded precedence to Judah in the person of David (^{<0025>}2 Samuel 2:15,25; 3:17 ff). It was a Benjamite who heaped curses upon David in the hour of his deep humiliation (^{<0065>}2 Samuel 16:5); and the jealousy of Benjamin led to the revolt on David's return, which was so effectually stamped out by Joab (2 Samuel 19 f). Part of the tribe, probably the larger part, went against Judah at the disruption of the kingdom, taking Bethel with them. ^{<1123>}1 Kings 12:20 says that none followed the house of David but the house of Judah only. But the next verse tells us that Rehoboam gathered the men of Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam. It seems probable that as Jerusalem had now become the royal city of the house of David, the adjoining parts of Benjamin proved loyal, while the more distant joined the Northern Kingdom. After the downfall of Samaria Judah assumed control of practically the whole territory of Benjamin (^{<1235>}2 Kings 23:15,19, etc.). Nehemiah gives the Valley of Hinnom as the south boundary of Benjamin in his time (^{<1613>}Nehemiah 11:30), while westward it extended to include Lod and Ono. Saul of Tarsus was a member of this tribe (^{<1005>}Philippians 3:5).

(4) A great-grandson of Benjamin, son of Jacob (^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 7:10).

(5) One of those who had married a foreign wife (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:32, and probably also ^{<1623>}Nehemiah 3:23; 12:34).

W. Ewing

BENJAMIN, GATE OF

See JERUSALEM.

BENJAMITE

<ben'-ja-mit>: One belonging to the tribe of Benjamin, such as Ehud (^{<0815>}Judges 3:15), Saul (^{<0901>}1 Samuel 9:1,2), Sheba (^{<1001>}2 Samuel 20:1), Shimei (^{<1008>}1 Kings 2:8), etc.

BENO

<be'-no> (w⁰Bⁱ) [beno], “his son”): The son of Jaaziah of the house of Levi (^{<1345>}1 Chronicles 24:26,27).

BEN-ONI

<ben-o'-ni> (ynw⁰Bⁱ) [ben-'oni]; [ὕιὸς ὀδύνης μου, huios odunes mou], “son of my sorrow”): The name given by the dying Rachel to her new-born son; changed by his father Jacob to BENJAMIN (^{<0358>}Genesis 35:18) which see.

BEN-ZOHETH

<ben-zo'-heth> (tj w⁰A[^]Bⁱ) [ben-zoheth], “son of Zoheth,” from a Hebrew root meaning “to be strong(?)”): A son of Ishi of the house of Judah (^{<1049>}1 Chronicles 4:20).

BEON

<be'-on> (^{<0618>}Numbers 32:3).

See BAAL-MEON.

BEOR

<be'-or> (rw⁰Bⁱ) [be`or], “destroyer”(?):

(1) Father of Bela, the first king of Edom (^{<0352>}Genesis 36:32; ^{<1046>}1 Chronicles 1:43).

(2) The father of the seer Balaam (^{<0215>}Numbers 22:5; 24:3,15; 31:8; ^{<0204>}Deuteronomy 23:4; ^{<0132>}Joshua 13:22; 24:9, omitted in Septuagint; ^{<3015>}Micah 6:5; ^{<0125>}2 Peter 2:15, the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin “Bosor”).

BERA

^{<be'-ra>} ([^{rB},[bera`], “gift”(??); compare HPN, 74 note): King of Sodom (^{<0140>}Genesis 14:2) who in the battle of Siddim was subdued by Chedorlaomer.

BERACAH

^{<be-ra'-ka>} (^{hkrB})[berakhah], “blessing,” the King James Version Berachah): A Benjamite who joined David at Ziklag (^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 12:3).

BERACAH, VALLEY OF

^{<be-ra'-ka>}, ^{<ber'-a-ka>} (the King James Version Berachah; ^{hkrB}][^{qm}][[Ⓔ] emeq berkhah]; [^{κοιλὰς εὐλογίας}, koilas eulogias]): After the victory of Jehoshaphat and his people over Moab and Ammon, “On the fourth day they assembled themselves in the valley of Beracah; for there they blessed Yahweh: therefore the name of that place was called The valley of Beracah (i.e. of blessing) unto this day” (^{<1015>}2 Chronicles 20:26). In the Wady `Arrub there is a ruin called Breikut and the valley in its proximity receives the same name. This is on the main road from Hebron to Jerusalem and not far from Tekoa; it suits the narrative well (see PEF, III, 352).

E. W. G. Masterman

BERACHIAH

^{<ber-a-ki'-a>}.

See BERECHIAH.

BERAIAH

<be-ri'-a> (**hyarB**) [bera'yah], “Yah hath created”): A son of Shimei of the house of Benjamin (~~<1382>~~ 1 Chronicles 8:21).

BEREA

<be-re'-a>.

See *BERCEA*.

BEREAVE; BEREAVEN; BEREFT

<be-rev'>, <be-rev'-er>, <be-reft'>: Bereave is frequently used in the Old Testament in the (now almost obsolete) meaning of “to deprive,” “to take away,” especially with reference to loss of children. The Hebrew word used here is **לל v** [shakhol], “to be childless,” or in the Piel “to make childless” (compare ~~<1426>~~ Genesis 42:36 et al.). In the King James Version ~~<2108>~~ Ecclesiastes 4:8 (from the Hebrew **רסב** [chacer], “to lack”) we read “and bereave my soul of good” (the Revised Version (British and American) “deprive”), and in ~~<2514>~~ Ezekiel 36:14 (from Hebrew **לל v** **כ** [kashal], “to stumble”), “neither bereave thy nations any more” (the Revised Version, margin “cause to stumble”).

Bereaver, otherwise very rare, is found the Revised Version (British and American) ~~<2513>~~ Ezekiel 36:13 (from Hebrew **לל v** [shakhol] “to be childless”), “a bereaver of thy nation” (the King James Version “hast bereaved”).

Bereft is found in ~~<5115>~~ 1 Timothy 6:5 (from the Greek [apostereo], “to rob”) “bereft of the truth” (the King James Version “destitute”). The expression bereavement (the Revised Version (British and American) ~~<2340>~~ Isaiah 49:20) in the phrase “the children of thy bereft” means “the children born to thee in the time when God had afflicted thee.”

A. L. Breslich

BERECHIAH

<ber-e-ki'-a> (hykṭB,[berekhyah], WhykṭB,[berekhyahu], “Yahweh blesses,” HPN, 216, 287):

- (1) A descendant of David (^{<181>}1 Chronicles 3:20).
- (2) The father of Asaph, the singer (^{<107>}1 Chronicles 6:39 the King James Version “Berachiah”; ^{<157>}1 Chronicles 15:17).
- (3) A former inhabitant of Jerusalem, a Levee (^{<196>}1 Chronicles 9:16).
- (4) A doorkeeper ‘for the ark at David’s time (^{<153>}1 Chronicles 15:23).
- (5) One of the heads of the children of Ephraim (^{<182>}2 Chronicles 28:12).
- (6) The father of Meshullam the builder (^{<184>}Nehemiah 3:4,30; 6:18).
- (7) The father of the prophet Zechariah (^{<107>}Zechariah 11:7).

A. L. Breslich

BERED (1)

<be'-red> (drB,[beredh], “hail,” from a Hebrew root meaning “to be cold”): The son of Shuthelah of the house of Ephraim (^{<121>}1 Chronicles 7:20). Compare *BECHER*.

BERED (2)

<be'-red> (drB,[beredh]; [Bαράδ, Barad]): A place in the Negeb mentioned in the story of Hagar (^{<164>}Genesis 16:14). The well Beer-lahai-roi was “between Kadesh and Bered.” The Onkelos Targum renders it Chaghra', which is the usual equivalent of Shur, while the Jerusalem Targum renders it Chalutsah, which is also Shur (^{<152>}Exodus 15:22). Chalutsah is clearly the city of Elusu mentioned by Ptolemy and from the 4th to the 7th centuries by various ecclesiastical writers. It was an important town on the road from Palestine to Kadesh and Mount Sinai. This is without doubt the very large and important ruin Kh. Khalasa, some 70 miles South of Jerusalem on the road from Beersheba and Rehoboth. “These ruins cover an area of 15 to 20 acres, throughout which the

foundations and enclosures of houses are distinctly to be traced. We judged that here there must have been a city with room enough for a population of 15,000 to 20,000 souls” (Robinson, BR, I, 201).

E. W. G. Masterman

BERENICE

<ber'-e-nes>.

See *BERNICE*.

BERI

<be'-ri> (yrB[beri], “wisdom”): A descendant of Asher (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 7:36).

BERIAH; BERITES

<be-ri'-a>, <be-ri'-its> (h[yrB][beri`ah], “in shouting,” probably derived from a Hebrew root meaning “to make noise,” or “in evil,” from another Hebrew root):

(1) A son of Asher and father of Heber and Malchiel (^{<1447>}Genesis 46:17; ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 7:30,31; the head of the family of the Beriites, ^{<1344>}Numbers 26:44 ff).

(2) A son of Ephraim, called Beriah by his father because “it went evil with his house” (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 7:23).

(3) A descendant of Benjamin (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:13,16).

(4) A Levite in the line of Gershon (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 23:10 f).

BERITES

<be'-rits> (myrB[berim]; according to Klostermann and others,

myrkBi[bikhrim]): The word is found only once in the Old Testament (^{<1304>}2 Samuel 20:14). The passage seems to be doubtful. The suggestion of Klostermann does not improve matters any; the other proposed reading,

μυρj B" [bachrim] (Vulgate, viri electi), "choice young men," is to be preferred.

BERITH

<be'-rith> (**tyrBj**)[berith], "covenant").

See BAAL-BERITH.

BERNICE

<ber-ni'-se> ([**Βερνίκη**] "victorious"): One of the shameless women of the Bible, mentioned in ^{<4253>}Acts 25:13,23; 26:30. She was the eldest daughter of Herod Agrippa I (^{<4110>}Acts 12:1,6,11,21) who ruled from 38-45 AD. Her whole life from the Jewish standpoint was incestuous. Its story is told by Josephus (Ant XIX, v, 1; XX, vii, 1-3), also by Juvenal (6, 156). Her first husband was her own uncle, Herod of Calchis. After his death she consorted with her own brother Agrippa II, with whom she listened to the impassioned defense of Paul at Caesarea before Felix. For a while she was married to King Ptolemy or Polemo of Sicily, who for her sake embraced Judaism, by the rite of circumcision. But she left him soon to return to Agrippa. Later on she figures shamefully in the lives of Vespasian and Titus, father and son. If heredity stands for anything, its lessons are forcibly taught in the history of the Herodian family.

Henry E. Dosker

BERODACH-BALADAN

<be-ro'-dak-bal'-a-dan>.

See MERODACH-BALADAN.

BEROEIA

<be-re'-a> ([**Βέροια**, Beroia] or [**Βέρροια**, Berroia]):

(1) A town of southwestern Macedonia, in the district of Emathia. It lay at the foot of Mt. Bermius, on a tributary of the Haliacmon, and seems to have been an ancient town, though the date of its foundation is uncertain. A passage in Thucydides (i.61) relating to the year 432 BC probably refers to another place of the same name, but an inscription (Inscr Graec, II, 5,

296i) proves its existence at the end of the 4th century BC, and it is twice mentioned by Polybius (xxvii.8; xxviii.8). After the battle of Pydha in 168 BC Berea was the first city to surrender to Rome and fell in the third of the four regions into which Macedonia was divided (Livy xlv.45; xlv.29). Paul and Silas came to Berea from Thessalonica which they had been forced by an uproar to leave, and preached in the synagogue to the Jews, many of whom believed after a candid examination of the apostolic message in the light of their Scriptures (^{<4171>}Acts 17:10,11). A number of “Gr women of honorable estate and of men” also believed, but the advent of a body of hostile Jews from Thessalonica created a disturbance in consequence of which Paul had to leave the city, though Silas and Timothy stayed there for a few days longer (^{<4172>}Acts 17:12-15). Perhaps the Sopater of Berea who accompanied Paul to Asia on his last journey to Jerusalem was one of his converts on this visit (^{<4116>}Acts 20:4). Berea, which was one of the most populous cities of Macedonia early became a bishopric under the metropolitan of Thessalonica and was itself made a metropolis by Andronicus II (1283-1328): there is a tradition that the first bishop of the church was Onesimus. It played a prominent part in the struggles between the Greeks and the Bulgarians and Serbs, and was finally conquered by the Turks in 1373-74. The town, which still bears among the Greeks its ancient name (pronounced Verria) though called by the Turks Karaferia, possesses but few remains of antiquity with the exception of numerous inscriptions (Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, III, 290 ff; Cousinery, *Voyage dans la Macedoine*, I, 57 ff; Dimitsis, *Makedonia in Greek*, 57 ff).

Marcus N. Tod

(2) The place where Menelaus the ex-high priest was executed by order of Antiochus Eupator, the victim, according to local custom, being cast from a tower 50 cubits high into a bed of ashes (2 Macc 13:3 ff). It was the ancient city of Chalab, lying about midway between Antioch and Hierapolis. Seleucus Nicator gave it the name Berea. It was a city of importance under the Moslems in the Middle Ages, when the old name again asserted itself, and remains to the present time.

The name “Aleppo” came to us through the Venetian traders in the days before the great overland route to India via Aleppo lost its importance through the discovery of the passage round the Cape. Aleppo is now a city of nearly 130,000 inhabitants. The governor exercises authority over a wide district extending from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean.

(3) ([**Βερέα**, Berea]); A place mentioned in 1 Macc 9:4. It may be identical with **BEEROTH** (which see) in Benjamin, a Hivite town, 8 miles North of Jerusalem, or with the modern Birez-Zait, 1 1/2 miles Northwest of Jifneh.

W. Ewing

BEROTH

<be'-roth> (1 Esdras 5:19).

See BEEROTH.

BEROTHAI

<be-ro'-tha> (^{<26716>}Ezekiel 47:16: **htwOBe**[berothah]; Septuagint Codex Vaticanus, [**βθηρά**, Abthera]; or BEROTHAI ^{<1008>}2 Samuel 8:8; **yt" rBe**[berothai], where for **yt" rBe**[mibberothai] Septuagint reads [*ek ton eklekton poleon*], "from the select cities"): Probably two forms of the same name. ^{<26716>}Ezekiel 47:16 places it on the ideal northern frontier of Israel, between Damascus and Hamath. According to ^{<1008>}2 Samuel 8:8 it was a city of Hadadezer, king of Zobah. In the parallel passage (^{<13008>}1 Chronicles 18:8) Cun is given in place of Berothai. Its site is unknown. Ewald connected it with Beirut (so also apparently H. P. Smith, ICC, "Samuel," 307), but Ezekiel's description excludes this view. Others have sought it in the Wady Brissa, in the East slope of Lebanon, North of Baalbec. A more plausible conjecture identifies it with Bereitan (Brithen), a village somewhat South of Baalbec (Baedeker, Pal3, 369). Possibly, however, the ideal northern frontier line should be drawn farther south.

See HETHLON; ZEDAD; ZOBAB.

C. H. Thomson

BEROTHITE

<be'-roth-it>.

See BEEROTHITE.

BERRIES

<ber'-is>: Occurs in ~~5082~~ James 3:12 (the King James Version) in the phrase “olive berries” ([ἐλαῖαι, elaiai]). The Revised Version (British and American) reads simply “olives.”

BERYL

<ber'-il>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

BERYTUS

<ber'-i-tus>, <be-ri'-tus> ([Βηρυτός, Berutos]; Arabic: modern Beirut, Beyrout, Beyrouth): An ancient Phoenician city situated on the North side of a promontory jutting out from the base of Lebanon to the West into the Mediterranean and forming a bay on the North connected with the fable of George and the Dragon, and hence called George's Bay. The city is about 25 miles North of Sidon and about 12 South of the famous Lycus or Dog River, at the mouth of which are found the sculptured rocks bearing the monuments of the ancient kings of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria.

The city has been thought by some to be the Berothai of ~~1088~~ 2 Samuel 8:8 or the Berothah of ~~2676~~ Ezekiel 47:16, but the connection in which these cities are mentioned seems to preclude the identification. The town is, however, an ancient one, for it occurs in Tell el-Amarna Letters as Beruti where it is closely connected with Gebal of which it may have been a dependency.

Though not mentioned in Old Testament or New Testament it appears in the history of Herod the Great as an important town where was assembled a court of 150 judges, presided over by Saturninus, a former Roman consul, to try the case which Herod brought against his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, who were condemned there by the Roman court (Ant., XVI, xi, 2). Beirut was a Roman colony at this time where many veterans settled and it afterward became the seat of a great Roman law school which was attended, in the days of Justinian, by thousands of students. It was utterly destroyed by an earthquake in 551 AD, and for a time was abandoned. Many remains of temples and public buildings of the Roman period remain. It rose to some importance during the Crusades and

is at present the chief seaport of Syria, and has the only harbor on the coast. It is a town of about 125,000 inhabitants.

H. Porter

BERZELUS

<ber-ze'-lus>.

See ZORZELLEUS.

BESAI

<be'-si> (ys" Bēbecay], “downtrodden”): The descendants of Besai (Nethinim) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (<1914> Ezra 2:49; <1672> Nehemiah 7:52 = Basthai, 1 Esdras 5:31).

BESET

<be-set'> ([εὐπερίστατος, euperistatos]): The most common sense of this word is “to surround.” This is the thought in <1915> Psalm 139:5, and teaches the omnipresence of God. Often wicked men find that the things which they have done so envelope them that they cannot escape ruin (<2072> Hosea 7:2). The reference in <8201> Hebrews 12:1 is first of all against the sin of apostasy against which repeated warning is given in this book. But the warning is also against any sin that is especially dangerous to us. It, again and again, surrounds us like a besieging army. To surrender would be traitorous and disgraceful, since the Captain of the Lord’s host is with us.

Jacob W. Kapp

BESIDE

<be-sid'>: Near to, or close to (<1922> Psalm 23:2). It is often used to refer to the mental state, to the derangement of the mind ([ἐξίστημι, existemi], <1071> Mark 3:21; <1071> Acts 26:24 the King James Version). Or it may refer to the condition of being out of the ordinary course of the life. A life consecrated to God and spent in the interest of humanity is so designated (2 Cor 5:13). It has the sense also of a state of being out of one’s usual mind, but not of mental derangement, occasioned by something that causes amazement or astonishment (<1072> Mark 5:42). Or it may refer to a state in which one is not conscious of present conditions, but is rapt in vision

(^{<4100>}Acts 10:10).

Besides is used in the sense of in addition to or that which is over and above what has been said or is possessed (^{<2163>}Luke 16:26; see the American Revised Version, margin “in”; ^{<5019>}Philemon 1:19).

Jacob W. Kapp

BESIEGE

<be-sej'>.

See *SIEGE*.

BESODEIAH

<bes-o-de'-ya>, *<bes-o-di'-a>* (*hyd" wṢB*) [becodheyah], “in the confidence or counsel of Yah”; compare ^{<2438>}Jeremiah 23:18,22; and HPN, 207, 221, 286): Father of Meshullam, the builder (^{<1686>}Nehemiah 3:6).

BESOM

<be'-zum>: Occurs only once in Scripture: “I will sweep it with the besom of destruction” (^{<2142>}Isaiah 14:23). Refers to what was in store for Babylon. The Hebrew word [maT'ate'], rendered “besom,” is close of kin to the one ([ti'te'thiha]) rendered “sweep.” In early English “besom” was synonymous with “broom,” and is still so used in some parts of England.

BESOR, THE BROOK

<be'-sor>, (*rwṢB*) l j " n' [nachal besor]; Codex Alexandrinus, [Βεχώρ, Bechor], Codex Vaticanus, [Βεανώ, Beana]; ^{<1819>}1 Samuel 30:9,20,21; Josephus, Ant, VI, xiv, 6): A torrent-bed ([nachal]) mentioned in the account of David's pursuit of the Amalekites. Thought to be Wady Ghazza, which enters the sea Southwest of Gaza.

BEST

Of five Hebrew originals the chief is *bwṢ* [Tobh], “good,” expressing quality, character. Various used of objects pleasing to the senses, feelings, mind, moral sense, e.g. “best of the land” (^{<1476>}Genesis 47:6); “of sheep” (^{<1959>}1 Samuel 15:9); of persons “married to whom they think best”

(~~<0305>~~ Numbers 36:6); of abode, “where it liketh (the Revised Version (British and American) “pleaseth”) him best” (~~<0236>~~ Deuteronomy 23:16).

In ~~<0482>~~ Numbers 18:12 the revenues of the priests were to be “holy gifts,” e.g. the “best of the oil,” etc. (**bl j** [chelebh], “fat”); also 18:29,30,32, the gifts of the heave-offering were to be “of all the best,” indicating that the richest elements of life were to go into the support and service of the sanctuary. So “the choice (best) fruits” (**hrmʒl** [zimrah], literally, “the song of the land”), a beautifully poetic expression for the most celebrated fruits (~~<0481>~~ Genesis 43:11); equally choice is **zzP** [pazaz], “separate,” “the finest (best) gold,” hence “purified” (~~<1108>~~ 1 Kings 10:18).

Used but twice in the New Testament:

(1) of spiritual gifts ([**κρείττον**, kreitton], “better” the Revised Version (British and American) “greater”); ~~<0423>~~ 1 Corinthians 12:31);

(2) of raiment ([**πρώτος**, protos], “first”), “best robe” (~~<0152>~~ Luke 15:22), of special significance as expressing the Father’s lavish love for the repentant and returning sinner.

Dwight M. Pratt

BESTEAD

~~<be-sted>~~ (**hvqʒi** [niqsheh], “caught in a snare,” “entrapped”; as Judah hard pressed in their own land by the Assyrians (~~<0302>~~ Isaiah 8:21 the King James Version)): Found only here. Old English word steden meaning “place,” hence, “set,” “beset”; usually with “ill,” “sorely bested.” In the Revised Version (British and American) rendered “sore distressed.”

BESTIALITY

~~<bes-ti-al’-i-ti>~~.

See CRIMES.

BESTOW

~~<be-sto’>~~: The seven Hebrew words rendered by this term variously mean “to put” or “place,” “to give”; “do,” “deposit,” as e.g. to locate chariots and horsemen in cities (~~<1105>~~ 1 Kings 10:26); or give a blessing (~~<0279>~~ Exodus

32:29). Four Greek words so translated signify “to give,” “to labor,” “to feed,” “to place around”; as [συνάγω, sunago], “to stow away goods” (^{<127>}Luke 12:17); or [ωμίζω, psomizo], “give away” (1 Cor 13:3). The term has richest significance in expressing God’s abundant gift of grace and love, [δίδωμι, didomi] (2 Cor 8:1 the King James Version; ^{<181>}1 John 3:1).

BETAH

^{<be’-ta>} (^{<188>}2 Samuel 8:8).

See *TIBHATH*.

BETANE

^{<bet’-a-ne>} ([Βαιτάνη, Baitane]): A place named in Judith 1:9, among those to which the messengers of Nebuchadnezzar were sent. From the order in which they are named we should seek for it South of Jerusalem. It may be identical with [*Beit `Ainun*], about 3 miles North of Hebron.

BETEN

^{<be’-ten>} (ⲡ,[beTen]; [Βατνέ, Batne]): A city of Asher mentioned between Hall and Achshaph (^{<192>}Joshua 19:25). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 8 Roman miles East of Ptolemais, giving it the name Bethseten. It may be identical with the modern village el-B`aneh, but no certainty is possible.

BETH (1)

^{<bath>} (b [b]): The second letter of the Hebrew alphabet. With the daghesh it is transliterated in this dictionary as “b,” and, without the daghesth, as “bh” (= “v”). It came also to be used for the number two (2) and with the dieresis for 2,000. For name, etc., see *ALPHABET*; *BAYITH*.

BETH (2)

^{<beth>} (in proper names; Greek transliteration in Septuagint, [βηθ, beth], [*baith*], or [*beth*]): This is the English transliteration for the Hebrew tyBe [beth], meaning “house,” “tent,” “place.” It occurs in many compound proper names formed similarly to the method of compounding words in the

German language, as shown in the articles immediately following. Thus we have [beth] [ʿanath] or [ʿanoth] = “house of replies” (^{<0638>}Joshua 19:38; ^{<0033>}Judges 1:33); [bethʿel] = “house of God” (^{<0118>}Genesis 12:8; 13:3), etc. We also find the word in hybrid formations, e.g. [Βηθφαγή, Bethphage] = Bethphage = “fig house” (^{<0201>}Matthew 21:1).

Frank E. Hirsch

BETHABARA

^{<beth-abʿ-ā-ra>} **hrB[]tyB** [bethʿabharah]; [Βηθαβρά, Bethabara], “house of the ford”): According to the King James Version (following Textus Receptus of the New Testament) the place where John baptized (^{<0028>}John 1:28). the Revised Version (British and American) (with Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek following Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Ephraemi) reads BETHANY. It is distinguished from the Bethany of Lazarus and his sisters as being “beyond the Jordan.” The reading “Bethabara” became current owing to the advocacy of Origen. Various suggestions have been made to explain the readings. G. A. Smith (HGHL) suggests that Bethany (“house of the ship”) and Bethabara (“house of the ford”) are names for the same place. Bethabara has also been identified with Bethbarah, which, however, was probably not on the Jordan but among the streams flowing into it (^{<0024>}Judges 7:24). It is interesting to note that LXXB reads [Baithabara] for Massoretic Text [Bethʿarablah], one of the cities of Benjamin (^{<0622>}Joshua 18:22). If this be correct, the site is in Judea. Another solution is sought in the idea of a corruption of the original name into Bethany and Bethabara, the name having the consonants n, b and r after Beth. In ^{<0627>}Joshua 13:27 (Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus) we find [Baithanabra] for Bethnimrah (Massoretic Text), and Sir George Grove in DB (arts. “Bethabara” and “Beth-nimrah”) identifies Bethabara and Bethnimrah. The site of the latter was a few miles above Jericho (*see BETH-NIMRAH*), “immediately accessible to Jerusalem and all Judea” (compare ^{<0035>}Matthew 3:5; ^{<0035>}Mark 1:5, and see article “Bethany” in EB). This view has much in its favor.

Then, again, as Dr. G. Frederick Wright observes: “The traditional site is at the ford east of Jericho; but as according to ^{<0029>}John 1:29,35,43 it was only one day’s journey from Cana of Galilee, while according to ^{<0040>}John 10:40; 11:3,6,27 it was two or three days from Bethany, it must have been well up

the river toward Galilee. Conder discovered a well-known ford near Beisan called Abarah, near the mouth of the valley of Jezreel. This is 20 miles from Cana and 60 miles from Bethany, and all the conditions of the place fit in with the history.”

See also BETHANY (2).

S. F. Hunter

BETH-ANATH

<beth-a'-nath> (**tn[]tyBe** [beth`anath]; [**Βαίναθάθ**, Bainathath]): A city in the territory of Naphtali, named with Horem and Bethshemesh (^{<698>}Joshua 19:38; ^{<7013>}Judges 1:33). It is represented by the modern village Ainatha, about 12 miles Northwest of Cafed. The name signifies the “house” or “temple” of Anath, a goddess of the Canaanites.

BETH-ANOTH

<beth-a'-noth> (**twQ[]tyBe** [beth`anoth]; [**Βαίθανάμ**, Baithanam], probably “House of Anath” — a god; ^{<659>}Joshua 15:59): The ruin of Beit `Ainun, 1 1/2 miles Southeast of Halhul, in the neighborhood also of Bethzur and Gedor — places mentioned in association with it as towns in the hill country of Judah — appears to be a probable site. The present surface ruins belong to later ages.

BETHANY

<beth'-a-ni> ([**Βηθανία**, Bethania]):

(1) A village, 15 furlongs from Jerusalem (^{<6118>}John 11:18), on the road to Jericho, at the Mount of Olives (^{<4101>}Mark 11:1; ^{<6929>}Luke 19:29), where lived “Simon the leper” (^{<4143>}Mark 14:3) and Mary, Martha and Lazarus (^{<6118>}John 11:18 f). This village may justifiably be called the Judean home of Jesus, as He appears to have preferred to lodge there rather than in Jerusalem itself (^{<4717>}Matthew 21:17; ^{<4111>}Mark 11:11). Here occurred the incident of the raising of Lazarus (John 11) and the feast at the house of Simon (^{<4701>}Matthew 26:1-13; ^{<4143>}Mark 14:3-9; ^{<6735>}Luke 7:36-50; ^{<6002>}John 1:2:1-8). The Ascension as recorded in ^{<6251>}Luke 24:50-51 is thus described: “He led them out until they were over against Bethany: and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed

them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven.”

Bethany is today el `Azareyeh (“the place of Lazarus” — the L being displaced to form the article). It is a miserably untidy and tumble-down village facing East on the Southeast slope of the Mount of Olives, upon the carriage road to Jericho. A fair number of fig, almond and olive trees surround the houses. The traditional tomb of Lazarus is shown and there are some remains of medieval buildings, besides rock-cut tombs of much earlier date (PEF, III, 27, Sheet XVII).

(2) “Bethany beyond the Jordan” (^{<0128>}John 1:28; the King James Version Bethabara; [Βηθαβαρά, Bethabara], a reading against the majority of the manuscripts, supported by Origen on geographical grounds): No such place is known. Grove suggested that the place intended is *BETH-NIMRAH* (which see), the modern Tell nimrin, a singularly suitable place, but hard to fit in with ^{<0128>}John 1:28; compare 2:1. The traditional site is the ford East of Jericho.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-ARABAH

<beth-ar'-a-ba> (hbr: [בֵּית אֲרָבָה] beth ha-`arabhah); [Βαιθαραβά, Baitharaba], “place of the Arabah”):

(1) One of the 6 cities of Judah “in the wilderness” (^{<0156>}Joshua 15:61), on the borders of Benjamin and Judah (^{<0156>}Joshua 15:6; 18:18 Septuagint). “The wilderness of Judah” is the barren land West of the Dead Sea. Beth-arabah is not yet identified.

(2) One of the cities of Benjamin (^{<0182>}Joshua 18:22). Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus) reads Baithabara, and this may be correct. The names are early confounded.

See BETHABARA.

BETHARAM

<beth-a'-ram> (hbr: [בֵּית רָמָה] beth haram]).

See BETH-HARAM.

BETH-ARBEL

<beth-ar'-bel> (𐤁𐤕𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 Betybel [beth 'arbe'l]): The scene of a terrific disaster inflicted on the inhabitants by Shalman (𐤑𐤏𐤏𐤏 Hosea 10:14). If the place intended was in Palestine, and was not the famous city of that name on the Euphrates, then probably it should be identified either with [Irbid] (or [Irbil]) in Galilee, or with [Irbid], which corresponds to Arbela of the Eusebius, Onomasticon, East of the Jordan, about 12 miles Southeast of Gadara. If, as Schrader thinks (COT, II, 140), Shalman stands for the Moabite king, Shalamanu, a tributary of Tiglath-pileser, the eastern town would be the more natural identification. Possibly however the reference is to Shalmaneser III or IV. For the Galilean site, *see* **ARBEL**; see also DB, under the word — *W. Ewing*

BETHASMOTH

<beth-az'-moth> (the King James Version Bethsamos; [Βαιθασμόθ, Baithasmoth] (1 Esdras 5:18); corresponds to Beth-azmaveth in 𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏 Nehemiah 7:28): A town in the territory of Benjamin, and may be identified with the modern el-Hizmeḥ.

See **AZMAVETH**.

BETH-AVEN

<beth-a'-ven> (𐤁𐤕𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤏 Bētyāw [beth 'awen]; [Βαιθών, Baithon], [Βαιθαύν, Baithaun]): A place on the northern boundary of the territory of Benjamin (𐤑𐤏𐤏𐤏 Joshua 18:12) East of Bethel, near Ai (𐤑𐤏𐤏𐤏 Joshua 7:2), West of Michmash (𐤑𐤏𐤏𐤏 1 Samuel 13:5; 14:23). Beth-aven, "house of vanity," i.e. "idolatry," may possibly represent an original beth-'on, "house of wealth." Wilson (PEFS, 1869, 126) suggests Khirbet An, West of Michmash. The name is used in mockery for Bethel by Hosea (4:15; 10:5,8, etc.; compare 𐤑𐤏𐤏𐤏 Amos 5:5).

BETH-AZMAVETH

<beth-az-ma'-veth> (𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏 Nehemiah 7:28).

See **AZMAVETH**.

BETH-BAAL-MEON

<beth-ba-al-me'-on> (⁽¹³¹⁷⁾Joshua 13:17).

See BAAL-MEON.

BETH-BARAH

<beth-ba'-ra> (^(hrB tyB)[beth barah]; [^(Baιθηρά)Baithera]): Perhaps Beth-`abharu, the guttural being lost in copying. It is a ford which the Midianites were expected to pass in fleeing from Gideon. Messengers were therefore sent by Gideon to the Ephraimites bidding them "take before them the waters, as far as Beth-barah, even (the Revised Version, margin "and also") the Jordan" (⁽¹⁰⁷⁴⁾Judges 7:24). "The waters" were the streams emptying themselves into the Jordan: "even the Jordan" is a gloss on "the waters." Between the Jordan and the modern Wady Fari`ah an enemy could be entrapped; it is therefore probable that Beth-barah was on that stream near its entrance into the Jordan.

See BETHABABA.

S. F. Hunter

BETHBASI

<beth-ba'-si> ([^(Baυθβασί)Baithbasi]): The name may mean "place of marshes" = Hebrew [beth-betsi]. According to G. A. Smith there is a Wady el-Bassah East of Tekoa in the wilderness of Judea. The name means "marsh," which Dr. Smith thinks impossible, and really "an echo of an ancient name." Jonathan and Simon repaired the ruins of the fortified place "in the desert" (1 Macc 9:62,64). Josephus reads Bethalaga, i.e. Beth-hoglah (Ant., XIII, i, 5). Peshitta version reads Beth-Yashan (*see JESHANAH*), which Dr. Cheyne thinks is probably correct. Thus the origin of the name and the site of the town are merely conjectural.

S. F. Hunter

BETH-BIRI

<beth-bir'-i> (the King James Version Beth-birei, beth-bir'-e-i)
yar" BAtyB ([beth bir'i]; [^(οικος Βραουμσεωρείμ)oikos

Braoumseoreim]; ^{<1361>}1 Chronicles 4:31 (called in ^{<16916>}Joshua 19:6, Beth-lebaoth, “abode of lions”): A site belonging to Simeon in the Negeb — unidentified.

BETH-CAR

^{<beth'-kar>} (^{rKAtyBe}beth-kar]; [^{Βαιθχώρ}, Baithchor], [^{Βελχώρ}, Belchor]): “And the men of Israel went out of Mizpah, and pursued the Philistines, and smote them, Until they came under Beth-car” (^{<1071>}1 Samuel 7:11). `Ain Karem has been suggested; if Mizpah is nebi Samwil then this identification is probable, as the pursuit would be along the deep Wady beit Hannineh — a natural line of retreat for the Philistines to take.

See BETH-HACCHEREM.

BETH-DAGON

^{<beth-da'-gon>} (^{^wGDAtyBe}bethdaghon]; [^{Βηθδαγών}, Bethdagon]):

(1) A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Gederoth, Naamah, and Makkedah (^{<1654>}Joshua 15:41). It may be represented by the modern Beit Dijan, about 6 miles Southeast of Jaffa. This however is a modern site, and not in the Shephelah. Nearly 2 miles to the south is Khirbet Dajan, a Roman site. The connection in which it occurs leads us to expect a position farther Southeast

(2) A city on the border of Asher (^{<1627>}Joshua 19:27) which Conder would identify with Tell D'auk, near the mouth of the Belus, in the plan of Acre.

The name seems to have been of frequent occurrence. There is a Beit Dejan about 6 miles East of Nablus, and Josephus speaks of a fortress called Dagon above Jericho (Ant., XII, viii, 1; BJ, I, ii, 3). This would seem to indicate a widespread worship of Dagon. But the name may mean “house of corn.”

W. Ewing

BETH-DIBLATHAIM

^{<beth-dib-la-tha'-im>} (^{μυλτ" I bDAtyBe}beth dibhlathayim]; [^{οίκος Δεβλαιθ αίμ}, oikos Deblaithaim], literally, “house of Diblathaim”): A

town in Moab mentioned with Dibon and Nebo (^{<2482>}Jeremiah 48:22). It is probably identical with Almondiblathaim (^{<06346>}Numbers 33:46 f). Mesha claims to have fortified it along with Mehedebea and Ba`al-me`on (see *MOABITE STONE*). The place is not yet identified.

BETH-EDEN

<beth-e'-den> (Amos 1:5 King James Version, margin; English Versions of the Bible “house of Eden”).

See *CHILDREN OF EDEN*.

BETHEL

<beth'-el> (*l aetyBe* [beth-'el]; [*Βαιθήλ*, Baithel] and [*οικος θεου*, oikos theou], literally, “house of God”):

(1) A town near the place where Abraham halted and offered sacrifice on his way south from Shechem.

1. IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION:

It lay West of Ai (^{<01238>}Genesis 12:8). It is named as on the northern border of Benjamin (the southern of Ephraim, ^{<06142>}Joshua 16:2), at the top of the ascent from the Jordan valley by way of Ai (^{<06813>}Joshua 18:13). It lay South of Shiloh (^{<07219>}Judges 21:19). Eusebius, *Onomasticon* places it 12 Roman miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Neapolis. It is represented by the modern Beitin, a village of some 400 inhabitants, which stands on a knoll East of the road to Nablus. There are four springs which yield supplies of good water. In ancient times these were supplemented by a reservoir hewn in the rock South of the town. The surrounding country is bleak and barren, the hills being marked by a succession of stony terraces, which may have suggested the form of the ladder in Jacob’s famous dream.

2. THE SANCTUARY:

The town was originally called Luz (^{<07289>}Genesis 28:19, etc.). When Jacob came hither on his way to Paddan-aram we are told that he lighted upon “the place” (^{<07281>}Genesis 28:11. Hebrew). The Hebrew [maqom], like the cognate Arabic [maqam], denotes a sacred place or sanctuary. The [maqom] was doubtless that at which Abraham had sacrificed, East of the

town. In the morning Jacob set up “for a pillar” the stone which had served as his pillow (^{<0288>}Genesis 28:18; *see PILLAR* — [matstsebhah]), poured oil upon it and called the name of the place Bethel, “house of God”; that is, of God whose epiphany was for him associated with the pillar. This spot became a center of great interest, lending growing importance to the town. In process of time the name Luz disappeared, giving place to that of the adjoining sanctuary, town and sanctuary being identified. Jacob revisited the place on his return from Paddan-aram; here Deborah, Rebekah’s nurse, died and was buried under “the oak” (^{<0306>}Genesis 35:6 f). Probably on rising ground East of Bethel Abraham and Lot stood to view the uninviting highlands and the rich lands of the Jordan valley (^{<0139>}Genesis 13:9 ff).

3. HISTORY:

Bethel was a royal city of the Canaanites (^{<0626>}Joshua 12:16). It appears to have been captured by Joshua (8:7), and it was allotted to Benjamin (^{<0682>}Joshua 18:22). In ^{<0002>}Judges 1:22 ff it is represented as held by Canaanites, from whom the house of Joseph took it by treachery (compare ^{<0378>}1 Chronicles 7:28). Hither the ark was brought from Gilgal (^{<0001>}Judges 2:1, Septuagint). Israel came to Bethel to consult the Divine oracle (^{<0708>}Judges 20:18), and it became an important center of worship (^{<0908>}1 Samuel 10:3). The home of the prophetess Deborah was not far off (^{<0045>}Judges 4:5). Samuel visited Bethel on circuit, judging Israel (^{<0076>}1 Samuel 7:16).

With the disruption of the kingdom came Bethel’s greatest period of splendor and significance. To counteract the influence of Jerusalem as the national religious center Jeroboam embarked on the policy which won for him the unenviable reputation of having “made Israel to sin.” Here he erected a temple, set up an image, the golden calf, and established an imposing ritual. It became the royal sanctuary and the religious center of his kingdom (^{<1129>}1 Kings 12:29 ff; ^{<3073>}Amos 7:13). He placed in Bethel the priests of the high places which he had made (^{<1123>}1 Kings 12:32). To Bethel came the man of God from Judah who pronounced doom against Jeroboam (1 Kings 13), and who, having been seduced from duty by an aged prophet in Bethel, was slain by a lion. According to the prophets Amos and Hosea the splendid idolatries of Bethel were accompanied by terrible moral and religious degradation. Against the place they launched the most scathing denunciations, declaring the vengeance such things must entail (^{<3084>}Amos 3:14; 4:4; 5:11 m; 9:1; ^{<2045>}Hosea 4:15; 5:8; 10:5,8,23).

With the latter the name Bethel gives place in mockery to Beth-aven. Bethel shared in the downfall of Samaria wrought by the Assyrians; and according to an old tradition, Shalmaneser possessed himself of the golden calf (compare ^{<2483>}Jeremiah 48:13). The priest, sent by the Assyrians to teach the people whom they had settled in the land how to serve Yahweh, dwelt in Bethel (^{<2728>}2 Kings 17:28). King Josiah completed the demolition of the sanctuary at Bethel, destroying all the instruments of idolatry, and harr ying the tombs of the idolaters. The monument of the man of God from Judah he allowed to stand (^{<2204>}2 Kings 23:4,25). The men of Bethel were among those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<4528>}Ezra 2:28; ^{<4073>}Nehemiah 7:32), and it is mentioned as reoccupied by the Benjamites (^{<6131>}Nehemiah 11:31). Zechariah (7:2) records the sending of certain men from Jerusalem in the 4th year of King Darius to inquire regarding particular religious practices. Bethel was one of the towns fortified by Bacchides in the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc 9:50; Ant, XIII, i, 3). It is named again as a small town which, along with Ephraim, was taken by Vespasian as he approached Jerusalem (BJ, IV, ix, 9).

(2) A city in Judah which in ^{<9827>}1 Samuel 30:27 is called Bethel; in ^{<6904>}Joshua 19:4 Bethul; and in ^{<3080>}1 Chronicles 4:30 Bethuel. The site has not been identified. In ^{<6850>}Joshua 15:30 Septuagint gives Baithel in Judah, where the Hebrew has [Kecil] — probably a scribal error.

W. Ewing

BETHELITE

<beth'-el-it>: The term applied to a man who in the days of Ahab rebuilt Jericho (^{<1164>}1 Kings 16:34).

See *HIEL*.

BETHEL, MOUNT

(l aAtyBerh" [har beth-'el]; [Βαιθηλ λοῦζα, Baithel louza] (^{<982>}1 Samuel 13:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "the mount of Bethel"; ^{<6401>}Joshua 16:1)): The hill which stretches from the North of the town to Tell `Acur. The road to Shechem lies along the ridge. An army in possession of these heights easily commanded the route from north to south.

BETH-EMEK

<*beth-e'-mek*> (qm[**b**; **ty**Be]beth ha-'emeq]; [**Βηθαεμέκ**, Bethaemek], “house of the valley”): A town in the territory of Zebulun (^{<RB>}Joshua 19:27). It has not been identified, but must be sought somewhere East of Acre, not far from Kabul, the ancient Cabul.

BETHER

<*be'-ther*> (**rt**B,[bether]): In Song 2:17 mention is made of “the mountains of Bether.” It is doubtful if a proper name is intended. The Revised Version, margin has, “perhaps, the spice malobathron.” A Bether is prominent in late Jewish history as the place where the Jews resisted Hadrian under Bar Cochba in 135 AD. Its identity with Bittir, 7 miles Southwest of Jerusalem, is attested by an inscription.

BETHESDA

<*be-thez'-da*> ([**Βηθεσδά**, Bethesda]; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, ^{<RB>}John 5:2 (probably **aDs**j i **ty**Be]beth chicda'), “house of mercy”); other forms occur as [*Bethzatha*] and [*Bethsaida*]):

1. THE CONDITIONS OF THE NARRATIVE: ^{<RB>}JOHN 5:2:

The only data we have is the statement in ^{<RB>}John 5:2-4: “Now there is in Jerusalem by the sheep gate a pool, which is called in Hebrew Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a multitude of them that were sick, blind, halt, withered.” Many ancient authorities add (as in the Revised Version, margin) “waiting for the moving of the water: for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and troubled the water,” etc.

The name does not help as to the site, no such name occurs elsewhere in Jerusalem; the mention of the sheep gate is of little assistance because the word “gate” is supplied, and even were it there, its site is uncertain. Sheep “pool” or “place” is at least as probable; the tradition about the “troubling of the water” (which may be true even if the angelic visitant may be of the nature of folk-lore) can receive no rational explanation except by the well-known phenomenon, by no means uncommon in Syria and always considered the work of a supernatural being, of an intermittent spring. The arrangement of the five porches is similar to that demonstrated by Dr. F.

Bliss as having existed in Roman times as the Pool of Siloam; the story implies that the incident occurred outside the city walls, as to carry a bed on the Sabbath would not have been forbidden by Jewish traditional law.

2. THE TRADITIONAL SITE:

Tradition has varied concerning the site. In the 4th century, and probably down to the Crusades, a pool was pointed out as the true site, a little to the Northwest of the present Stephen's Gate; it was part of a twin pool and over it were erected at two successive periods two Christian churches. Later on this site was entirely lost and from the 13th century the great Birket Israel, just North of the Temple area, was pointed out as the site.

Within the last quarter of a century, however, the older traditional site, now close to the Church of Anne, has been rediscovered, excavated and popularly accepted. This pool is a rock-cut, rain-filled cistern, 55 ft. long X 12 ft. broad, and is approached by a steep and winding flight of steps. The floor of the rediscovered early Christian church roofs over the pool, being supported upon five arches in commemoration of the five porches. At the western end of the church, where probably the font was situated, there was a fresco, now much defaced and fast fading, representing the angel troubling the waters.

3. A MORE PROBABLE SITE:

Although public opinion supports this site, there is much to be said for the proposal, promulgated by Robinson and supported by Conder and other good authorities, that the pool was at the "Virgin's Fount" (*see GIHON*), which is today an intermittent spring whose "troubled" waters are still visited by Jews for purposes of cure. As the only source of "living water" near Jerusalem, it is a likely spot for there to have been a "sheep pool" or "sheep place" for the vast flocks of sheep coming to Jerusalem in connection with the temple ritual. See *Biblical World*, XXV, 80 ff.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-EZEL

<beth-e'-zel> (I xab; tyBe [beth ha-'etsel]; [οἶκος ἐχόμενος αὐτῆς, oikos echomenous autes]; literally, "adjoining house"): A place named along with other cities in the Philistine plain (<300> Micah 1:11). The site has

not been identified. By some it is thought to be the same as Azel of ^{<345>}Zechariah 14:5; but see *AZEL*.

BETH-GADER

<beth-ga'-der> (^{<145>}Βαῖθγαδέρ, Baithgader]; [^{<145>}Βαῖθγαιδών, Baithgaidon]), or (Codex Vaticanus) [^{<145>}Βαῖθγαιδών, Baithgaidon]): The name occurs between those of Bethlehem and Kiriath-jearim in ^{<105>}1 Chronicles 2:51. It is possibly identical with Geder of ^{<623>}Joshua 12:13.

BETH-GAMUL

<beth-ga'-mul> (^{<145>}Βαῖθγαμὺλ, Baithgamul]; [^{<145>}οἶκος αἰμὼλ, oikos Gaimol]; Codex Sinaiticus, [^{<145>}αμωλά, Gamola]): A city in Moab named with Dibon, Kiriathaim and Beth-meon (^{<483>}Jeremiah 48:23). Conder places it at Umm el-Jamal, toward East of the plateau, S. of Medeba (HDB, under the word). Others (Guthe, Kurz. bib. Worterbuch, under the word; Buhl, GAP, 268, etc.) favor Jemeil, a site 6 miles East of Dhiban. Since the town is not mentioned among the cities of Israel Buhl doubts if it should be sought North of the Arnon.

BETH-GILGAL

<beth-gil'-gal> (^{<145>}Βαῖθγαλγάλ, Baithgalgal]; [^{<145>}Βηθαγκαλγάλ, Bethaggalgal]; the King James Version house of Gilgal): The Gilgal which lay in the plain East of Jericho (^{<623>}Nehemiah 12:29).

See GILGAL.

BETH-HACCHEREM

<beth-ha-ke'-rem>, *<beth-hak'-e-rem>* (the King James Version Beth-haccerem; [^{<145>}Βαῖθχακέρημ, Baithhakcherem]; [^{<145>}Βηθαχχαρμά, Bethachcharma] (see DB), “place of the vineyard”): A district (in ^{<483>}Nehemiah 3:14) ruled over by one, Malchijah; mentioned in ^{<401>}Jeremiah 6:1 as a suitable signal station. From its association with Tekoa (^{<401>}Jeremiah 6:1) and from the statement by Jerome that it was a village which he could see daily from Bethlehem, the Frank mountain (Herodium) has been suggested. It certainly would be a unique place for a beacon. More suitable is the fertile vineyard country around `Ain Karem

(the “spring of the vineyard”). On the top of Jebel `Ali, above this village, are some remarkable cairns which, whatever their other uses, would appear to have been once beacons. `Ain Karem appears as Carem in the Septuagint (^{<1659>}Joshua 15:59).

See BETH-CAR.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-HAGGAN

^{<beth-hag'-an>} (𐤁𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤁𐤕𐤕 *tyBe* [beth-ha-gan], “house of the garden”). The place where Ahaziah was slain by Jehu (^{<1197>}2 Kings 9:27). The words are rendered in English Versions of the Bible “the garden house,” but some take them to be a proper name. The location is doubtful.

BETH-HANAN; ELON-BETH-HANAN

^{<beth-ha'-nan>} (^{<1049>}1 Kings 4:9).

See ELON.

BETH-HARAM

^{<beth-ha'-ram>} (𐤁𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤁𐤕𐤕 *tyBe* [beth haram]; [Βαῖθαρὰν, Baitharan]; Codex Alexandrinus, [Βαῖθαρρά, Baitharra]; the King James Version wrongly, Beth-Aram): An Amorite city taken and fortified by the Gadites (^{<1637>}Joshua 13:27; ^{<1626>}Numbers 32:36; in the latter passage the name appears as Beth-haran, probably the original form). It corresponds to Bethramphtha of Josephus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1), which, according to Eusebius, was the name used by the Syrians. Here was a palace of Herod (Ant., XVII, x, 6; BJ, II, iv, 2). Eusebius, Onomasticon says it was called Livia. Josephus says it was fortified by Herod Antipas, who called it Julias for the wife of Augustus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1). The name would be changed to Julias when Livia, by the will of the emperor, was received into the Gens Julia. It is represented by Tell er-Rameh in Wady Chesban, about 6 miles East of Jordan.

W. Ewing

BETH-HARAN

<beth-ha'-ran> ([^]rh; tyBe [beth haran]): A fenced city East of the Jordan (^{<1432>}Numbers 32:36) identical with **BETH-HARAM**, which see.

BETH-HOGLAH

<beth-hog'-la> (hl g] ; tyBe [beth-choglah]; Septuagint [Βαιθαγλαάμ, Baithaglaam], “house of partridge”): Mentioned in ^{<1436>}Joshua 15:6; 18:19, identified with Ain Haijab (“partridge spring”) lying between Jericho and the Jordan, where in 1874 there was still a ruined Greek monastery called Kasr Hajlah, dating from the 12th century. The ruins are now destroyed. In ^{<1436>}Joshua 15:5; 18:19 it is said to be at the mouth of the Jordan on a Tongue (Lisan) of the Salt Sea. But it is now several miles inland, probably because the Jordan has silt edition up a delta to that extent.

See DEAD SEA.

George Frederick Wright

BETH-HORON

<beth-ho'-ron> ([^]rwDAtyBe [beth-choron] (other Hebrew forms occur); [Βηθωρόν, Bethoron], probably the “place of the hollow”; compare Hauran, “the hollow”):

1. THE ANCIENT TOWNS:

The name of two towns, Beth-horon the Upper (^{<1435>}Joshua 16:5) and Beth-horon the Lower (^{<1435>}Joshua 16:3), said to have been built (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:24) by Sheerah, the daughter of Beriah. The border line between Benjamin and Ephraim passed by the Beth-horons (^{<1435>}Joshua 16:5; 21:22), the cities belonging to the latter tribe and therefore, later on, to the Northern Kingdom. Solomon “built Beth-horon the upper, and Beth-horon the nether, fortified cities, with walls, gates, and bars” (^{<1435>}2 Chronicles 8:5; ^{<1397>}1 Kings 9:17).

From Egyptian sources (Muller, As. und Europa, etc.) it appears that Beth-horon was one of the places conquered by Shishak of Egypt from Rehoboam. Again, many centuries later, Bacchides repaired Beth-horon, “with high walls, with gates and with bars and in them he set a garrison,

that they might work malice upon (“vex”) Israel” (1 Macc 9:50,51), and at another time the Jews fortified it against Holofernes (Judith 4:4,5).

2. THE MODERN BEIT UR EL FOQA AND EL TACHTA:

These two towns are now known as Beit Ur el foqa (i.e. “the upper”) and Beit Ur el tachta (i.e. “the lower”), two villages crowning hill tops, less than 2 miles apart; the former is some 800 ft. higher than the latter. Today these villages are sunk into insignificance and are off any important lines of communication, but for many centuries the towns occupying their sites dominated one of the most historic roads in history.

3. THE PASS OF THE BETH-HORONS:

When (~~600~~ Joshua 10:10) Joshua discomfited the kings of the Amorites “he slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon, and chased them by the way of the `Ascent of Beth-horon.’ “ When the Philistines were opposing King Saul at Michmash they sent a company of their men to hold “the way of Beth-horon.”

This pass ascends from the plain of Ajalon (now Yalo) and climbs in about 3/4 hr. to Beit Ur el tachta (1,210 ft.); it then ascends along the ridge, with valleys lying to north and south, and reaches Beit Ur el foqa (2,022 ft.), and pursuing the same ridge arrives in another 4 1/2 miles at the plateau to the North of el Jib (Gibeon). At intervals along this historic route traces of the ancient Roman paving are visible. It was the great highroad into the heart of the land from the earliest times until about three or four centuries ago. Along this route came Canaanites, Israelites, Philistines, Egyptians, Syrians, Romans, Saracens and Crusaders. Since the days of Joshua (~~600~~ Joshua 10:10) it has frequently been the scene of a rout. Here the Syrian general Seron was defeated by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 3:13-24), and six years later Nicanor, retreating from Jerusalem, was here defeated and slain (1 Macc 7:39 ff; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 5). Along this pass in 66 AD the Roman general Cestius Gallus was driven in headlong flight before the Jews.

Now the changed direction of the highroad to Jerusalem has left the route forsaken and almost forgotten. See PEF, III, 86, Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF:

1. THE POLITICAL SITUATION:

The battle which gave to the Israelites under Joshua the command of southern Palestine has always excited interest because of the astronomical marvel which is recorded to have then taken place.

In invading Palestine the Israelites were not attacking a single coherent state, but a country occupied by different races and divided, like Greece at a later period, into a number of communities, each consisting practically of but a single city and the cultivated country around it. Thus Joshua destroyed the two cities of Jericho and Ai without any interference from the other Amorites. The destruction of Jericho gave him full possession of the fertile valley of the Jordan; the taking of Ai opened his way up to the ridge which forms the backbone of the country, and he was able to lead the people unopposed to the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim for the solemn reading of the Law. But when the Israelites returned from this ceremony a significant division showed itself amongst their enemies. Close to Ai, Joshua's most recent conquest, was Beeroth, a small town inhabited by Hivites; and no doubt because in the natural order of events Beeroth might look to be next attacked, the Hivites determined to make terms with Israel. An embassy was therefore sent from Gibeon, their chief city, and Joshua and the Israelites, believing that it came from a distant land not under the Ban, entered into the proposed alliance.

The effect on the political situation was immediate. The Hivites formed a considerable state, relatively speaking; their cities were well placed on the southern highland, and Gibeon, their capital, was one of the most important fortresses of that district, and only 6 miles distant from Jerusalem, the chief Amorite stronghold. The Amorites recognized at once that, in view of this important defection, it was imperative for them to crush the Gibeonites before the Israelites could unite with them, and this they endeavored to do. The Gibeonites, seeing themselves attacked, sent an urgent message to Joshua, and he at the head of his picked men made a night march up from Gilgal and fell upon the Amorites at Gibeon the next day and put them to flight.

2. JOSHUA'S STRATEGY:

We are not told by which route he marched, but it is significant that the Amorites fled by the way of Beth-horon; that is to say, not toward their own cities, but away from them. A glance at the map shows that this means that Joshua had succeeded in cutting their line of retreat to Jerusalem. He had probably therefore advanced upon Gibeon from the south, instead of by the obvious route past Ai which he had destroyed and Beeroth with which he was in alliance. But, coming up from Gilgal by the ravines in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, he was exposed to a great danger, for the Amorites might have caught him before he had gained a footing on the plateau, and have taken him at a complete disadvantage. It was thus that the eleven tribes suffered such terrible loss at the hands of the Benjamites in this very region during the first inter-tribal war, and probably the military significance of the first repulse from Ai was of the same character; the forces holding the high ground being able to overwhelm their opponents without any fear of reprisals.

It would seem possible, therefore, that Joshua may have repeated, on a larger scale, the tactics he employed in his successful attack upon Ai. He may have sent one force to draw the Amorites away from Gibeon, and when this was safely done, may have led the rest of his army to seize the road to Jerusalem, and to break up the forces besieging Gibeon. If so, his strategy was successful up to a certain point. He evidently led the Israelites without loss up to Gibeon, crushed the Amorites there, and cut off their retreat toward Jerusalem. He failed in one thing. In spite of the prodigious efforts which he and his men had made, the greater part of the Amorite army succeeded in escaping him and gained a long start in their flight, toward the northwest, through the two Beth-horons.

3. JOSHUA'S COMMAND TO THE SUN AND MOON:

It was at this point that the incident occurred upon which attention has been chiefly fixed. The Book of Jasher (which seems to have been a collection of war songs and other ballads) ascribes to Joshua the command:

Sun, be thou silent upon (be) Gibeon (compare Revised Version margin); And thou, Moon, in (be) the valley of Aijalon. And the Sun was silent, And the Moon stayed, Until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies' (¹⁸¹²Joshua 10:12,23).

And the prose narrative continues, “The sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.”

4. THE ASTRONOMICAL RELATIONS OF THE SUN AND MOON:

In these two, the ballad and the prose chronicle, we have several distinct astronomical relations indicated. The sun to Joshua was associated with Gibeon, and the sun can naturally be associated with a locality in either of two positions: it may be overhead to the observer, in which case he would consider it as being above the place where he himself was standing; or on the other hand, he might see the locality on the skyline and the sun rising or setting just behind it. In the present instance there is no ambiguity, for the chronicle distinctly states that the sun was in “the midst of heaven”; literally, in the halving of the heaven, that is to say overhead. This is very important because it assures us that Joshua must have been at Gibeon when he spoke, and that it must have been noonday of summer when the sun in southern Palestine is only about 8 degrees or 12 degrees from the exact zenith. Next, the moon appeared to be associated with the valley of Aijalon; that is, it must have been low down on the horizon in that direction, and since Aijalon is Northwest of Gibeon it must have been about to set, which would imply that it was about half full, in its “third quarter,” the sun being, as we have seen, on the meridian. Thirdly, “the sun hasted not to go down,” that is to say, it had already attained the meridian, its culmination; and henceforward its motion was downward. The statement that it was noonday is here implicitly repeated, but a further detail is added. The going down of the sun appeared to be slow. This is the work of the afternoon, that is of half the day, but on this occasion the half-day appeared equal in length to an ordinary whole day. There is therefore no question at all of the sun becoming stationary in the sky: the statement does not admit of that, but only of its slower progress.

5. THE “SILENCE” OF THE SUN:

The idea that the sun was fixed in the sky, in other words, that the earth ceased for a time to rotate on its axis, has arisen from the unfortunate rendering of the Hebrew verb [dum], “be silent,” by “stand thou still.” It is our own word “dumb,” both being onomatopoeic words from the sound made when a man firmly closes his lips upon his speech. The primary

meaning of the word therefore is “to be silent,” but its secondary meaning is “to desist,” “to cease,” and therefore in some cases “to stand still. “

From what was it then that Joshua wished the sun to cease: from its moving or from its shining? It is not possible to suppose that, engaged as he was in a desperate battle, he was even so much as thinking of the sun’s motion at all. But its shining, its scorching heat, must have been most seriously felt by him. At noon, in high summer, the highland of southern Palestine is one of the hottest countries of the world. It is impossible to suppose that Joshua wished the sun to be fixed overhead, where it must have been distressing his men who had already been 17 hours on foot. A very arduous pursuit lay before them and the enemy not only had a long start but must have been fresher than the Israelites. The sun’s heat therefore must have been a serious hindrance, and Joshua must have desired it to be tempered. And the Lord hearkened to his voice and gave him this and much more. A great hailstorm swept up from the west, bringing with it a sudden lowering of temperature, and no doubt hiding the sun and putting it to “silence.”

6. “YAHWEH FOUGHT FOR ISRAEL”:

And “Yahweh fought for Israel,” for the storm burst with such violence upon the Amorites as they fled down the steep descent between the Beth-horons, that “they were more who died with the hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword” (~~6001~~ Joshua 10:11). This was the culminating incident of the day, the one which so greatly impressed the sacred historian. “There was no day like that before it or after it, that Yahweh hearkened unto the voice of a man” (~~6004~~ Joshua 10:14). It was not the hailstorm in itself nor the veiling of the sun that made the day so remarkable. It was that Joshua had spoken, not in prayer or supplication, but in command, as if all Nature was at his disposal; and the Lord had hearkened and had, as it were, obeyed a human voice: an anticipation of the time when a greater Joshua should command even the winds and the sea, and they should obey Him (~~4023~~ Matthew 8:23-27).

7. THE AFTERNOON’S MARCH:

The explanation of the statement that the sun “hasted not to go down about a whole day” is found in ~~6000~~ Joshua 10:10, in which it is stated that the Lord discomfited the Amorites before Israel, “and he slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon, and chased them by the way of the ascent of

Beth-horon, and smote them to Azekah, and unto Makkedah.” The Israelites had of course no time-keepers, no clocks or watches, and the only mode of measuring time available to them was the number of miles they marched. Now from Gibeon to Makkedah by the route indicated is some 30 miles, a full day’s march for an army. It is possible that, at the end of the campaign, the Israelites on their return found the march from Makkedah to Gibeon heavy work for an entire day. Measured by the only means available to them, that afternoon seemed to be double the ordinary length. The sun had “hasted not to go down about a whole day.”

8. THE CHRONICLE AND THE POEM INDEPENDENT WITNESSES:

Joshua’s reference to the moon in connection with the Valley of Aijalon appears at first sight irrelevant, and has frequently been assumed to be merely inserted to complete the parallelism of the poem. But when examined astronomically it becomes clear that it cannot have been inserted haphazard. Joshua must have mentioned the moon because he actually saw it at the moment of speaking. Given that the sun was “in the midst of heaven,” above Gibeon, there was only a very restricted arc of the horizon in which the moon could appear as associated with some terrestrial object; and from Gibeon, the Valley of Aijalon does lie within that narrow arc. It follows therefore that unless the position assigned to the moon had been obtained from actual observation at the moment, it would in all probability have been an impossible one. The next point is especially interesting. The ballad does not expressly state whether the sun was upon Gibeon in the sense of being upon it low down on the distant horizon, or upon it, in the sense of being overhead both to Joshua and to that city. But the moon being above the Valley of Aijalon, it becomes clear that the latter is the only possible solution. The sun and moon cannot both have been setting — though this is the idea that has been generally held, it being supposed that the day was far spent and that Joshua desired it to be prolonged — for then sun and moon would have been close together, and the moon would be invisible. The sun cannot have been setting, and the moon rising; for Aijalon is West of Gibeon. Nor can the sun have been rising, and the moon setting, since this would imply that the time of year was either about October 30 of our present calendar, or about February 12. The month of February was already past, since the Israelites had kept the Feast of the Passover. October cannot have come; for, since Beeroth, Gibeon and Jerusalem were so close together, it is certain that the events between the

return of the Israelites to Gilgal and the battle of Beth-horon cannot have been spread over several months, but must have occupied only a few days. The poem therefore contains implicitly the same fact that is explicitly stated in the prose narrative — that the sun was overhead — but the one statement cannot, in those days, have been inferred from the other.

9. DATE OF THE EVENTS:

A third point of interest is that the position of the moon gives an indication of the time of the year. The Valley of Aijalon is 17 degrees North of West of from Gibeon, of which the latitude is 31 degrees 51 minutes North. With these details, and assuming the time to be nearly noon, the date must have been about the 21st day of the 4th month of the Jewish calendar, corresponding to July 22 of our present calendar, with a possible uncertainty of one or two days on either side. The sun's declination would then be about 21 degrees North, so that at noon it was within 11 degrees of the zenith. It had risen almost exactly at 5 AM and would set almost exactly at 7 PM. The moon was now about her third quarter, and in North latitude. about 5 degrees. It had risen about 11 o'clock the previous night, and was now at an altitude of under 7 degrees, and within about half an hour of setting. The conditions are not sufficient to fix the year, since from the nature of the luni-solar cycle there will always be one or two years in each cycle of 19 that will satisfy the conditions of the case, and the date of the Hebrew invasion of Palestine is not known with sufficient certainty to limit the inquiry to any particular cycle.

10. THE RECORDS ARE CONTEMPORANEOUS WITH THE EVENTS:

It will be seen however that the astronomical conditions introduced by the mention of the moon are much more stringent than might have been expected. They supply therefore proof of a high order that the astronomical details, both of the poem and prose chronicle, were derived from actual observation at the time and have been preserved to us unaltered. Each, therefore, supplies a strictly contemporaneous and independent record.

This great occurrence appears to be referred to in one other passage of Scripture — the Prayer of Habakkuk. Here again the rendering of the English versions is unfortunate, and the passage should stand:

The sun and moon ceased (to shine) in their habitation; At the light

of Thine arrows they vanished, And at the shining of Thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, Thou didst thresh the nations in anger' (^{<3811>}Habakkuk 3:11,22).

E. W. Maunder

BETHINK

^{<be-think>} (bl e a,byvhe) [beshibh 'el lebh], "to lay to heart," hence, "recall to mind"): Anglo-Saxon word used only in seventh petition of Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple. If the people, carried into captivity, because of sin, should "take it to heart," then God (he prayed) would hear and forgive (^{<1087>}1 Kings 8:47; ^{<4067>}2 Chronicles 6:37). A choice illustration of the mental and heart process in reflection, repentance and conversion.

BETH-JESHIMOTH

^{<beth-jesh'-i-moth>} (tmoyh" tyBe) [beth ha-yeshimoth]; Codex Vaticanus, [ισιμώθ, Haisimoth]; Codex Alexandrinus, [σιμώθ, Asimoth], and other variants (see DB, under the word)): Mentioned as the point in the south from which the camp of Israel stretched to Abel-shittim in the plains of Moab (^{<0639>}Numbers 33:49). In ^{<0612>}Joshua 12:3 the way to Beth-jeshimoth is described as South of the Arabah, near the Dead Sea. It was in the lot assigned to Reuben (^{<0633>}Joshua 13:20), At what times and how long it was actually held by Israel we do not know; but it appears in Ezk 25:9 as belonging to Moab. It may be identical with Khirbet es-Suweimeh, where there are some ruins and a well, about 3 miles East of the mouth of the Jordan.

W. Ewing

BETH-LE-'APHRAH

^{<beth-le-af'-ra>} (hrKI f]tyBe) [beth le`aphrah]; Septuagint [ἐξ οἴκου κατὰ γέλωτα, ex oikou kata gelota], "house of dust"): The name of a place found only in ^{<3300>}Micah 1:10. From the connection in which it is used it was probably in the Philistine plain. There seems to be a play upon the name in the sentence, "at Beth le-`apharah have I rolled myself in the dust," `aphrah meaning "dust," and possibly another on Philistine in rolled,

ytivKP” th [hith-palldshithi] (see G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, called Minor, in the place cited.).

BETH-LEBAOTH

<beth-le-ba’-oth>, <beth-leb’-aoth> (twəb]]tyBəbeth lebha’oth]; [Βαιθαλβάθ, Baithalbath], “house of lionesses”): A town in the territory of Simeon (^{<06906>}Joshua 19:6). In ^{<13061>}1 Chronicles 4:31 the name is given as Beth-birei: the Revised Version (British and American) **BETH-BIRI** (which see).

BETHLEHEM

<beth’-le-hem> (μj l AtyBəbethlechem]; [Βαιθλεέμ, Baithleem], or [Βηθλεέμ, Bethleem], “house of David,” or possibly “the house of Lakhmu,” an Assyrian deity):

1. BETHLEHEM JUDAH:

Bethlehem Judah, or **EPHRATH** or **EPHRATHAH** (which see) is now Beit Lahm (Arabic = “house of meat”), a town of upward of 10,000 inhabitants, 5 miles South of Jerusalem and 2,350 ft. above sea level. It occupies an outstanding position upon a spur running East from the watershed with deep valleys to the Northeast and South It is just off the main road to Hebron and the south, but upon the highroad to Tekoa and En-gedi. The position is one of natural strength; it was occupied by a garrison of the Philistines in the days of David (^{<10234>}2 Samuel 23:14; ^{<13116>}1 Chronicles 11:16) and was fortified by Rehoboam (^{<14106>}2 Chronicles 11:6). The surrounding country is fertile, cornfields, fig and olive yards and vineyards abound. Bethlehem is not naturally well supplied with water, the nearest spring is 800 yds. to the Southeast, but for many centuries the “low level aqueduct” from “Solomon’s Pools” in the [ArTas] valley, which has here been tunneled through the hill, has been tapped by the inhabitants; there are also many rock-cut cisterns.

1. Early History:

In ^{<13251>}1 Chronicles 2:51 Salma, the son of Caleb, is described as the “father of Bethlehem.” In ^{<0359>}Genesis 35:19; 48:7 it is recorded that Rachel “was buried in the way to Ephrath (the same is Beth-lehem).” Tradition points

out the site of Rachel's tomb near where the road to Bethlehem leaves the main road. The Levites of the events of Judges 17; 19 were Bethlehemites. In the list of the towns of Judah the name Bethlehem occurs, in the Septuagint version only in ^{<1657>}Joshua 15:57.

2. David the Bethlehemite:

Ruth, famous chiefly as the ancestress of David, and of the Messiah, settled in Bethlehem with her second husband Boaz, and it is noticeable that from her new home she could view the mountains of Moab, her native land. David himself "was the son of that Ephrathite of Bethlehem-judah, whose name was Jesse" (^{<972>}1 Samuel 17:12). To Bethlehem came Samuel to anoint a successor to unworthy Saul (^{<964>}1 Samuel 16:4): "David went to and fro from Saul to feed his father's sheep at Bethlehem" (^{<975>}1 Samuel 17:15). David's "three mighty men" "brake through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Beth-lehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David" (^{<1234>}2 Samuel 23:14,16). Tradition still points out the well. From this town came those famous "sons of Zeruah," David's nephews, whose loyalty and whose ruthless cruelty became at once a protection and a menace to their royal relative: in ^{<102>}2 Samuel 2:32 it is mentioned that one of them, Asahel, was buried "in the sepulchre of his father, which was in Bethlehem."

3. Later Bible History:

After the time of David, Bethlehem would appear to have sunk into insignificance. But its future fame is pointed at by Micah (5:2): "But thou, Beth-lehem Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

In the return of the Jews captive Bethlehemites re-inhabited the place (^{<112>}Ezra 2:21; ^{<1026>}Nehemiah 7:26 "men"; 1 Esdras 5:17 "sons").

4. The Christian Era:

In the New Testament Bethlehem is mentioned as the birthplace of the Messiah Jesus (^{<101>}Matthew 2:1,5; ^{<101>}Luke 2:4,25) in consequence of which event occurred Herod's "massacre of the innocents" (^{<1018>}Matthew 2:8,26). Inasmuch as Hadrian devastated Bethlehem and set up there a sacred grove to Adonis (Jerome, Ep. ad Paul, lviii.3) it is clear that veneration of this spot as the site of the Nativity must go back before 132

AD. Constantine (circa 330) founded a basilica over the cave-stable which tradition pointed out as the scene of the birth, and his church, unchanged in general structure though enlarged by Justinian and frequently adorned, repaired and damaged, remains today the chief attraction of the town. During the Crusades, Bethlehem became of great importance and prosperity; it remained in Christian hands after the overthrow of the Latin kingdom, and at the present day it is in material things one of the most prosperous Christian centers in the Holy Land.

2. BETHLEHEM OF ZEBULUN:

Bethlehem of Zebulun (^{<695>}Joshua 19:15) was probably the home of Ibzan (^{<718>}Judges 12:8,20) though Jewish tradition is in support of (1). See Josephus, Ant, V, vii, 13. This is now the small village of Beit Lahm, some 7 miles Northwest of Nazareth on the edge of the oak forest. Some antiquities have been found here recently, showing that in earlier days it was a place of some importance. It is now the site of a small German colony. See PEF, I, 270, Sh V.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-LEHEMITE

^{<beth'-le-hem-it>} (ymj l" h" tyBēbeth ha-lachmi]): An inhabitant of Bethlehem, a town in Judah, 5 miles South of Jerusalem. Jesse is so named in ^{<968>}1 Samuel 16:18; 17:58, and Elhanan in ^{<1219>}2 Samuel 21:19. The children of Bethlehem are referred to in ^{<19121>}Ezra 2:21; ^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:26; 1 Esdras 5:17.

BETHLEHEM, STAR OF

See STAR OF THE MAGI.

BETH-LOMON

^{<beth-lo'-mon>} ([Βαιθλωμόν, Baithlomon]; Codex Vaticanus, [Ραγεθλωμόν, Rhagethlomon]): The inhabitants of this city are mentioned as returning with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:17). It is the city of Bethlehem in Judah, the modern [Beit Lachm] (^{<19121>}Ezra 2:21).

BETH-MAACAH

<beth-ma'-a-ka>.

See ABEL-BETH-MAACAH.

BETH-MARCABOTH

<beth-mar'-ka-both> (תְּבֵרֵי מַרְכָּבֹת *tybē beth ha-markabhoth*);

[Baithmachereb], “the house of chariots”): Mentioned along with Hazar-susah, “the station of horses” (^{<1095>}Joshua 19:5; ^{<1348>}1 Chronicles 4:31) as cities in the Negeb near Ziklag. It is tempting to connect these stations with “the cities for his chariots, and the cities for his horsemen” which Solomon built (^{<1099>}1 Kings 9:19; compare ^{<1106>}1 Kings 10:26). The site of Beth-marcaboth has not been identified, but Guerin (*Lamentations Terre Sainte. Jerusalem et le Nord de la Judee*, II, 230) suggests Khan Yunas , Southwest of Gaza, as a suitable chariot city.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-MEON

<beth-me'-on>: A city of Moab (^{<2483>}Jeremiah 48:23), identical with BAAL-MEON (which see).

BETH-MERHAK

<beth-mer'-hak> (בֵּית מֶרְחָק *tybē beth ha-merchaq*); [ἐν οἴκῳ τῷ μακράν, en oiko to makran], literally “a place (house) that was far off” (^{<1057>}2 Samuel 15:17 the Revised Version, margin “the Far House”)): A place mentioned in the account of David’s flight from Absalom. No town of this name is known on the route which he followed. Some scholars think the name denotes simply the outermost of the houses of the city.

BETH-MILLO

<beth-mil'-o>.

See JERUSALEM.

BETH-NIMRAH

<beth-nim'-ra> (**hrm****n****i****t****y****B****e**) [beth nimrah], “house of leopard,” ⁽¹⁶²⁶⁾Numbers 32:36, but in verse 3 it is simply Nimrah): In ⁽¹⁶³⁷⁾Joshua 13:27 the full name appears. In ⁽²³⁴⁶⁾Isaiah 15:6 the name appears as Nimrim, identified as Tell Nimrim, between Jericho and the mountains on the east, where there is a fountain of large size. The city was assigned to Gad. In the 4th century AD it was located as five Roman miles North of Livias. Eusebius calls it Bethamnaram (SEP, I, Tell Nimrin).

BETH-PALET

<beth-pa'-let>.

See *BETH-PELET*.

BETH-PAZZEZ

<beth-paz'-ez> (**ÄX****E****"** **t****y****B****e**) [beth patstsets]; [**Βηρσαφής**, Bersaphes], [**Βαιθφρασή**, Baithphrasee]: A town in the territory of Issachar, named with En-gannim and En-haddah (⁽¹⁶⁹²⁾Joshua 19:21). The site has not been discovered; it probably lay near the modern Jenin.

BETH-PELET

<beth-pe'-let> (**f****i** **P****A****t****y****B****e**) [beth-peleT]; [**Βαιθφαλέθ**, Baithphaleth], “house of escape”; the King James Version Beth-palet; ⁽¹⁶⁵⁷⁾Joshua 15:27, Beth-phelet, the King James Version ⁽¹⁶¹²⁶⁾Nehemiah 11:26): One of “the uttermost cities of the tribe of the children of Judah toward the border of Edom in the (Negeb) South” (⁽¹⁶⁵²⁾Joshua 15:21,27). Site unknown.

BETH-PEOR

<beth-pe'-or> (**r****w****Q****P****i****t****y****B****e**) [beth pe`or]; [**οικος ογόρ**, oikos Phogor]; in Joshua (Vaticanus), [**Βαιθφογόρ**, Baithphogor], or [**βθε**, beth-]: “Over against Beth-peor” the Israelites were encamped, “beyond the Jordan, in the valley,” when Moses uttered the speeches recorded in Deuteronomy (⁽¹⁶⁸⁹⁾Deuteronomy 3:29; 4:46). “In the valley in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor” Moses was buried (⁽¹⁶⁴⁶⁾Deuteronomy 34:6). Beth-peor and the slopes of Pisgah (the King James Version “Ashdodth-pisgah”) are

mentioned in close connection in ^{<0630>}Joshua 13:20. According to Eusebius, Onomasticon, Beth-peor was situated near Mt. Peor (Fogor) opposite Jericho, 6 miles above Livias. Mt. Peor is the “top” or “head” of Peor (^{<0238>}Numbers 23:28). Some height commanding a view of the plain East of the river in the lower Jordan valley is clearly intended, but thus far no identification is possible. “The slopes of Pisgah” are probably the lower slopes of the mountain toward Wady `Ayun Musa. Somewhere North of this the summit we are in search of may be found. Conder suggested the cliff at Minyeh, South of Wady Jedeideh, and of Pisgah; and would locate Beth-peor at el-Mareighat, “the smeared things,” evidently an ancient place of worship, with a stone circle and standing stones, about 4 miles East, on the same ridge. This seems, however, too far South, and more difficult to reach from Shittim than we should gather from ^{<0230>}Numbers 25:1 ff.

W. Ewing

BETHPHAGE

^{<beth'-fa-je>}, ^{<beth'-faj>} (from ^{tyBetyBe}beth paghah]; [^{Βεθφαγή}, Bethphage], or [^{Βηθφαγή}, Bethphage]; in Aramaic “place of young figs”): Near the Mount of Olives and to the road from Jerusalem to Jericho; mentioned together with Bethany (^{<2100>}Matthew 21:1; ^{<4110>}Mark 11:1; ^{<2120>}Luke 19:29). The place occurs in several Talmudic passages where it may be inferred that it was near but outside Jerusalem; it was at the Sabbatical distance limit East of Jerusalem, and was surrounded by some kind of wall. The medieval Bethphage was between the summit and Bethany. The site is now enclosed by the Roman Catholics. As regards the Bethphage of the New Testament, the most probable suggestion was that it occupied the summit itself where Kefr et Tur stands today. This village certainly occupies an ancient site and no other name is known. This is much more probable than the suggestion that the modern Abu Dis is on the site of Bethphage.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-PHELET

^{<beth-fe'-let>}.

See BETH-PELET.

BETH-RAPHA

<beth-ra'-fa> (אֶבְרָפָה beth rapha'); B, [ὁ Βαθραΐα, ho Bathraia], [Βαθρεφά, Bathrepha]: The name occurs only in the genealogical list in ^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:12. It does not seem possible now to associate it with any particular place or clan.

BETH-REHOB

<beth-re'-hob> (בֵּית רְחוֹב beth-rechobh); [ὁ οἶκος Ραάβ, ho oikos Rhaab]: An Aramean town and district which, along with Zobah and Maacah, assisted Ammon against David (^{<1006>}2 Samuel 10:6,8, Rehob). It is probably identical with Rehob (^{<0432>}Numbers 13:21), the northern limit of the spies' journey. Laish-Daniel (probably Tell el-Kadi) was situated near it (^{<0783>}Judges 18:28). The site of the town is unknown. It has been conjecturally identified with Hunin, West of Banias, and, more plausibly, with Banias itself (Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (2), 218; Buhl, *Geog.*, 240; Moore, *ICC*, Jgs, 399).

C. H. Thomson

BETHSAIDA

<beth-sa'-i-da> ([Βηθσαιδά, Bethsaida], "house of fishing"):

(1) A city East of the Jordan, in a "desert place" (that is, uncultivated ground used for grazing) at which Jesus miraculously fed the multitude with five loaves and two fishes (^{<4052>}Mark 6:32 ff; ^{<0390>}Luke 9:10). This is doubtless to be identified with the village of Bethsaida in Lower Gaulonitis which the Tetrarch Philip raised to the rank of a city, and called Julias, in honor of Julia, the daughter of Augustus. It lay near the place where the Jordan enters the Sea of Gennesaret (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1; III, x, 7; Vita, 72). This city may be located at et-Tell, a ruined site on the East side of the Jordan on rising ground, fully a mile from the sea. As this is too far from the sea for a fishing village, Schumacher (*The Jaulan*, 246) suggests that el-`Araj, "a large, completely destroyed site close to the lake," connected in ancient times with et-Tell "by the beautiful roads still visible," may have been the fishing village, and et-Tell the princely residence. He is however inclined to favor el-Mes`adiyah, a ruin and winter village of Arab et-Tellawiyeh, which stands on an artificial mound,

about a mile and a half from the mouth of the Jordan. It should be noted, however, that the name is in origin radically different from Bethsaida. The substitution of sin for cad is easy: but the insertion of the guttural `ain is impossible. No trace of the name Bethsaida has been found in the district; but any one of the sites named would meet the requirements.

To this neighborhood Jesus retired by boat with His disciples to rest awhile. The multitude following on foot along the northern shore of the lake would cross the Jordan by the ford at its mouth which is used by foot travelers to this day. The “desert” of the narrative is just the barriyeh of the Arabs where the animals are driven out for pasture. The “green grass” of ~~4069~~ Mark 6:39, and the “much grass” of ~~4060~~ John 6:10, point to some place in the plain of el-BaTeichah, on the rich soil of which the grass is green and plentiful compared with the scanty herbage on the higher slopes.

(2) Bethsaida of Galilee, where dwelt Philip, Andrew, Peter (~~4044~~ John 1:44; 12:21), and perhaps also James and John. The house of Andrew and Peter seems to have been not far from the synagogue in Capernaum (~~4084~~ Matthew 8:14; ~~4009~~ Mark 1:29, etc.). Unless they had moved their residence from Bethsaida to Capernaum, of which there is no record, and which for fishermen was unlikely, Bethsaida must have lain close to Capernaum. It may have been the fishing town adjoining the larger city. As in the case of the other Bethsaida, no name has been recovered to guide us to the site. On the rocky promontory, however, East of Khan Minyeh we find Sheikh `Aly ec-Caiyadin, “Sheikh Aly of the Fishermen,” as the name of a ruined weley, in which the second element in the name Bethsaida is represented. Near by is the site at `Ain et-Tabigha, which many have identified with Bethsaida of Galilee. The warm water from copious springs runs into a little bay of the sea in which fishes congregate in great numbers. This has therefore always been a favorite haunt of fishermen. If Capernaum were at Khan Minyeh, then the two lay close together. The names of many ancient places have been lost, and others have strayed from their original localities. The absence of any name resembling Bethsaida need not concern us.

WERE THERE TWO BETHSAIDAS?:

Many scholars maintain that all the New Testament references to Bethsaida apply to one place, namely, Bethsaida Julias. The arguments for and against this view may be summarized as follows:

- (a) Galilee ran right round the lake, including most of the level coastland on the East. Thus Gamala, on the eastern shore, was within

the jurisdiction of Josephus, who commanded in Galilee (BJ, II, xx, 4). Judas of Gamala (Ant., XVIII, i, 1) is also called Judas of Galilee (ibid., i, 6). If Gamala, far down the eastern shore of the sea, were in Galilee, a fortiori Bethsaida, a town which lay on the very edge of the Jordan, may be described as in Galilee.

But Josephus makes it plain that Gamala, while added to his jurisdiction, was not in Galilee, but in Gaulonitis (BJ, II, xx, 6). Even if Judas were born in Gamala, and so might properly be called a Gaulonite, he may, like others, have come to be known as belonging to the province in which his active life was spent. "Jesus of Nazareth" was born in Bethlehem. Then Josephus explicitly says that Bethsaida was in Lower Gaulonitis (BJ, II, ix, 1). Further, Luke places the country of the Gerasenes on the other side of the sea from Galilee (8:26) — *antipera tes Galilaias* ("over against Galilee").

(b) To go to the other side — [*eis to peran*] (~~4065~~ Mark 6:45) — does not of necessity imply passing from the East to the West coast of the lake, since Josephus uses the verb *diaperaioo* of a passage from Tiberias to Tarichea (Vita, 59). But

(i) this involved a passage from a point on the West to a point on the South shore, "crossing over" two considerable bays; whereas if the boat started from any point in el-BaTeichah, to which we seem to be limited by the "much grass," and by the definition of the district as belonging to Bethsaida, to sail to et-Tell, it was a matter of coasting not more than a couple of miles, with no bay to cross.

(ii) No case can be cited where the phrase [*eis*] to peran certainly means anything else than "to the other side."

(iii) Mark says that the boat started to go unto the other side to Bethsaida, while John, gives the direction "over the sea unto Capernaum" (~~4067~~ Mark 6:17). The two towns were therefore practically in the same line. Now there is no question that Capernaum was on "the other side," nor is there any suggestion that the boat was driven out of its course; and it is quite obvious that, sailing toward Capernaum, whether at Tell Chum or at Khan Minyeh, it would never reach Bethsaida Julius.

(iv) The present writer is familiar with these waters in both storm and calm. If the boat was taken from any point in el-BaTeichah towards et-Tell, no east wind would have distressed the rowers, protected as that part is by the mountains. Therefore it was no contrary wind that carried them toward Capernaum and the “land of Gennesaret.” On the other hand, with a wind from the West, such as is often experienced, eight or nine hours might easily be occupied in covering the four or five miles from el-BaTeichah to the neighborhood of Capernaum.

(c) The words of Mark (^{<4065>}Mark 6:45), it is suggested (Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 42), have been too strictly interpreted: as the Gospel was written probably at Rome, its author being a native, not of Galilee, but of Jerusalem. Want of precision on topographical points, therefore, need not surprise us. But as we have seen above, the “want of precision” must also be attributed to the writer of ^{<4067>}John 6:17. The agreement of these two favors the strict interpretation. Further, if the Gospel of Mark embodies the recollections of Peter, it would be difficult to find a more reliable authority for topographical details connected with the sea on which his fisher life was spent.

(d) In support of the single-city theory it is further argued that

(i) Jesus withdrew to Bethsaida as being in the jurisdiction of Philip, when he heard of the murder of John by Antipas, and would not have sought again the territories of the latter so soon after leaving them.

(ii) Medieval works of travel notice only one Bethsaida.

(iii) The East coast of the sea was definitely attached to Galilee in AD 84, and Ptolemy (circa 140) places Julius in Galilee. It is therefore significant that only the Fourth Gospel speaks of “Bethsaida of Galilee.”

(iv) There could hardly have been two Bethsaidas so close together.

But:

(i) It is not said that Jesus came hither that he might leave the territory of Antipas for that of Philip; and in view of ^{<4069>}Mark 6:30 ff, and ^{<4090>}Luke 9:10 ff, the inference from ^{<4043>}Matthew 14:13 that he did so, is not warranted.

(ii) The Bethsaida of medieval writers was evidently on the West of the Jordan. If it lay on the East it is inconceivable that none of them should have mentioned the river in this connection.

(iii) If the 4th Gospel was not written until well into the 2nd century, then the apostle was not the author; but this is a very precarious assumption. John, writing after 84 AD, would hardly have used the phrase “Bethsaida of Galilee” of a place only recently attached to that province, writing, as he was, at a distance from the scene, and recalling the former familiar conditions.

(iv) In view of the frequent repetition of names in Palestine the nearness of the two Bethsaidas raises no difficulty. The abundance of fish at each place furnished a good reason for the recurrence of the name.

W. Ewing

BETHSAMOS

<beth-sa'-mos>.

See *BETHASMOS*.

BETH-SHEAN; BETH-SHAN

<beth-she'-an>, <beth'-shan> (^{ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲧⲏⲛ} Beth-shan], or ^{ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲧⲏⲛ} Beth [beth-she'an]; in Apocrypha [^{ⲃⲁⲓⲑⲥⲁⲛ} Baithsan] or [^{ⲃⲉⲑⲥⲁ} Bethsa]): A city in the territory of Issachar assigned to Manasseh, out of which the Canaanites were not driven (^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}Joshua 17:11; ^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}Judges 1:27); in the days of Israel's strength they were put to taskwork (^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}Judges 1:28). They doubtless were in league with the Philistines who after Israel's defeat on Gilboa exposed the bodies of Saul and his sons on the wall of the city (^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}1 Samuel 31:7 ff), whence they were rescued by the men of Jabesh, who remembered the earlier kindness of the king (^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}1 Samuel 31:7 ff; ^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}2 Samuel 21:12). In ^{ⲓⲟⲩⲩⲁ}1 Kings 4:12 the name applies to the district in which the city stands. It was called Scythopolis by the Greeks. This may be connected with the invasion of Palestine by the Scythians who, according to George Syncellus, “overran Palestine and took possession of Beisan.” This may be the invasion noticed by Herodotus, circa 600 BC (i.104-6). Here Tryphon failed in his first attempt to take Jonathan by treachery (1

Macc 12:40). It fell to John Hyrcanus, but was taken from the Jews by Pompey. It was rebuilt by Gabinius (Ant., XIV, v, 3), and became an important member of the league of the “ten cities” (BJ, III, ix, 7). The impiousness of the inhabitants is painted in dark colors by Josephus (Vita, 6; BJ, II, xviii, 3); and the Mishna speaks of it as a center of idol worship (‘Abhodhah Zarah, i.4). Later it was the seat of a bishop.

It is represented by the modern Beisan, in the throat of the Vale of Jezreel where it falls into the Jordan valley, on the southern side of the stream from ‘Ain Jalud. The ruins of the ancient city are found on the plain, and on the great mound where probably stood the citadel. Between the town and the stretch of marsh land to the South runs the old road from East to West up the Vale of Jezreel, uniting in Esdraelon with the great caravan road from North to South.

W. Ewing

BETH-SHEMESH

<beth-she'-mesh>, <beth'-shemesh> (בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ [beth-shemesh];

[Βαϊθσαμς, Baithsamus], “house of the sun”): This name for a place doubtless arose in every instance from the presence of a sanctuary of the sun there. In accordance with the meaning and origin of the word, it is quite to be expected that there should be several places of this name in Bible lands, and the expectation is not disappointed. Analysis and comparison of the passages in the Bible where a Beth-shemesh is mentioned show four places of this name.

1. BETH-SHEMESH OF JUDAH:

The first mention of a place by this name is in the description of the border of the territory of Judah (⁽⁶⁵⁰⁾Joshua 15:10) which “went down to Beth-Shemesh.” This topographical indication “down” puts the place toward the lowlands on the East or West side of Palestine, but does not indicate which. This point is clearly determined by the account of the return of the ark by the Philistine lords from Ekron (⁽⁹⁰⁰⁾1 Samuel 6:9-19). They returned the ark to Beth-shemesh, the location of which they indicated by the remark that if their affliction was from Yahweh, the kine would bear the ark “by the way of its own border.” The Philistines lay along the western border of Judah and the location of Beth-Shemesh of Judah is thus clearly

fixed near the western lowland, close to the border between the territory of Judah and that claimed by the Philistines. This is confirmed by the account of the twelve officers of the commissariat of King Solomon. One of these, the son of Dekar, had a Beth-shemesh in his territory. By excluding the territory assigned to the other eleven officers, the territory of this son of Dekar is found to be in Judah and to lie along the Philistine border (^{<1049>}1 Kings 4:9). A Philistine attack upon the border-land of Judah testifies to the same effect (^{<1038>}2 Chronicles 28:18). Finally, the battle between Amaziah of Judah and Jehoash of Israel, who “looked one another in the face” at Beth-shemesh, puts Beth-Shemesh most probably near the border between Judah and Israel, which would locate it near the northern part of the western border of Judah’s territory. In the assignment of cities to the Levites, Judah gave Beth-shemesh with its suburbs (^{<10216>}Joshua 21:16). It has been identified with a good degree of certainty with the modern `Ain Shems.

It may be that Ir-shemesh, “city of the sun,” and Har-cherec, “mount of the sun,” refer to Beth-shemesh of Judah (^{<10510>}Joshua 15:10; 19:41-43; ^{<1049>}1 Kings 4:9; ^{<10133>}Judges 1:33,35). But the worship of the sun was so common and cities of this name so many in number that it would be hazardous to conclude with any assurance that because these three names refer to the same region they therefore refer to the same place.

2. BETH-SHEMESH OF ISSACHAR:

In the description of the tribal limits, it is said of Issachar (^{<10692>}Joshua 19:22), “And the border reached to Tabor, and Shahazumah, and Beth-shemesh; and the goings out of their border were at the Jordan.” The description indicates that Beth-shemesh was in the eastern part of Issachar’s territory. The exact location of the city is not known.

3. BETH-SHEMESH OF NAPHTALI:

A Beth-shemesh is mentioned together with Beth-anath as cities of Naphtali (^{<10698>}Joshua 19:38). There is no clear indication of the location of this city. Its association with Beth-anath may indicate that they were near each other in the central part of the tribal allotment. As at Gezer, another of the cities of the Levites the Canaanites were not driven out from Beth-shemesh.

4. BETH-SHEMESH “THAT IS IN THE LAND OF EGYPT”:

A doom is pronounced upon “Beth-shemesh, that is in the land of Egypt” (^{<24813>}Jeremiah 43:13). The Seventy identify it with Heliopolis. There is some uncertainty about this identification. If Beth-shemesh, “house of the sun,” is here a description of Heliopolis, why does it not have the article? If it is a proper name, how does it come that a sanctuary in Egypt is called by a Hebrew name? It may be that the large number of Jews in Egypt with Jeremiah gave this Hebrew name to Heliopolis for use among themselves, Beth-shemesh. being a translation of Egyptian Perra as suggested by Griffith. Otherwise, Beth-shemesh. cannot have been Heliopolis, but must have been some other, at present unknown, place of Semitic worship. This latter view seems to be favored by Jeremiah’s double threat: “He shall also break the pillars of Beth-shemesh, that is in the land of Egypt; and the houses of the gods of Egypt shall he burn with fire” (save place). If Beth-shemesh were the “house of the sun,” then the balancing of the state ment would be only between “pillars” and “houses,” but it seems more naturally to be between Beth-shemesh, a Semitic place of worship “that is in the land of Egypt” on the one hand, and the Egyptian place of worship, “the houses of the gods of Egypt,” on the other.

But the Seventy lived in Egypt and in their interpretation of this passage were probably guided by accurate knowledge of facts unknown now, such as surviving names, tradition and even written history. Until there is further light on the subject, it is better to accept their interpretation and identify this Beth-shemesh with Heliopolis.

See ON.

M. G. Kyle

BETH-SHEMITE

^{<beth-she'-mit>} ^{yvmj} ^{AtyBe} [beth-shimshi] (^{<0064>}1 Samuel 6:14,28)): An inhabitant of Beth-shemesh in Judah (compare **BETH-SHEMESH** 1).

BETH-SHITTAH

^{<beth-shit'-a>} (^{hFyh} ^{tyBe} [beth ha-shiTtah], “house of the acacia”): A place on the route followed by the Midianites in their flight before Gideon (^{<0022>}Judges 7:22). It is probably identical with the modern

ShuTTa, a village in the Vale of Jezreel, about 6 miles Northwest of Beisan.

BETHSURA; BETHSURON

<beth-su'-ra> ([Βαιθσοῦρα, Baithsoura] (1 Macc 4:29, etc.)), (2 Macc 11:5 the Revised Version (British and American)): The Greek form of the name *BETH-ZUR* (which see).

BETH-TAPPUAH

<beth-tap'-u-a> (h" WPT" AtyBē [beth-tappuah]; [Βεθθαπφουέ, Beththapphoue], "place of apples" (see however APPLE)); A town in the hill country of Judah (^{<0655>}Joshua 15:53), probably near Hebron (el Tappuah, ^{<006>}1 Chronicles 2:43), possibly the same as Tephon (1 Macc 9:50). The village of Tuffuch, 3 1/2 miles Northwest of Hebron, is the probable site; it stands on the edge of a high ridge, surrounded by very fruitful gardens; an ancient highroad runs through the village, and there are many old cisterns and caves. (See PEF, III, 310, 379, Sh XXI.)

E. W. G. Masterman

BETHUEL (1)

<be-thu'-el> (l aWtB) [bethu'el; "dweller in God"): A son of Nahor and Milcah, Abraham's nephew, father of Laban and Rebekah (^{<0223>}Genesis 22:23; 24:15,24,47,50; 25:20; 28:2,5). In the last-named passage, he is surnamed "the Syrian." The only place where he appears as a leading character in the narrative is in connection with Rebekah's betrothal to Isaac; and even here, his son Laban stands out more prominently than he — a fact explainable on the ground of the custom which recognized the right of the brother to take a special interest in the welfare of the sister (compare ^{<0345>}Genesis 34:5,21,25; ^{<0330>}2 Samuel 13:20,22). Ant, I, xvi, 2 states that Bethuel was dead at this time.

Frank E. Hirsch

BETHUEL (2)

<be-thu'-el>, <beth'-u-el> ([**a**W**t**B]) [bethu'el], “destroyed of God”): A town of Simeon (^{<1080>}1 Chronicles 4:30), the same as Bethul (^{<0690>}Joshua 19:4), and, probably, as the Beth-el of ^{<0817>}1 Samuel 30:27.

BETHUL

<beth'-ul>, <be'-thul> ([**I** W**t**B]) [bethul]):

See BETHUEL; CHESIL.

BETHULIA

<be-thu'-li-a> ([**B**aιθουλονά, Baithouloua]): A town named only in the Book of Judith (4:6; 6:10 ff; 7:1 ff; 8:3; 10:6; 12:7; 15:3,6; 16:21 ff). From these references we gather that it stood beside a valley, on a rock, at the foot of which was a spring, not far from Jenin; and that it guarded the passes by which an army might march to the South. The site most fully meeting these conditions is that of Sanur. The rock on the summit of which it stands rises sheer from the edge of Merj el-Ghariq, on the main highway, some 7 miles South of Jenin. Other identifications are suggested: Conder favoring Mithiliyeh, a little farther north; while the writer of the article “Bethulia” in Encyclopedia Biblica argues for identification with Jerusalem.

W. Ewing

BETH-ZACHARIAS

<beth-zak-a-ri'-as> [**B**aιθ-ζαχαριά, Baith-zacharia]): Here Judas Maccabeus failed in battle with Antiochus Eupator, and his brother Eleazar fell in conflict with an elephant (1 Macc 6:32 ff; the King James Version “Bathzacharias”). It was a position of great strength, crowning a promontory which juts out between two deep valleys. It still bears the ancient name with little change, Beit Zakaria. It lies about 4 miles Southwest of Bethlehem (BR, III, 283 ff; Ant, XII, ix, 4).

BETH-ZUR

<beth'-zur> (**r**W**x**A**Ty**B) [beth-tsur]; [**B**aιθ-σούρ, Baith-sour], “house of rock”; less probably “house of the god Zur”):

(1) Mentioned (~~<1658>~~ Joshua 15:58) as near Halhul and Gedor in the hill country of Judah; fortified by Rehoboam (~~<4107>~~ 2 Chronicles 11:7). In ~~<1816>~~ Nehemiah 3:16 mention is made of “Nehemiah the son of Azbuk, the ruler of half the district of Beth-zur.” During the Maccabean wars it (Bethsura) came into great importance (1 Macc 4:29,61; 6:7,26,31,49,50; 9:52; 10:14; 11:65; 14:7,33). Josephus describes it as the strongest place in all Judea (Ant., XIII, v, 6). It was inhabited in the days of Eusebius and Jerome.

(2) It is the ruined site Belt Cur, near the main road from Jerusalem to Hebron, and some 4 miles North of the latter. Its importance lay in its natural strength, on a hilltop dominating the highroad, and also in its guarding the one southerly approach for a hostile army by the Vale of Elah to the Judean plateau. The site today is conspicuous from a distance through the presence of a ruined medieval tower. (See PEF, III, 311, Sh XXI).

E. W. G. Masterman

BETIMES

~~<be-timz'>~~: In the sense of “early” is the translation of two Hebrew words:

(1) **μk" v;**[shakham], a root meaning “to incline the shoulder to a load,” hence “to load up,” “start early”: in ~~<1258>~~ Genesis 26:31 “they rose up betimes in the morning,” also in ~~<4885>~~ 2 Chronicles 36:15 (the American Standard Revised Version “early”);

(2) of **rj " v;**[shachar], a root meaning “to dawn” in ~~<885>~~ Job 8:5; 24:5, the American Standard Revised Version “diligently,” and in ~~<1932>~~ Psalm 13:24, “chasteneth him betimes.”

In the Apocrypha (Sirach 6:36) “betimes” is the translation of [ὀρθίζω, orthizo], literally, “to rise early in the morning,” while in Bel and the Dragon verse 16 the same word is translated “betime.”

In other cases the King James Version “betimes” appears as “before the time” (Sirach 51:30); “early” (1 Macc 4:52; 11:67); “the mourning” (1 Macc 5:30).

BETOLION

<be-to'-li-on> ([Βετολιώ, Betolio] (Codex Alexandrinus), or (Codex Vaticanus) [Βητολιώ, Betolio]; the King James Version Betolius, be-to'-li-us): A town the people of which to the number of 52 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:21). It corresponds to Bethel in <1028> Ezra 2:28.

BETOMESTHAIM; BETOMASTHAIM

<be-to-mes'-tha-im>, <be-to-mes'-tham> the King James Version Betomestham, ([Βετομεσθάιμ, Betomesthaim] (Judith 4:6)): the King James Version Betomasthem ([Βαιτομασθάιμ, Baitornasthaim] (Judith 15:4)): The place is said to have been “over against Jezreel, in the face of (i.e eastward of) the plain that is near Dothan” It can hardly be Deir Massin, which lies West of the plain. The district is clearly indicated, but no identification is yet possible.

BETONIM

<bet'-o-nim>, <be-to'-nim> (μυνίβ)[beTonim]; [Βοτανεί, Botanei] or [Botanin]): A town East of the Jordan in the territory of Gad (<0635> Joshua 13:26). It may be identical with BaTneh, about 3 miles Southwest of es-Salt.

BETRAY

<be-tra'> (hmr:[ramah]; [παράδιδωμι, paradidomi]): In the Old Testament only once (<1327> 1 Chronicles 12:17). David warns those who had deserted to him from Saul: “If ye be come to betray me to mine adversaries the God of our fathers look thereon.” The same Hebrew word is elsewhere translated “beguile” (<0225> Genesis 29:25; <0622> Joshua 9:22), “deceive” (<0917> 1 Samuel 19:17; 28:12; <1026> 2 Samuel 19:26; <2069> Proverbs 26:19; <2019> Lamentations 1:19).

In the New Testament, for paradidomi: 36 times, of the betrayal of Jesus Christ, and only 3 times besides (<0240> Matthew 24:10; <4132> Mark 13:12; <2216> Luke 21:16) of kinsmen delivering up one another to prosecution. In

these three places the Revised Version (British and American) translates according to the more general meaning, “to deliver up,” and also (in ~~<0172>~~ Matthew 17:22; 20:18; 26:16; ~~<0140>~~ Mark 14:10,21; ~~<0220>~~ Luke 22:4,6) where it refers to the delivering up of Jesus. The Revisers’ idea was perhaps to retain “betray” only in direct references to Judas’ act, but they have not strictly followed that rule. Judas’ act was more than that of giving a person up to the authorities; he did it under circumstances of treachery which modified its character:

(a) he took advantage of his intimate relation with Jesus Christ as a disciple to put Him in the hands of His enemies;

(b) he did it stealthily by night, and

(c) by a kiss, an act which professed affection and friendliness;

(d) he did it for money, and

(e) he knew that Jesus Christ was innocent of any crime (~~<0170>~~ Matthew 27:4).

T. Rees

BETRAYERS

~~<be-tra'-ers>~~ ([~~<prodota>~~], “betrayers,” “traitors”): Stephen charged the Jews with being betrayers of the Righteous One (~~<0175>~~ Acts 7:52) i.e. as having made Judas’ act their own; compare ~~<0166>~~ Luke 6:16: “Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor;” ~~<0180>~~ 2 Timothy 3:4, “traitors.”

BETROTH

~~<be-troth'>~~, ~~<be-troth'>~~ (~~<crā>~~['dras]): On betrothal as a social custom see *MARRIAGE*. Hosea, in his great parable of the prodigal wife, surpassed only by a greater Teacher’s parable of the Prodigal Son, uses betrothal as the symbol of Yahweh’s pledge of His love and favor to penitent Israel (~~<0169>~~ Hosea 2:19,20). In ~~<0208>~~ Exodus 21:8,9 the Revised Version (British and American) renders “espouse” for the “betroth” of the King James Version, the context implying the actual marriage relation.

BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS:

As the title indicates, the historical period in the life of Israel extends from the cessation of Old Testament prophecy to the beginning of the Christian era.

1. THE PERIOD IN GENERAL.

The Exile left its ineffaceable stamp on Judaism as well as on the Jews. Their return to the land of their fathers was marked by the last rays of the declining sun of prophecy. With Malachi it set. Modern historical criticism has projected some of the canonical books of the Bible far into this post-exilic period. Thus Kent (HJP, 1899), following the lead of the Wellhausen-Kuenen hypothesis, with all its later leaders, has charted the period between 600 BC, the date of the first captivity, to 160 BC, the beginning of the Hasmonean period of Jewish history, in comparative contemporaneous blocks of double decades. Following the path of Koster, the historical position of Ezra and Nehemiah is inverted, and the former is placed in the period 400-380 BC, contemporaneously with Artaxerxes II; Joel is assigned to the same period; portions of Isaiah (chapters 63 through 66; 24 through 27) are placed about 350 BC; Zechariah is assigned to the period 260-240, and Daniel is shot way down the line into the reign of the Seleucids, between 200 and 160 BC. Now all this is very striking and no doubt very critical, but the ground of this historical readjustment is wholly subjective, and has the weight only of a hypothetical conjecture. Whatever may be our attitude to the critical hypothesis of the late origin of some of the Old Testament literally, it seems improbable that any portion of it could have reached far into the post-exilic period. The interval between the Old and the New Testaments is the dark period in the history of Israel. It stretches itself out over about four centuries, during which there was neither prophet nor inspired writer in Israel. All we know of it we owe to Josephus, to some of the apocryphal books, and to scattered references in Greek and Latin historians. The seat of empire passed over from the East to the West, from Asia to Europe. The Persian Empire collapsed, under the fierce attacks of the Macedonians, and the Greek Empire in turn gave way to the Roman rule.

2. A GLANCE AT CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY.

For the better understanding of this period in the history of Israel, it may be well to pause for a moment to glance at the wider field of the history of the world in the centuries under contemplation, for the words “fullness of time” deal with the all-embracing history of mankind, for whose salvation Christ appeared, and whose every movement led to its realization.

1. The Egyptian Empire:

In the four centuries preceding Christ, The Egyptian empire, the oldest and in many respects the most perfectly developed civilization of antiquity, was tottering to its ruins. The 29th or Mendesian Dynasty, made place, in 384 BC, for the 30th or Sebennitic Dynasty, which was swallowed up, half a century later, by the Persian Dynasty. The Macedonian or 32nd replaced this in 332 BC, only to give way, a decade later, to the last or 33rd, the Ptolemaic Dynasty. The whole history of Egypt in this period was therefore one of endless and swiftly succeeding changes. In the Ptolemaic Dynasty there was a faint revival of the old glory of the past, but the star of empire had set for Egypt, and the mailed hand of Rome finally smote down a civilization whose beginnings are lost in the dim twilight of history. The Caesarian conquest of 47 BC was followed, 17 years later, by the annexation of Egypt to the new world-power, as a Roman province. Manetho's history is the one great literary monument of Egyptian history in this period. Her priests had been famous for their wisdom, to which Lycurgus and Solon, the Greek legislators, had been attracted, as well as Pythagoras and Plato, the world's greatest philosophers.

2. Greece:

In Greece also the old glory was passing away. Endless wars sapped the strength of the national life. The strength of Athens and Sparta, of Corinth and Thebes had departed, and when about the beginning of our period, in 337 BC, the congress of Greek states had elected Philip of Macedon to the hegemony of united Greece, the knell of doom sounded for all Greek liberty. First Philip and after him Alexander wiped out the last remnants of this liberty, and Greece became a fighting machine for the conquest of the world in the meteoric career of Alexander the Great. But what a galaxy of illustrious names adorn the pages of Greek history, in this period, so dark for Israel! Think of Aristophanes and Hippocrates, of Xenophon and Democritus, of Plato and Apelles, of Aeschines and Demosthenes, of

Aristotle and Praxiteles and Archimedes, all figuring, amid the decay of Greek liberty, in the 4th and 3rd centuries before Christ! Surely if the political glory of Greece had left its mark on the ages, its intellectual brilliancy is their pride.

3. Rome:

Rome meanwhile was strengthening herself, by interminable wars, for the great task of world-conquest that lay before her. By the Latin and Samnite and Punic wars she trained her sons in the art of war, extended her territorial power and made her name dreaded everywhere. Italy and north Africa, Greece and Asia Minor and the northern barbarians were conquered in turn. Her intellectual brilliancy was developed only when the lust of conquest was sated after a fashion, but in the century immediately preceding the Christian era we find such names as Lucretius and Hortentius, Cato and Cicero, Sallust and Diodorus Siculus, Virgil and Horace. At the close of the period between the Testaments, Rome had become the mistress of the world and every road led to her capital.

4. Asia:

In Asia the Persian empire, heir to the civilization and traditions of the great Assyrian-Babylonian world-power, was fast collapsing and was ultimately utterly wiped out by the younger Greek empire and civilization. In far-away India the old ethnic religion of Brahma a century or more before the beginning of our period passed through the reformatory crisis inaugurated by Gatama Buddha or Sakya Mouni, and thus Buddhism, one of the great ethnic religions, was born. Another reformer of the Tauistic faith was Confucius, the sage of China, a contemporary of Buddha, while Zoroaster in Persia laid the foundations of his dualistic world-view. In every sense and in every direction, the period between the Testaments was therefore one of political and intellectual ferment.

3. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS.

As regards Jewish history, the period between the Testaments may be divided as follows:

- (1) the Persian period;
- (2) the Alexandrian period;
- (3) the Egyptian period;

- (4) the Syrian period;
- (5) the Maccabean period;
- (6) the Roman period.

1. The Persian Period:

The Persian period extends from the cessation of prophecy to 334 BC. It was in the main uneventful in the history of the Jews, a breathing spell between great national crises, and comparatively little is known of it. The land of Palestine was a portion of the Syrian satrapy, while the true government of the Jewish people was semi-theocratic, or rather sacerdotal, under the rule of the high priests, who were responsible to the satrap. As a matter of course, the high-priestly office became the object of all Jewish ambition and it aroused the darkest passions. Thus John, the son of Judas, son of Eliashib, through the lust of power, killed his brother Jesus, who was a favorite of Bagoses, a general of Artaxerxes in command of the district. The guilt of the fratricide was enhanced, because the crime was committed in the temple itself, and before the very altar. A storm of wrath, the only notable one of this period, thereupon swept over Judea. The Persians occupied Jerusalem, the temple was defiled, the city laid waste in part, a heavy fine was imposed on the people and a general persecution followed, which lasted for many years (Ant., XI, 7; Kent, HJP, 231). Then as later on, in the many persecutions which followed, the Samaritans, ever pliable and willing to obey the tyrant of the day, went practically scot free.

2. The Alexandrian Period:

The Alexandrian period was very brief, 334-323 BC. It simply covers the period of the Asiatic rule of Alexander the Great. In Greece things had been moving swiftly. The Spartan hegemony, which had been unbroken since the fall of Athens, was now destroyed by the Thebans under Epaminondas, in the great battles of Leuctra and Mantinea. But the new power was soon crushed by Philip of Macedon, who was thereupon chosen general leader by the unwilling Greeks. Persia was the object of Philip's ambition and vengeance, but the dagger of Pausanias (Ant., XI, viii, 1) forestalled the execution of his plans. His son Alexander, a youth of 20 years, succeeded him, and thus the "great he-goat," of which Daniel had spoken (²⁰⁰⁸ Daniel 8:8; 10:20), appeared on the scene. In the twelve years of his reign (335-323 BC) he revolutionized the world. Swift as an eagle he moved. All Greece was laid at his feet. Thence he moved to Asia, where he

defeated Darius in the memorable battles of Granicus and Issus. Passing southward, he conquered the Mediterranean coast and Egypt and then moved eastward again, for the complete subjugation of Asia, when he was struck down in the height of his power, at Babylon, in the 33rd year of his age. In the Syrian campaign he had come in contact with the Jews. Unwilling to leave any stronghold at his back, he reduced Tyre after a siege of several months, and advancing southward demanded the surrender of Jerusalem. But the Jews, taught by bitter experience, desired to remain loyal to Persia. As Alexander approached the city, Jaddua the high priest, with a train of priests in their official dress, went out to meet him, to supplicate mercy. A previous dream of this occurrence is said to have foreshadowed this event, and Alexander spared the city, sacrificed to Yahweh, had the prophecies of Daniel concerning him rehearsed in his hearing, and showed the Jews many favors (Ant., XI, viii, 5) From that day on they became his favorites; he employed them in his army and gave them equal rights with the Greeks, as first citizens of Alexandria, and other cities, which he founded. Thus the strong Hellenistic spirit of the Jews was created, which marked so large a portion of the nation, in the subsequent periods of their history.

3. The Egyptian Period:

The Egyptian period (324-264 BC). The death of Alexander temporarily turned everything into chaos. The empire, welded together by his towering genius, fell apart under four of his generals — Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Cassander, and Selenus (~~2012~~ Daniel 8:21,22). Egypt fell to the share of Ptolemy Soter and Judea was made part of it. At first Ptolemy was harsh in his treatment of the Jews, but later on he learned to respect them and became their patron as Alexander had been. Hecataeus of Thrace is at this time said to have studied the Jews, through information received from Hezekiah, an Egyptian Jewish immigrant, and to have written a Jewish history from the time of Abraham till his own day. This book, quoted by Josephus and Origen, is totally lost. Soter was succeeded by Ptolemy Philadelphus, an enlightened ruler, famous through the erection of the lighthouse of Pharos, and especially through the founding of the celebrated Alexandrian library. Like his father he was very friendly to the Jews, and in his reign the celebrated Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures, the Septuagint, was made, according to tradition (Ant., XII, ii). As however the power of the Syrian princes, the Seleucids, grew, Palestine increasingly became the battle ground between them and the Ptolemies. In

the decisive battle between Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus the Great, at Raphia near Gaza, the latter was crushed and during Philopator's reign Judea remained an Egyptian province. And yet this battle formed the turning-point of the history of the Jews in their relation to Egypt. For when Ptolemy, drunk with victory, came to Jerusalem, he endeavored to enter the holy of holies of the temple, although he retreated, in confusion, from the holy place. But he wreaked his vengeance on the Jews, for opposing his plan, by a cruel persecution. He was succeeded by his son Ptolemy Epiphanes, a child of 5 years. The long-planned vengeance of Antiochus now took form in an invasion of Egypt. Coele-Syria and Judea were occupied by the Syrians and passed over into the possession of the Seleucids.

4. The Syrian Period:

The Syrian period (204-165 BC). Israel now entered into the valley of the shadow of death. This entire period was an almost uninterrupted martyrdom. Antiochus was succeeded by Seleucis Philopator. But harsh as was their attitude to the Jews, neither of these two was notorious for his cruelty to them. Their high priests, as in former periods, were still their nominal rulers. But the aspect of everything changed when Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC) came to the throne. He may fitly be called the Nero of Jewish history. The nationalists among the Jews were at that time wrangling with the Hellenists for the control of affairs. Onias III, a faithful high priest, was expelled from office through the machinations of his brother Jesus or Jason (2 Macc 4:7-10). Onias went to Egypt, where at Heliopolis he built a temple and officiated as high priest. Meanwhile Jason in turn was turned out of the holy office by the bribes of still another brother, Menelaus, worse by far than Jason, a Jew-hater and an avowed defender of Greek life and morals. The wrangle between the brothers gave Antiochus the opportunity he craved to wreak his bitter hatred on the Jews, in the spoliation of Jerusalem, in the wanton and total defilement of the temple, and in a most horrible persecution of the Jews (1 Macc 1:16-28; 2 Macc 5:11-23; ²⁷¹¹²⁸Daniel 11:28; Ant, XII, v, 3.4). Thousands were slain, women and children were sold into captivity, the city wall was torn down, all sacrifices ceased, and in the temple on the altar of burnt offering a statue was erected to Jupiter Olympius (1 Macc 1:43; 2 Macc 6:1-2). Circumcision was forbidden, on pain of death, and all the people of Israel were to be forcibly paganized. As in the Persian persecution, the Samaritans again played into the hands of the Syrians and implicitly obeyed

the will of the Seleucids. But the very rigor of the persecution caused it to fail of its purpose and Israel proved to be made of sterner stuff than Antiochus imagined. A priestly family dwelling at Modin, west of Jerusalem, named Hasmonean, after one of its ancestors, consisting of Mattathias and his five sons, raised the standard of revolt, which proved successful after a severe struggle.

See ASMONEAN.

5. The Maccabean Period:

The Maccabean period (165-63 BC). The slaying of an idolatrous Jew at the very altar was the signal of revolt. The land of Judea is specially adapted to guerilla tactics, and Judas Maccabeus, who succeeded his father, as leader of the Jewish patriots, was a past master in this kind of warfare. All efforts of Antiochus to quell the rebellion failed most miserably, in three Syrian campaigns. The king died of a loathsome disease and peace was at last concluded with the Jews. Though still nominally under Syrian control, Judas became governor of Palestine. His first act was the purification and rededication of the temple, from which the Jews date their festival of purification (*see PURIFICATION*). When the Syrians renewed the war, Judas applied for aid to the Romans, whose power began to be felt in Asia, but he died in battle before the promised aid could reach him (Ant., XII, xi, 2). He was buried by his father's side at Modin and was succeeded by his brother Jonathan. From that time the Maccabean history becomes one of endless cabals. Jonathan was acknowledged by the Syrians as meridarch of Judea, but was assassinated soon afterward. Simon succeeded him, and by the help of the Romans was made hereditary ruler of Palestine. He in turn was followed by John Hyrcanus. The people were torn by bitter partisan controversies and a civil war was waged, a generation later, by two grandsons of John Hyrcanus, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. In this internecine struggle the Roman general Pompey participated by siding with Hyrcanus, while Aristobulus defied Rome and defended Jerusalem. Pompey took the city, after a siege of three months, and entered the holy of holies, thereby forever estranging from Rome every loyal Jewish heart.

6. The Roman Period:

The Roman period (63-4 BC). Judea now became a Roman province. Hyrcanus, stripped of the hereditary royal power, retained only the high-

priestly office. Rome exacted an annual tribute, and Aristobulus was sent as a captive to the capital. He contrived however to escape and renewed the unequal struggle, in which he was succeeded by his sons Alexander and Antigonus. In the war between Pompey and Caesar, Judea was temporarily forgotten, but after Caesar's death, under the triumvirate of Octavius, Antony and Lepidus, Antony, the eastern triumvir, favored Herod the Great, whose intrigues secured for him at last the crown of Judea and enabled him completely to extinguish the old Maccabean line of Judean princes.

4. INTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THIS PERIOD.

One thing remains, and that is a review of the developments within the bosom of Judaism itself in the period under consideration. It is self-evident that the core of the Jewish people, which remained loyal to the national traditions and to the national faith, must have been radically affected by the terrible cataclysms which mark their history, during the four centuries before Christ. What, if any, was the literary activity of the Jews in this period? What was their spiritual condition? What was the result of the manifest difference of opinion within the Jewish economy? What preparation does this period afford for the "fullness of time"? These and other questions present themselves, as we study this period of the history of the Jews.

1. Literary Activity:

The voice of prophecy was utterly hushed in this period, but the old literary instinct of the nation asserted itself; it was part and parcel of the Jewish traditions and would not be denied. Thus in this period many writings were produced, which although they lack canonical authority, among Protestants at least, still are extremely helpful for a correct understanding of the life of Israel in the dark ages before Christ.

(a) The Apocrypha.

First of all among the fruits of this literary activity stand the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. It is enough here to mention them. They are fourteen in number: 1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, 2 Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Song of the Three Holy Children, History of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, Prayer of Manasses, 1 and 2 Maccabees. As 3 and 4 Maccabees fall presumably within the Christian era,

they are not here enumerated. All these apocryphal writings are of the utmost importance for a correct understanding of the Jewish problem in the day in which they were written. For fuller information, *see APOCRYPHA*.

(b) Pseudepigrapha.

Thus named from the spurious character of the authors' names they bear. Two of these writings very probably belong to our period, while a host of them evidently belong to a later date. In this class of writings there is a mute confession of the conscious poverty of the day. First of all, we have the Psalter of Solomon, originally written in Hebrew and translated into Greek — a collection of songs for worship, touching in their spirit, and evincing the fact that true faith never died in the heart of the true believer. The second is the Book of Enoch, a production of an apocalyptic nature, named after Enoch the patriarch, and widely known about the beginning of the Christian era. This book is quoted in the New Testament (~~Gen~~Jude 1:14). It was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and translated into Greek as there is no trace of a Christian influence in the book, the presumption is that the greater part of it was written at an earlier period. Both Jude and the author of Revelation must have known it, as a comparative study of both books will show. The question of these quotations or allusions is a veritable crux interpretum: how to reconcile the inspiration of these books with these quotations?

(c) The Septuagint.

The tradition of the Septuagint is told by Josephus (Ant., XII, ii, 13). Aristéas and Aristobulus, a Jewish priest in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (2 Macc 1:10), are also quoted in support of it by Clement of Alexandria and by Eusebius. *See SEPTUAGINT*. The truth of the matter is most probably that this great translation of the Old Testament Scriptures was begun at the instance of Ptolemy Philadelphus 285-247 BC, under the direction of Demetrius Phalereus, and was completed somewhere about the middle of the 2nd century BC. Internal evidence abounds that the translation was made by different hands and at different times. If the translation was in any way literal, the text of the Septuagint raises various interesting questions in regard to the Hebrew text that was used in the translation, as compared with the one we now possess. The Septuagint was of the utmost missionary value and contributed perhaps more than any other thing to prepare the world for the "fullness of time."

2. *Spiritual Conditions:*

The return from Babylon marked a turning point in the spiritual history of the Jews. From that time onward, the lust of idolatry, which had marked their whole previous history, utterly disappears. In the place of it came an almost intolerable spirit of exclusiveness, a striving after legal holiness, these two in combination forming the very heart and core of the later Pharisaism. The holy books, but especially the law, became an object of almost idolatrous reverence; the spirit was utterly lost in the form. And as their own tongue, the classic Hebrew, gradually gave way to the common Aramaic, the rabbis and their schools strove ever more earnestly to keep the ancient tongue pure, worship and life each demanding a separate language. Thus, the Jews became in a sense bilingual, the Hebrew tongue being used in their synagogues, the Aramaic in their daily life, and later on, in part at least, the Greek tongue of the conqueror, the [*lingua franca*] of the period. A spiritual aristocracy very largely replaced the former rule of their princes and nobles. As the core of their religion died, the bark of the tree flourished. Thus, tithes were zealously paid by the believer (compare ⁴¹²³Matthew 23:23), the Sabbath became a positive burden of sanctity, the simple laws of God were replaced by cumbersome human inventions, which in later times were to form the bulk of the Talmud, and which crushed down all spiritual liberty in the days of Christ (⁴¹²⁸Matthew 11:28; 23:4,23). The substitution of the names “Elohim” and “Adonai” for the old glorious historic name “Yahweh” is an eloquent commentary on all that has been said before and on the spiritual condition of Israel in this period (Ewald, History of Israel, V, 198), in which the change was inaugurated. The old centripetal force, the old ideal of centralization, gave way to an almost haughty indifference to the land of promise. The Jews became, as they are today, a nation without a country. For, for every Jew that came back to the old national home, a thousand remained in the land of their adoption. And yet scattered far and wide, in all sorts of environments, they remained Jews, and the national consciousness was never extinguished. It was God’s mark on them now as then. And thus they became world-wide missionaries of the knowledge of the true God, of a gospel of hope for a world that was hopeless, a gospel which wholly against their own will directed the eyes of the world to the fullness of time and which prepared the fallow soil of human hearts for the rapid spread of Christianity when it ultimately appeared.

3. *Parties:*

During the Greek period the more conservative and zealous of the Jews were all the time confronted with a tendency of a very considerable portion of the people, especially the younger and wealthier set, to adopt the manners of life and thought and speech of their masters, the Greeks. Thus the Hellenistic party was born, which was bitterly hated by all true blooded Jews, but which left its mark on their history, till the date of the final dispersion 70 AD. From the day of Mattathias, the Chasids or Haside ans (1 Macc 2:42) were the true Jewish patriots. Thus the party of the Pharisees came into existence (Ant., XIII, x, 5; XVIII, i, 2; BJ, I, v, 2). *See PHARISEES*. They were opposed by the more secular-minded Sadducees (Ant., XIII, x, 6; XVIII, i, 3; BJ, II, viii, 14), wealthy, of fine social standing, wholly free from the restraints of tradition, utterly oblivious of the future life and closely akin to the Greek Epicureans. *See SADDUCEES*. These parties bitterly opposed each other till the very end of the national existence of the Jews in Palestine, and incessantly fought for the mastery, through the high-priestly office. Common hatred for Christ, for a while, afforded them a community of interests.

4. *Preparation for Christianity:*

Throughout this entire dark period of Israel's history, God was working out His own Divine plan with them. Their Scriptures were translated into Greek, after the conquest of Alexander the Great the common language in the East. Thus the world was prepared for the word of God, even as the latter in turn prepared the world for the reception of the gift of God, in the gospel of His Son. The Septuagint thus is a distinct forward movement in the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise (^{<0128>}Genesis 12:3; 18:18). As the sacrificial part of Jewish worship declined, through their wide separation from the temple, the eyes of Israel were more firmly fixed on their Scriptures, read every Sabbath in their synagogues, and, as we have seen, these Scriptures, through the rendering of the Septuagint, had become the property of the entire world. Thus, the synagogue everywhere became the great missionary institute, imparting to the world Israel's exalted Messianic hopes. On the other hand, the Jews themselves, embittered by long-continued martyrdoms and suffering, utterly carnalized this Messianic expectation in an increasing ratio as the yoke of the oppressor grew heavier and the hope of deliverance grew fainter. And thus when their Messiah came, Israel recognized Him not, while the heart-hungry heathen, who

through the Septuagint had become familiar with the promise, humbly received Him (~~and~~ John 1:9-14). The eyes of Israel were blinded for a season, 'till the fullness of the Gentiles shall be gathered in' (~~and~~ Romans 9:32; 11:25). — *Henry E. Dosker*

BEULAH

<bu'-la> (hī w[B]) [be`ulah] “married”): A name symbolically applied to Israel: “Thy land (shall be called) Beulah thy land shall be married. so shall thy sons marry thee” (Isaiah 62:4 f). In this figure, frequently used since Hosea, the prophet wishes to express the future prosperity of Israel. The land once desolate shall again be populated.

BEWAIL

<be-wal'> ([κόπτω, kopto]): In the middle voice, this word has the thought of striking on the breast and of loud lamentation, so common among oriental people in time of great sorrow. It is used to express the most intense grief, a sorrow that compels outward demonstration (<B85> Luke 8:52; 23:27). A striking instance of this grief is that of the daughter of Jephthah (<D7135> Judges 11:37; <B8005> Leviticus 10:6).

See BURIAL, IV, 4, 5, 6; GRIEF.

BEWITCH

<be-wich'> ([ἐξίστημι, existemi]): There are two Greek words in the New Testament translated “bewitch.” The one given above (**<480>** Acts 8:9,21 the King James Version “bewitched,” the Revised Version (British and American) “amazed”) has reference to the work of Simon Magus. It means “to be out of one’s mind,” “to astonish,” “to overwhelm with wonder.” The other word, [βασκαίνω, baskaino] (**<480>** Galatians 3:1), means “to fascinate by false representation.” It is by this means the apostle complains they have been led to accept a teaching wholly contrary to the gospel of Christ. Both these words reveal to us something of the difficulty the early teachers had to eradicate the idea so widely held by the Jews and Egyptians especially, that there were certain powers, dark and mysterious, which by certain occult forces they could control. For a long time this had to be contended with as one of the corrupt practices brought into the church by the converts, both from Judaism and heathenism. These words have a reference to the evil eye which for centuries was, and even today is, an

important factor in the life of the people of the East. ^{<416D>}1 Timothy 6:20 is a reference to this thought and explains the word “science” (the King James Version) as there used.

See DIVINATION; EVIL EYE; SORCERY; SUPERSTITION.

Jacob W. Kapp

BEWRAY; BEWRAYER

^{<be-ra'>}, ^{<be-ra'-er>}: In its derivation is entirely different from betray (Latin, tradere), and meant originally “to disclose,” “reveal” (compare Shakspeare, Titus Andronicus, II, iv, 3: “Write down thy mind, bewray thy meaning so”); but has been affected by the former word and is used almost synonymously. It is the translation of three Hebrew words:

(1) ^{arq}: [qara’], meaning “to call out” (^{<1716>}Proverbs 27:16), “the ointment of his right hand which bewrayeth itself” (the American Standard Revised Version “his right hand encountereth oil,” the American Revised Version, margin “the oil of his right hand betrayeth itself”);

(2) ^{dgh}: [naghadh] meaning “to front,” “to announce” (by word of mouth): ^{<1724>}Proverbs 29:24, “heareth cursing and bewrayeth it not” (the American Standard Revised Version “heareth the adjuration and uttereth nothing”);

(3) ^{hl} ^ḡ: [galah], “to denude,” figuratively, “to reveal” (^{<2348>}Isaiah 16:3), “bewray not him that wandereth” (the American Standard Revised Version “betray not the fugitive”).

In Sirach 27:17 “bewray (the Revised Version (British and American) “reveal”) his secrets” is the translation of [^{ἀποκαλύπτω}, apokalupto], literally “to uncover”; so also in Sirach 27:21 (the Revised Version (British and American) “revealeth”). Bewrayer of 2 Macc 4:1 (“bewrayer of. the money and of his country,” the Revised Version (British and American) “had given information of the money and had betrayed his country”) is the translation of [^{ἐνδείκτης} endeiktes], literally, “one who shows.”

In the New Testament “bewrayeth” is the King James Version of ^{<1773>}Matthew 26:73; “thy speech bewrayeth thee” is the translation of the

phrase [δῆλον ποιεῖν, delon poiein], which the American Standard Revised Version renders “maketh thee known.”

Arthur J. Kinsella

BEYOND

<be-yond>: Found in the Hebrew only in its application to space and time, and for these ideas three words are employed: **hal** [hale’ah] (<0520> Genesis 35:21) = “to the distance”; **rb** [ʾabhar] = “to go beyond” “to cross” derivative **rb[e]bher** (Chald. **Rb** [ʾabhar]) = “across,” “beyond” (<0103> Deuteronomy 30:13; <0607> Joshua 18:7; <0036> Judges 3:26; <0035> 1 Samuel 20:36; <0402> 2 Chronicles 20:2; <0407> Ezra 4:17,20; <0522> Jeremiah 25:22); and **l** [ʾal] (<0155> Leviticus 15:25) = “beyond the time.” In the New Testament [πέραν, peran], is used to express “beyond” in the spatial sense (<0415> Matthew 4:15), while other words and phrases are employed for adverbial ideas of degree: [ὑπερπερισσῶς, hyperperissos] (<0473> Mark 7:37); [ὑπέρ, hyper] (2 Cor 8:3; 10:16); [καθυπερβολήν, kathyperbolen] (<0013> Galatians 1:13). In the King James Version **rb[B]** [be`ehher], is occasionally translated “beyond,” and when this word is joined to **De** [ha-yarden], “Jordan,” as it usually is, it becomes critically important. In the American Standard Revised Version, [be`ebher ha-yarden] is translated “beyond the Jordan,” in (<0500> Genesis 50:10,21; <0030> Deuteronomy 3:20,25; <0010> Joshua 9:10; <0017> Judges 5:17; “on this side Jordan” in <0006> Deuteronomy 1:1,5; <0014> Joshua 1:14,25; “on the other side Jordan” in <0010> Deuteronomy 11:30; <0010> Joshua 12:1; 22:4; 24:2,8 (compare the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), <0014> Joshua 24:14,25; *see RIVER, THE*), <0008> Judges 10:8; <0017> 1 Samuel 31:7; and “on the side of Jordan” in <0010> Joshua 5:1. the American Standard Revised Version gives “beyond the Jordan” throughout. **Rb[me]** [me`ebher], is used with [ha-yarden] in <0015> Numbers 34:15; 35:14; <0032> Joshua 13:32; <0025> Judges 7:25; and **rb[e]bher**, alone in <0049> Deuteronomy 4:49 (the King James Version “on this side”); <0037> Joshua 13:27 (the King James Version “on the other side”). It is clear that the phrase may be translated “across Jordan”; that it is used of either side of the Jordan (<0008> Deuteronomy 3:8 speaks of the eastern, 3:20,25 of the western); that “beyond Jordan” may be used of the side of the Jordan on

which the writer stands (^{<681>}Joshua 5:1; 9:1; 12:7); but from the fact that ^{<600>}Deuteronomy 1:1,5; 4:41,46,47,49, where statements are made about Moses, the reference is to the country East of the Jordan, while in ^{<681>}Deuteronomy 3:20,25; 11:30, where Moses is represented as speaking, the West is indicated, critics have concluded that the author (at least of Deuteronomy) must have lived after Moses, being careful to distinguish between himself and the prophet.

Frank E. Hirsch

BEZAANANNIM

^{<be-za-an-an'-im>} (^{<683>}Joshua 19:33 the Revised Version, margin).

See ZAANANNIM.

BEZAI

^{<be'-za-i>} (יֶזַע" בֶּזַי [betsay], "shining"(?)):

- (1) A chief who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant (^{<608>}Nehemiah 10:18).
- (2) The descendants of Bezai returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (323, ^{<627>}Ezra 2:17; 324, ^{<623>}Nehemiah 7:23 = Bassai, 1 Esdras 5:16).

BEZALEL

^{<bez'-a-lel>} (לְאֵלֶיךָ [betsal'el], "in the shadow (protection) of 'El (God)"; [Βεσελεύλ, Beseleel]; the King James Version Bezaleel):

- (1) A master workman under Moses; son of Uri, son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah. Yahweh gave him especial wisdom and skill for his task, which was, with the aid of Oholiab of the tribe of Dan, to superintend the making of the tabernacle and its furniture (^{<630>}Exodus 31:2; 35:30; 36:1,2 (8); 37:1; 38:22; ^{<622>}1 Chronicles 2:20; ^{<606>}2 Chronicles 1:5).
- (2) An Israelite of the time of Ezra who put away a foreign wife (^{<603>}Ezra 10:30).

F. K. Farr

BEZEK

<be'-zek> (qzβ_i[bezeq]; [Βέζεκ, Bezek], Codex Vaticanus, [βιέζεκ, Abiezek]):

(1) The city of Adoni-bezek taken by Judah and Simeon (^{<0004>}Judges 1:4 f), in the territory allotted to Judah. It is somewhat doubtfully identified with Bezqah, about 3 miles Northeast of Gezer.

(2) The place where Saul marshaled his army before marching to the relief of Jabesh-gilead (^{<0108>}1 Samuel 11:8). Eusebius, Onomasticon speaks of two villages of this name 17 Roman miles from Shechem, on the way to Scythopolis. No doubt [Khirbet Ibbiq] is intended. Here, or on the neighboring height, [Ras Ibbiq], a mountain 2,404 ft. above sea level, the army probably assembled.

W. Ewing

BEZER

<be'-zer> (rxβ_i[betser]; [Βόσορ, Bosor], “strong”):

(1) A city of refuge, set apart by Moses for the Reubenites and located in the “plain country” (or table-land, Mishor) East of the Jordan, later assigned to this tribe by Joshua (^{<0048>}Deuteronomy 4:43; ^{<0008>}Joshua 20:8). The same city was assigned by lot as place of residence to the children of Merari of the Levite tribe (^{<0236>}Joshua 21:36; ^{<0366>}1 Chronicles 6:63,78). Driver, HDB, suggests the identity of Bezer with Bozrah (Septuagint, Bosor) (^{<0484>}Jeremiah 48:24). Besheir has been suggested as the present site. According to the manuscript it was fortified by Mesha.

(2) A son of Zophah of the house of Asher (^{<0375>}1 Chronicles 7:37).

A. L. Breslich

BEZETH

<be'-zeth> ([Bηζεθ, Bezeth]): A place in the neighborhood of Jerusalem to which Bacchides withdrew and where he slew several deserters (1 Macc 7:19). Possibly the same as Bezetha (*see JERUSALEM*).

BEZETHA

<be-ze'-tha>: Also called by Josephus the “New City” (BJ, V, iv, 2), certain suburbs of Jerusalem, North of the Temple, which were outside the second but included within the third wall. **BEZETH** (which see) may be the same place.

See JERUSALEM.

BIATAS

<bi'-a-tas> ([αλίης, Phalias]; Codex Alexandrinus, [ιαθάς, Phiathas]): the Revised Version (British and American) “Phalias,” one of the Levites (1 Esdras 9:48) who “taught (the people) the law of the Lord, making them withal to understand it.” Called Pelaiah in <887> Nehemiah 8:7.

BIBLE, THE

<bi'-b'-l>, ([βιβλία, biblia]):

GENERAL DESIGNATION:

This word designates the collection of the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament recognized and in use in the Christian churches. Different religions (such as the Zoroastrian, Hindu, Buddhist, Mohammedan) have their collections of sacred writings, sometimes spoken of as their “Bibles.” The Jews acknowledge only the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Christians add the writings contained in the New Testament. The present article deals with the origin, character, contents and purpose of the Christian Scriptures, regarded as the depository and authoritative record of God’s revelations of Himself and of His will to the fathers by the prophets, and through His Son to the church of a later age (<800> Hebrews 1:1,2). Reference is made throughout to the articles in which the several topics are more fully treated.

1. THE NAMES.

1. Bible:

The word “Bible” is the equivalent of the Greek word [*biblia*] (diminutive from [*biblos*], the inner bark of the papyrus), meaning originally “books.” The phrase “the books” ([*ta biblia*]) occurs in <200> Daniel 9:2 (Septuagint)

for prophetic writings. In the Prologue to Sirach (“the rest of the books”) it designates generally the Old Testament Scriptures; similarly in 1 Macc 12:9 (“the holy books”). The usage passed into the Christian church for Old Testament (2 Clem 14:2), and by and by (circa 5th century) was extended to the whole Scriptures. Jerome’s name for the Bible (4th century) was “the Divine Library” (*Bibliotheca Divina*). Afterward came an important change from plural to singular meaning. “In process of time this name, with many others of Greek origin, passed into the vocabulary of the western church; and in the 13th century, by a happy solecism, the neuter plural came to be regarded as a feminine singular, and ‘The Books’ became by common consent ‘The Book’ (*[biblia]*, singular), in which form the word was passed into the languages of modern Europe” (Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, 5). Its earliest occurrences in English are in *Piers Plowman*, Chaucer and Wycliffe.

2. Other Designations — Scriptures, etc.:

There is naturally no name in the New Testament for the complete body of Scripture; the only Scriptures then known being those of the Old Testament. In ^{<616>}2 Peter 3:16, however, Paul’s epistles seem brought under this category. The common designations for the Old Testament books by our Lord and His apostles were “the scriptures” (writings) (^{<124>}Matthew 21:42; ^{<1149>}Mark 14:49; ^{<242>}Luke 24:32; ^{<619>}John 5:39; ^{<1824>}Acts 18:24; ^{<6154>}Romans 15:4, etc.), “the holy, scriptures” (^{<6102>}Romans 1:2); once “the sacred writings” (2 Tim 3:15). The Jewish technical division (see below) into “the law,” the “prophets,” and the “(holy) writings” is recognized in the expression “in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms” (^{<244>}Luke 24:44). More briefly the whole is summed up under “the law and the prophets” (^{<1517>}Matthew 5:17; ^{<113>}11:13; ^{<4135>}Acts 13:15). Occasionally even the term “law” is extended to include the other divisions (^{<618>}John 10:34; 12:34; 15:25; ^{<6121>}1 Corinthians 14:21). Paul uses the phrase “the oracles of God” as a name for the Old Testament Scriptures (^{<6102>}Romans 3:2; compare ^{<4173>}Acts 7:38; ^{<862>}Hebrews 5:12; ^{<1041>}1 Peter 4:11).

3. Old Testament and New Testament:

Special interest attaches to the names “Old” and “New Testament,” now and since the close of the 2nd century in common use to distinguish the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures. “Testament” (literally “a will”) is used in the New Testament (the King James Version) to represent the Greek

word [*diatheke*], in classical usage also “a will,” but in the Septuagint and New Testament employed to translate the Hebrew word [*berith*], “a covenant.” In the Revised Version (British and American), accordingly, “testament” is, with two exceptions (^{<3916>}Hebrews 9:16,27), changed to “covenant” (^{<4153>}Matthew 26:28; ^{<4016>}2 Corinthians 3:6; ^{<4015>}Galatians 3:15; ^{<3922>}Hebrews 7:22; 9:15, etc.). Applied to the Scriptures, therefore, “Old” and “New Testament” mean, strictly, “Old” and “New Covenant,” though the older usage is now too firmly fixed to be altered. The name is a continuation of the Old Testament designation for the law, “the book of the covenant” (^{<1271>}2 Kings 23:2). In this sense Paul applies it (2 Cor 3:14) to the Old Testament law; “the reading of the old testament” (the Revised Version (British and American) “Covenant”). When, after the middle of the 2nd century, a definite collection began to be made of the Christian writings, these were named “the New Testament,” and were placed as of equal authority alongside the “Old.” The name *Novum Testamentum* (also *Instrumentum*) occurs first in Tertullian (190-220 AD), and soon came into general use. The idea of a Christian Bible may be then said to be complete.

2. LANGUAGES.

The Old Testament, it is well known, is written mostly in Hebrew; the New Testament is written wholly in Greek, the parts of the Old Testament not in Hebrew, namely, ^{<1548>}Ezra 4:8 through 6:18; 7:12-26; ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 10:11; ^{<2014>}Daniel 2:4 through 7:28, are in Aramaic (the so-called Chaldee), a related dialect, which, after the Exile, gradually displaced Hebrew as the spoken language of the Jews (*see ARAMAIC; LANGUAGE AND TEXT OF OLD TESTAMENT*). The ancient Hebrew text was “unpointed,” i.e. without the vowel-marks now in use. These are due to the labors of the Massoretic scholars (after 6th century AD).

The Greek of the New Testament, on which so much light has recently been thrown by the labors of Deissmann and others from the Egyptian papyri, showing it to be a form of the “common” (Hellenistic) speech of the time (*see LANGUAGE OF NEW TESTAMENT*), still remains, from its penetration by Hebrew ideas, the influence of the Septuagint, peculiarities of training and culture in the writers, above all, the vitalizing and transforming power of Christian conceptions in vocabulary and expression, a study by itself. “We speak,” the apostle says, “not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth” (1 Cor 2:13). This is not

always remembered in the search for parallels in the papyri. (For translations into other languages, *see* **VERSIONS.**)

3. COMPASS AND DIVISIONS.

The story of the origin, collection, and final stamping with canonical authority of the books which compose our present Bible involves many points still keenly in dispute. Before touching on these debatable matters, certain more external facts fall to be noticed relating to the general structure and compass of the Bible, and the main divisions of its contents.

1. Jewish Bible

Josephus, etc.:

A first step is to ascertain the character and contents of the Jewish Bible — the Bible in use by Christ and His apostles. Apart from references in the New Testament itself, an important aid is here afforded by a passage in Josephus (Apion, I, 8), which may be taken to represent the current belief of the Jews in the 1st century AD. After speaking of the prophets as writing their histories “through the inspiration of God,” Josephus says: “For we have not myriads of discordant and conflicting books, but 22 only, comprising the record of all time, and justly accredited as Divine. Of these, 5 are books of Moses, which embrace the laws and the traditions of mankind until his own death, a period of almost 3,000 years. From the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, the prophets who followed Moses narrated the events of their time in 13 books. The remaining 4 books consist of hymns to God, and maxims of conduct for men. From Artaxerxes to our own age, the history has been written in detail, but it is not esteemed worthy of the same credit, on account of the exact succession of the prophets having been no longer maintained.” He goes on to declare that, in this long interval, “no one has dared either to add anything to (the writings), or to take anything from them, or to alter anything,” and speaks of them as “the decrees (dogmata) of God,” for which the Jews would willingly die. Philo (20 BC-circa 50 AD) uses similar strong language about the law of Moses (in Eusebius, Pr. Ev., VIII, 6).

In this enumeration of Josephus, it will be seen that the Jewish sacred books — 39 in our Bible — are reckoned as 22 (after the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet), namely, 5 of the law, 13 of the prophets and 4

remaining books. These last are Ps, Prov, Song and Eccl. The middle class includes all the historical and prophetic books, likewise Job, and the reduction in the number from 30 to 13 is explained by Jgs-Ruth, 1 and 2 S, 1 and 2 K, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezr-Neh, Jer-Lamentations and the 12 minor prophets, each being counted as one book. In his 22 books, therefore, Josephus includes all those in the present Hebrew canon, and none besides — not the books known as the *APOCRYPHA*, though he was acquainted with and used some of these.

Other Lists and Divisions.

The statement of Josephus as to the 22 books acknowledged by the Jews is confirmed, with some variation of enumeration, by the lists preserved by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, vi.26) from Melito of Sardis (circa 172 AD) and Origen (186-254 AD), and by Jerome (Pref to Old Testament, circa 400) — all following Jewish authorities. Jerome knew also of a rabbinical division into 24 books. The celebrated passage from the Talmud (*Babha' Bathra'*, 14b: *see Canon Of Old Testament*; compare Westcott, *Bible in Church*, 35; Driver, *LOT*, vi) counts also 24. This number is obtained by separating Ruth from Judges and Lamentations from Jeremiah. The threefold division of the books, into Law, Prophets, and other sacred Writings (*Hagiographa*), is old. It is already implied in the Prologue to Sirach (circa 130 BC), “the law, the prophets, and the rest of the books”; is glanced at in a work ascribed to Philo (*Deuteronomy vita contempl.*, 3); is indicated, as formerly seen, in ~~Q344~~ Luke 24:44. It really reflects stages in the formation of the Hebrew canon (see below). The rabbinical division, however, differed materially from that of Josephus in reckoning only 8 books of the prophets, and relegating 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezr-Neh, Esther, Job and Daniel to the *Hagiographa*, thus enlarging that group to 9 (Westcott, *op. cit.*, 28; DB, I, “Canon”). When Ruth and Lamentations were separated, they were added to the list, raising the number to 11. Some, however, take this to be the original arrangement. In printed Hebrew Bibles the books in all the divisions are separate. The Jewish schools further divided the “Prophets” into “the former prophets” (the historical books — Josh, Jgs, Sam and Ki), and “the latter prophets” (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets as one book).

New Testament References.

It may be concluded that the above lists, excluding the Apocrypha, represent the Hebrew Bible as it existed in the time of our Lord (the

opinion, held by some, that the Sadducees received only the 5 books of the law rests on no sufficient evidence). This result is borne out by the evidence of quotations in Josephus and Philo (compare Westcott, op. cit.). Still more is it confirmed by an examination of Old Testament quotations and references in the New Testament. It was seen above that the main divisions of the Old Testament are recognized in the New Testament, and that, under the name “Scriptures,” a Divine authority is ascribed to them. It is therefore highly significant that, although the writers of the New Testament were familiar with the Septuagint, which contained the Apocrypha (see below), no quotation from any book of the Apocrypha occurs in their pages, One or two allusions, at most, suggest acquaintance with the Book of Wisdom (e.g. The Wisdom of Solomon 5:18-21 parallel ~~Heb~~ Ephesians 6:13-17). On the other hand, “every book in the Hebrew Bible is distinctly quoted in the New Testament with the exception of Josh, Jgs, Chronicles, Cant, Eccl, Ezr, Neh, Esther, Ob, Zeph and Nah” (Westcott). Enumerations differ, but about 178 direct quotations may be reckoned in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles; if references are included, the number is raised to about 700 (*see QUOTATIONS IN* New Testament). In four or five places (~~Q14~~ Luke 11:49-51; ~~3015~~ James 4:5; ~~4119~~ 1 Corinthians 2:9; ~~4514~~ Ephesians 5:14; ~~4078~~ John 7:38) apparent references occur to sources other than the Old Testament; it is doubtful whether most of them are really so (compare Westcott, op. cit., 46-48; ~~4514~~ Ephesians 5:14 may be from a Christian hymn). An undeniable influence of Apocalyptic literature is seen in Jude, where 1:14,25 are a direct quotation from the Book of Enoch. It does not follow that Jude regarded this book as a proper part of Scripture.

2. The Septuagint:

Hitherto we have been dealing with the Hebrew Old Testament; marked changes are apparent when we turn to the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Septuagint current in the Greek-speaking world at the commencement of the Christian era. The importance of this version lies in the fact that it was practically the Old Testament of the early church. It was used by the apostles and their converts, and is freely quoted in the New Testament, sometimes even when its renderings vary considerably from the Hebrew. Its influence was necessarily, therefore, very great.

Origin.

The special problems connected with origin, text and literary relations of the Septuagint are dealt with elsewhere (*see SEPTUAGINT*). The version took its rise, under one of the early Ptolemies, from the needs of the Jews in Egypt, before the middle of the 2nd century BC; was gradually executed, and completed hardly later than circa 100 BC; thereafter spread into all parts. Its renderings reveal frequent divergence in manuscripts from the present Massoretic Text, but show also that the translators permitted themselves considerable liberties in enlarging, abbreviating, transposing and otherwise modifying the texts they had, and in the insertion of materials borrowed from other sources.

The Apocrypha.

The most noteworthy differences are in the departure from Jewish tradition in the arrangement of the books (this varies greatly; compare Swete, *Introduction to Old Testament in Greek*, II, chapter i), and in the inclusion in the list of the other books, unknown to the Hebrew canon, now grouped as the Apocrypha. These form an extensive addition. They include the whole of the existing Apocrypha, with the exception of 2 Esdras and Proverbs Man. All are of late date, and are in Greek, though Sirach had a Hebrew original which has been partly recovered. They are not collected, but are interspersed among the Old Testament books in what are taken to be their appropriate places. The Greek fragments of Esther, e.g. are incorporated in that book; Susanna and Bel and the Dragon form part of Daniel; Baruch is joined with Jeremiah, etc. The most important books are Wisdom, Sirach and 1 Maccabees (circa 100 BC). The fact that Sirach, originally in Hebrew (circa 200 BC), and of high repute, was not included in the Hebrew canon, has a weighty bearing on the period of the closing of the latter.

Ecclesiastical Use.

It is, as already remarked, singular that, notwithstanding this extensive enlargement of the canon by the Septuagint, the books just named obtained no Scriptural recognition from the writers of the New Testament. The more scholarly of the Fathers, likewise (Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Cyprian, Jerome, etc.), adhere to the Hebrew list, and most draw a sharp distinction between the canonical books, and the Greek additions, the reading of which is, however, admitted for edification (compare Westcott,

op. cit., 135-36, 168, 180, 182-83). Where slight divergencies occur (e.g. Est is omitted by Melito and placed by Athanasius among the Apocrypha; Origen and Athanasius add Baruch to Jer), these are readily explained by doubts as to canonicity or by imperfect knowledge. On the other hand, familiarity with the Septuagint in writers ignorant of Hebrew could not but tend to break down the limits of the Jewish canon, and to lend a Scriptural sanction to the additions to that canon. This was aided in the West by the fact that the Old Latin versions (2nd century) based on the Septuagint, included these additions (the Syriac Peshitta followed the Hebrew). In many quarters, therefore, the distinction is found broken down, and ecclesiastical writers (Clement, Barnabas, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, etc.) quote freely from books like Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, Tobit, 2 Esdras, as from parts of the Old Testament.

3. The Vulgate (Old Testament):

An important landmark is reached in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) or Latin version of Jerome. Jerome, on grounds explained in his Preface, recognized only the Hebrew Scriptures as canonical; under pressure he executed later a hasty translation of Tobit and Judith. Feeling ran strong, however, in favor of the other books, and ere long these were added to Jerome's version from the Old Latin (*see VULGATE*). It is this enlarged Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) which received official recognition, under anathema, at the Council of Trent (1543), and, with revision, from Clement VIII (1592), though, earlier, leading Romish scholars (Ximenes, Erasmus, Cajetan) had made plain the true state of the facts. The Greek church vacillated in its decisions, sometimes approving the limited, sometimes the extended, canon (compare Westcott, op. cit., 217-29). The churches of the Reformation (Lutheran, Swiss), as was to be expected, went back to the Hebrew canon, giving only a qualified sanction to the reading and ecclesiastical use of the Apocrypha. The early English versions (Tyndale, Coverdale, etc.) include, but separate, the apocryphal books (*see ENGLISH VERSIONS*). The Anglican Articles express the general estimate of these books: "And the other books (as Jerome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine" (Art. VIII). Modern Protestant Bibles usually exclude the Apocrypha altogether.

4. *The New Testament:*

From this survey of the course of opinion on the compass of the Old Testament, we come to the New Testament. This admits of being more briefly treated. It has been seen that a Christian New Testament did not, in the strict sense, arise till after the middle of the 2nd century. Gospels and Epistles had long existed, collections had begun to be made, the Gospels, at least, were weekly read in the assemblies of the Christians (Justin, 1 Apol., 67), before the attempt was made to bring together, and take formal account of, all the books which enjoyed apostolic authority (*see CANON OF NEW TESTAMENT*). The needs of the church, however, and very specially controversy with Gnostic opponents, made it necessary that this work should be done; collections also had to be formed for purposes of translation into other tongues. Genuine gospels had to be distinguished from spurious; apostolic writings from those of later date, or falsely bearing apostolic names. When this task was undertaken, a distinction soon revealed itself between two classes of books, setting aside those recognized on all hands as spurious:

(1) books universally acknowledged — those named afterward by Eusebius the [*homologoumena*]; and

(2) books only partially acknowledged, or on which some doubt rested — the Eusebian antilegomena (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, iii.25). It is on this distinction that differences as to the precise extent of the New Testament turned.

(1) **Acknowledged Books.**

The “acknowledged” books present little difficulty. They are enumerated by Eusebius, whose statements are confirmed by early lists (e.g. that of Muratori, circa 170 AD), quotations, versions and patristic use. At the head stand the Four Gospels and the Acts, then come the 13 epistles of Paul, then 1 Peter and 1 John. These, Westcott says, toward the close of the 2nd century, “were universally received in every church, without doubt or limitation, as part of the written rule of Christian faith, equal in authority with the Old Scriptures, and ratified (as it seemed) by a tradition reaching back to the date of their composition” (op. cit., 133). With them may almost be placed Revelation (as by Eusebius) and He, the doubts regarding the latter relating more to Pauline authority than to genuineness (e.g. Origen).

(2) Disputed Books.

The “disputed” books were the epistles of James, Jude, 2 John and 3 John and 2 Peter. These, however, do not all stand in the same rank as regards authentication. A chief difficulty is the silence of the western Fathers regarding James, 2 Peter and 3 John. On the other hand, James is known to Origen and is included in the Syriac Peshitta; the Muratorian Fragment attests Jude and 2 John as “held in the Catholic church” (Jude also in Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen); none of the books are treated as spurious. The weakest in attestation is 2 Pet, which is not distinctly traceable before the 3rd century (*See CANON OF NEW TESTAMENT*; articles under the word) It is to be added that, in a few instances, as in the case of the Old Testament Apocrypha, early Fathers cite as Scripture books not generally accepted as canonical (e.g. Barnabas, Hermas, Apocrypha of Peter).

The complete acceptance of all the books in our present New Testament canon may be dated from the Councils of Laodicea (circa 363 AD) and of Carthage (397 AD), confirming the lists of Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome and Augustine.

4. LITERARY GROWTH AND ORIGIN — CANONICITY.

Thus far the books of the Old Testament and New Testament have been taken simply as given, and no attempt has been made to inquire how or when they were written or compiled, or how they came to acquire the dignity and authority implied in their reception into a sacred canon. The field here entered is one bristling with controversy, and it is necessary to choose one's steps with caution to find a safe way through it. Details in the survey are left, as before, to the special articles.

1. The Old Testament:

Attention here is naturally directed, first, to the Old Testament. This, it is obvious, and is on all sides admitted, has a long literary history prior to its final settlement in a canon. As to the course of that history traditional and modern critical views very widely differ. It may possibly turn out that the truth lies somewhere midway between them.

(1) Indications of Old Testament Itself.

If the indications furnished by the Old Testament itself be accepted, the results are something like the following:

(a) Patriarchal Age:

No mention is made of writing in the patriarchal age, though it is now known that a high literary culture then prevailed in Babylonia, Egypt and Palestine, and it is not improbable, indeed seems likely, that records in some form came down from that age, and are, in parts, incorporated in the early history of the Bible.

(b) Mosaic Age:

In Mosaic times writing was in use, and Moses himself was trained in the learning of the Egyptians (^{<1190>}Exodus 2:10; ^{<4172>}Acts 7:22). In no place is the composition of the whole Pentateuch (as traditionally believed) ascribed to Moses, but no inconsiderable amount of written matter is directly attributed to him, creating the presumption that there was more, even when the fact is not stated. Moses wrote “all the words of Yahweh” in the “book of the covenant” (Exodus 21 through 23; 24:4,7). He wrote “the words of this law” of Deuteronomy at Moab, “in a book, until they were finished” (^{<6309>}Deuteronomy 31:9,24,26). This was given to the priests to be put by the side of the ark for preservation (^{<6325>}Deuteronomy 31:25,26). Other notices occur of the writing of Moses (^{<1274>}Exodus 17:14; ^{<632>}Numbers 33:2; ^{<6319>}Deuteronomy 31:19,22; compare ^{<4126>}Numbers 11:26). The song of Miriam, and the snatches of song in Numbers 21, the first (perhaps all) quoted from the “book of the Wars of Yahweh” (^{<1214>}Numbers 21:14 ff), plainly belong to Mosaic times. In this connection it should be noticed that the discourses and law of Deuteronomy imply the history and legislation of the critical JE histories (see below). The priestly laws (Leviticus, Numbers) bear so entirely the stamp of the wilderness that they can hardly have originated anywhere else, and were probably then, or soon after, written down. Joshua, too, is presumed to be familiar with writing (^{<630>}Joshua 8:30-35; compare ^{<6278>}Deuteronomy 27:8), and is stated to have written his farewell address “in the book of the law of God” (^{<1245>}Joshua 24:26; compare 1:7,8). These statements already imply the beginning of a sacred literature.

(c) Judges:

The song of Deborah (Judges 5) is an indubitably authentic monument of the age of the Judges, and the older parts of Jgs, at least, must have been nearly contemporary with the events which they record. A knowledge of writing among the common people seems implied in ^{<0784>}Judges 8:14 (American Revised Version, margin). Samuel, like Joshua, wrote “in a book” (^{<0925>}1 Samuel 10:25), and laid it up, evidently among other writings, “before Yahweh.”

(d) Monarchy:

The age of David and Solomon was one of high development in poetical and historical composition: witness the elegies of David (^{<1017>}2 Samuel 1:17 ff; 3:33,34), and the finely-finished narrative of David’s reign (2 Samuel 9 through 20), the so-called “Jerusalem-Source,” admitted to date “from a period very little later than that of the events related” (Driver, LOT, 183). There were court scribes and chroniclers.

David and the Monarchy: David, as befits his piety and poetical and musical gifts (compare on this POT, 440 ff), is credited with laying the foundations of a sacred psalmody (^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:1 ff; *see PSALMS*), and a whole collection of psalms (Pss 1 through 72, with exclusion of the distinct collection, Psalms 42 through 50), once forming a separate book (compare ^{<1721>}Psalms 72:20), are, with others, ascribed to him by their titles (Pss 1; 2; 10 are untitled). It is hardly credible that a tradition like this can be wholly wrong, and a Davidic basis of the Psalter may safely be Assumed. Numerous psalms, by their mention of the “king” (as Psalms 2; 18; 20; 21; 28; 33; 45; 61; 63; 72; 101; 110), are naturally referred to the period of the monarchy (some, as Psalm 18 certainly, Davidic). Other groups of psalms are referred to the temple guilds (Sons of Korah, Asaph).

(e) Wisdom Literature — History:

Solomon is renowned as founder of the Wisdom literature and the author of Proverbs (^{<1062>}1 Kings 4:32; ^{<1001>}Proverbs 1:1; 10:1; ^{<1129>}Ecclesiastes 12:9; Ecclesiastes itself appears to be late), and of the Song (Song 1:1). The “men of Hezekiah” are said to have copied put a collection of his proverbs (^{<1121>}Proverbs 25:1; *see PROVERBS*). Here also may be placed the Book of Job. Hezekiah’s reign appears to have been one of literary activity: to it, probably, are to be referred certain of the Psalms (e.g. Psalms 46, 48; compare Perowne, Delitzsch). In history, during the monarchy, the prophets would seem to have acted as the “sacred historiographers” of the

nation. From their memoirs of the successive reigns, as the later books testify (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 29:29; ^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 9:29; 12:15, etc.), are compiled most of the narratives in our canonical writings (hence the name “former prophets”). The latest date in 2 Kings is 562 BC, and the body of the book is probably earlier.

(f) Prophecy:

(i) Assyrian Age:

With the rise of written prophecy a new form of literature enters, called forth by, and vividly mirroring, the religious and political conditions of the closing periods of the monarchy in Israel and Judah (*see* PROPHECY). On the older view, Obadiah and Joel stood at the head of the series in the pre-Assyrian period (9th century), and this seems the preferable view still. On the newer view, these prophets are late, and written prophecy begins in the Assyrian period with Amos (Jeroboam II, circa 750 BC) and Hosea (circa 745-735). When the latter prophet wrote, Samaria was tottering to its fall (721 BC). A little later, in Judah, come Isaiah (circa 740-690) and Micah (circa 720-708). Isaiah, in the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, is the greatest of the prophets in the Assyrian age, and his ministry reaches its climax in the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib (2 Kings 18; 19; Isaiah 36; 37). It is a question whether some oracles of an Isaianic school are not mingled with the prophet's own writings, and most scholars now regard the 2nd part of the book (Isaiah 40 through 66) as exilic or (in part) post-exilic in date. The standpoint of much in these chapters is certainly in the Exile; whether the composition of the whole can be placed there is extremely doubtful (*see* ISAIAH). Nahum, who prophesies against Nineveh, belongs to the very close of this period (circa 660).

(ii) Chaldean Age:

The prophets Zephaniah (under Josiah, circa 630 BC) and Habakkuk (circa 606) may be regarded as forming the transition to the next — the Chaldean — period. The Chaldeans (unnamed in Zephaniah) are advancing but are not yet come (^{<3006>}Habakkuk 1:6). The great prophetic figure here, however, is Jeremiah, whose sorrowful ministry, beginning in the 13th year of Josiah (626 BC), extended through the succeeding reigns till after the fall of Jerusalem (586 BC). The prophet elected to remain with the remnant in the land, and shortly after, troubles having arisen, was forcibly carried

into Egypt (Jeremiah 43). Here also he prophesied (Jeremiah 43; 44). From the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah consistently declared the success of the Chaldean arms, and foretold the 70 years' captivity (25:12-14). Baruch acted as his secretary in writing out and editing his prophecies (Jeremiah 36; 45).

(g) Josiah's Reformation:

A highly important event in this period was Josiah's reformation in his 18th year (621 BC), and the discovery, during repairs of the temple, of "the book of the law," called also "the book of the covenant" and "the law of Moses" (¹²²⁸2 Kings 22:8; 23:2,24,25). The finding of this book, identified by most authorities with the Book of Deuteronomy, produced an extraordinary sensation. On no side was there the least question that it was a genuine ancient work. Jeremiah, strangely, makes no allusion to this discovery, but his prophecies are deeply saturated with the ideas and style of Deuteronomy.

(h) Exilian and Post-Exilian:

The bulk of Isaiah 40 through 66 belongs, at least in spirit, to the Exile, but the one prophet of the Exile known to us by name is the priestly Ezekiel. Carried captive under Jehoiachin (597 BC), Ezekiel labored among his fellow-exiles for at least 22 years (³⁰⁰⁰Ezekiel 1:2; 29:17). A man of the strongest moral courage, his symbolic visions on the banks of the Chebar alternated with the most direct expostulation, exhortation, warning and promise. In the description of an ideal temple and its worship with which his book closes (chapters 40 through 48), critics think they discern the suggestion of the Levitical code.

(i) Daniel, etc.:

After Ezekiel the voice of prophecy is silent till it revives in Daniel, in Babylon, under Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. Deported in 605 BC, Daniel rose to power, and "continued" until the 1st year of Cyrus (536 BC; ²⁰⁰²Daniel 1:21). Criticism will have it that his prophecies are product of the Maccabean age, but powerful considerations on the other side are ignored (*see DANIEL*). Jonah may have been written about this time, though the prophet's mission itself was pre-Assyrian (9th century). The rebuilding of the temple after the return, under Zerubbabel, furnished the occasion for the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah (520 BC). Scholars

are disposed to regard only Zechariah 1 through 8 as belonging to this period — the remainder being placed earlier or later. Malachi, nearly century after (circa 430), brings up the rear of prophecy, rebuking unfaithfulness, and predicting the advent of the “messenger of the covenant” (~~391E~~ Malachi 3:1,2). To this period, or later, belong, besides post-exilic psalms (e.g. Psalms 124; 126), the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther and apparently Ecclesiastes.

(j) Preexilic Bible:

If, in this rapid sketch, the facts are correctly represented, it will be apparent that, in opposition to prevalent views, large body of sacred literature existed (laws, histories, psalms, wisdom-books, prophecies), and was recognized long before the Exile. God’s ancient people had “Scriptures” — had a Bible — if not yet in collected form. This is strikingly borne out by the numerous Old Testament passages referring to what appears to be a code of sacred writings in the hands of the pious in Israel. Such are the references to, and praises of, the “law” and “word” of God in many of the Psalms (e.g. 1; 19; 119; 12:6; 17:4; 18:21,22), with the references to God’s known “words,” “ways,” “commandments,” “statutes,” in other books of the Old Testament (~~398B~~ Job 8:8; ~~398D~~ Hosea 8:12; ~~398E~~ Daniel 9:2). In brief, Scriptures, which must have contained records of God’s dealings with His people, a knowledge of which is constantly presupposed, “laws” of God for the regulation of the heart and conduct, “statutes,” “ordinances,” “words” of God, are postulate of a great part of the Old Testament.

(2) Critical views.

The account of the origin and growth of the Old Testament above presented is in marked contrast with that given in the textbooks of the newer critical schools. The main features of these critical views are sketched in the article *CRITICISM* (which see); here a brief indication will suffice. Generally, the books of the Old Testament are brought down to late dates; are regarded as highly composite; the earlier books, from their distance from the events recorded, are deprived of historical worth. Neither histories nor laws in the Pentateuch belong to the Mosaic age: Joshua is a “romance”; Judges may embody ancient fragments, but in bulk is unhistorical. The earliest fragments of Israelite literature are lyric pieces like those preserved in ~~400E3~~ Genesis 4:23,24; 9:25-27; Numbers 21; the Song of Deborah (Judges 5) is probably genuine. Historical writing begins about

the age of David or soon thereafter. The folklore of the Hebrews and traditions of the Mosaic age began to be reduced to writing about the 9th century BC.

(a) The Pentateuch:

Our present Pentateuch (enlarged to a “Hexateuch,” including Josh) consists of 4 main strands (themselves composite), the oldest of which (called Jahwist (Jahwist), from its use of the name Yahweh) goes back to about 850 BC. This was Judean. A parallel history book (called E, from its use of the name Elohim, God) was produced in the Northern kingdom about a century later (circa 750). Later still these two were united (JE). These histories, “prophetic” in spirit, were originally attributed to individual authors, distinguished by minute criteria of style: the more recent fashion is to regard them as the work of “schools.” Hitherto the only laws known were those of the (post-Mosaic) Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20 through 23). Later, in Josiah’s reign, the desire for centralization of worship led to the composition of the Book of Deuteronomy. This, secreted in the temple, was found by Hilkiah (2 Kings 22), and brought about the reformation of Josiah formerly mentioned. Deuteronomy (D), thus produced, is the third strand in the Pentateuchal compilation. With the destruction of the city and temple, under the impulse of Ezekiel, began a new period of law-construction, now priestly in spirit. Old laws and usages were codified; new laws were invented; the history of institutions was recast; finally, the extensive complex of Levitical legislation was brought into being, clothed with a wilderness dress, and ascribed to Moses. This elaborate Priestly Code (PC), with its accompanying history, was brought from Babylon by Ezra, and, united with the already existing JE and D, was given forth by him to the restored community at Jerusalem (444 BC; Nehemiah 8) as “the law of Moses.” Their acceptance of it was the inauguration of “Judaism.”

(b) Histories:

In its theory of the Pentateuch the newer criticism lays down the determinative positions for its criticism of all the remaining books of the Old Testament. The historical books show but a continuation of the processes of literary construction exemplified in the books ascribed to Moses. The Deuteronomic element, e.g. in Josh, Jgs, 1, 2 Sam, 1, 2 Ki, proves them, in these parts, to be later than Josiah, and historically

untrustworthy. The Levitical element in 1, 2 Chronicles demonstrates its pictures of David and his successors to be distorted and false. The same canon applies to the prophets. Joel, e.g. must be post-exilian, because it presupposes the priestly law. The patriarchal and Mosaic histories being subverted, it is not permitted to assume any high religious ideas in early Israel. David, therefore, could not have written the Psalms. Most, if not practically all, of these are post-exilian.

(c) Psalms and Prophets:

Monotheism came in — at least first obtained recognition — through Amos and Hosea. The prophets could not have the foresight and far-reaching hopes seen in their writings: these passages, therefore, must be removed. Generally the tendency is to put dates as low as possible and very many books, regarded before as preexilian, are carried down in whole or part, to exilian, post-exilian, and even late Greek times (Priestly Code, Psalter, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Second Isaiah, Joel, Lamentations). Daniel is Maccabean and unhistorical (circa 168-167 BC).

It is not proposed here to discuss this theory, which is not accepted in the present article, and is considered elsewhere (*see CRITICISM; PENTATEUCH*). The few points calling for remark relate to canonical acceptance.

(3) Formation of the Canon.

The general lines of the completed Jewish canon have already been sketched, and some light has now been thrown on the process by which the several books obtained a sacred authority. As to the actual stages in the formation of the canon opinions again widely diverge (*see CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*).

(a) Critical Theory:

On theory at present in favor, no collections of sacred books were made prior to the return from Babylon. The only books that had authority before the Exile were, perhaps, the old Book of the Covenant, and, from Josiah's time, the Book of Deuteronomy. Both, after the return, were, on this theory, embodied, with the JE histories, and the Priestly Code, in Ezra's completed Book of the Law (with Joshua(?)), in which, accordingly, the foundation of a canon was laid. The fivefold division of the law was later. Subsequently, answering to the 2nd division of the Jewish canon, a

collection was made of the prophetic writings. As this includes books which, on the critical view, go down to Greek times (Jon; Zechariah 9 through 14), its completion cannot be earlier than well down in the 3rd century BC. Latest of all came the collection of the “Hagiographa” — a division of the canon, on theory, kept open to receive additions certainly till the 2nd century, some think after. Into it were received such late writings as Ecclesiastes, the Maccabean Psalms, Daniel. Even then one or two books (Ecclesiastes, Esther) remained subjects of dispute.

(b) More Positive View:

It will appear from the foregoing that this theory is not here accepted without considerable modification. If the question be asked, What constituted a right to a place in the canon? the answer can hardly be other than that suggested by Josephus in the passage formerly quoted — a real or supposed inspiration in the author of the book. Books were received if men had the prophetic spirit (in higher or lower degree: that, e.g. of wisdom); they ceased to be received when the succession of prophets was thought to fail (after Malachi). In any case the writings of truly inspired men (Moses, the prophets, psalmists) were accepted as of authority. It was sought, however, to be shown above, that such books, many of them, already existed from Moses down, long before the Exile (the law, collections of psalms, of proverbs, written prophecies: to what end did the prophets write, if they did not mean their prophecies to be circulated and preserved?); and such writings, to the godly who knew and used them, had the full value of Scripture. A canon began with the first laying up of the “book of the law” before Yahweh (~~Ex~~ Deuteronomy 31:25,26; ~~Josh~~ Joshua 24:26). The age of Ezra and Nehemiah, therefore, is not that of the beginning, but, as Jewish tradition rightly held (Josephus; 2 Macc 2:13; Talmud), rather that of the completion, systematic delimitation, acknowledgment and formal close of the canon. The divisions of “law, prophets, and holy writings” would thus have their place from the beginning, and be nearly contemporaneous. The Samaritans accepted only the 5 books of the law, with apparently Joshua (*see SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH*).

(c) Close of Canon:

There is no need for dogmatism as to an absolute date for the close of the canon. If inspired voices continued to be heard, their utterances were

entitled to recognition. Books duly authenticated might be added, but the non-inclusion of such as a book as Sirach (Ecclesiasticus: in Hebrew, circa 200 BC) shows that the limits of the canon were jealously guarded, and the onus of proof rests on those who affirm that there were such books. Calvin, e.g. held that there were Maccabean Psalms. Many modern scholars do the same, but it is doubtful if they are right. Ecclesiastes is thought on linguistic grounds to be late, but it and other books need not be so late as critics make them. Daniel is confidently declared to be Maccabean, but there are weighty reasons for maintaining a Persian date (*see DANIEL*). As formerly noticed, the threefold division into “the law, the prophets, and the rest ([*ta loipa*], a definite number) of the books” is already attested in the Prologue to Sirach.

2. The New Testament:

Critical controversy, long occupied with the Old Testament, has again keenly attached itself to the New Testament, with similar disturbing results (*see CRITICISM*). Extremist opinions may be here neglected, and account be taken only of those that can claim reasonable support. The New Testament writings are conveniently grouped into the historical books (Gospels and Acts); Epistles (Pauline and other); and a Prophetic book (Rev). In order of writing, the Epistles, generally, are earlier than the Gospels, but in order of subject, the Gospels naturally claim attention first.

(1) Historical Books:

The main facts about the origin of the Gospels can perhaps be distinguished from the complicated literary theories which scholars are still discussing (*see GOSPELS*). The first three Gospels, known as the Synoptics, evidently embody a common tradition, and draw from common sources. The Fourth Gospel — that of John — presents problems by itself.

(a) The Synoptics:

The former — the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke) — fall in date well within the apostolic age, and are, in the 2nd century, uniformly connected with the authors whose names they bear, Mark is spoken of as “the interpreter of Peter” (Papias, in HE iii.39); Luke is the well-known companion of Paul. A difficulty arises about Matthew, whose Gospel is stated to have been written in Aramaic (Papias, *ut supra*, etc.), while the gospel bearing his name is in Greek. The Greek gospel seems at least to

have been sufficiently identified with the apostle to admit of the early church always treating it as his.

The older theory of origin assumed an oral basis for all 3 Gospels. The tendency in recent criticism is to distinguish two main sources:

- (1) Mk, the earliest gospel, a record of the preaching of Peter;
- (2) a collection of the sayings and discourses of Jesus, attributed to Matthew (the Eusebian Logia, now called Q); with
- (3) a source used by Luke in the sections peculiar to himself — the result of his own investigations (~~Q~~Luke 1:1-4).

Matthew and Luke are supposed to be based on Mark and the Logia (Q); in Luke's case with the addition of his special material. Oral tradition furnished what remains. A simpler theory may be to substitute for

- (1) a Petrine tradition already firmly fixed while yet the apostles were working together in Jerusalem. Peter, as foremost spokesman, would naturally stamp his own type upon the oral narratives of Christ's sayings and doings (the Mark type), while Matthew's stories, in part written, would be the chief source for the longer discourses. The instruction imparted by the apostles and those taught by them would everywhere be made the basis of careful catechetical teaching, and records of all this, more or less fragmentary, would be early in circulation (~~Q~~Luke 1:1-4). This would explain the Petrine type of narrative, and the seeming dependence of Matthew and Luke, without the necessity of supposing a direct use of Mark. So important a gospel could hardly be included in the "attempts" of ~~Q~~Luke 1:1.

(b) Fourth Gospel:

The Fourth Gospel (Jn), the genuineness of which is assumed (*see JOHN, GOSPEL OF*), differs entirely in character and style. It is less a narrative than a didactic work, written to convince its readers that Jesus is "the Son of God" (~~Q~~John 20:31). The gospel may be presumed to have been composed at Ephesus, in the last years of the apostle's residence there. With this its character corresponds. The other gospels had long been known; John does not therefore traverse the ground already covered by them. He confines himself chiefly to matters drawn from his personal recollections: the Judean ministry, the visits of Christ to Jerusalem, His last

private discourses to His disciples. John had so often retold, and so long brooded over, the thoughts and words of Jesus, that they had become, in a manner, part of his own thought, and, in reproducing them, he necessarily did so with a subjective tinge, and in a partially paraphrastic and interpretative manner. Yet it is truly the words, thoughts and deeds of his beloved Lord that he narrates. His gospel is the needful complement to the others — the “spiritual” gospel.

(c) Acts:

The Acts narrates the origin and early fortunes of the church, with, as its special motive (compare 1:8), the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles through the labors of Paul. Its author is Luke, Paul’s companion, whose gospel it continues (1:1). Certain sections — the so-called “we-sections” (16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1 through 28:16) — are transcribed directly from Luke’s journal of Paul’s travels. The book closes abruptly with Paul’s 2 years’ imprisonment at Rome (28:30,31; 60-61 AD), and not a hint is given of the issue of the imprisonment — trial, liberation or death. Does this mean that a 3rd “treatise” was contemplated? Or that the book was written while the imprisonment still continued? (thus now Harnack). If the latter, the Third Gospel must be very early.

(2) The Epistles.

(a) Pauline:

Doubt never rested in the early church on the 13 epistles of Paul. Following upon the rejection by the “Tubingen” school of all the epistles but 4 (Rom, 1, 2 Cor, Gal), the tide of opinion has again turned strongly in favor of their genuineness. An exception is the Pastoral epistles (1, 2 Tim, Tit), still questioned by some on insufficient grounds (*see PASTORAL EPISTLES*). The epistles, called forth by actual needs of the churches, are a living outpouring of the thoughts and feelings of the mind and heart of the apostle in relation to his converts. Most are letters to churches he himself had founded (1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians(?), Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians): two are to churches he had not himself visited, but with which he stood in affectionate relations (Romans, Colossians); one is purely personal (Philemon); three are addressed to individuals, but with official responsibilities (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus). The larger number were written during his missionary labors, and reflect his personal situation, anxieties and companionships at

the places of their composition; four are epistles of the 1st Roman imprisonment (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon): 2 Timothy is a voice from the dungeon, in his 2nd imprisonment, shortly before his martyrdom. Doctrine, counsel, rebuke, admonition, tender solicitude, ethical instruction, prayer, thanksgiving, blend in living fusion in their contents. So marvelous a collection of letters, on such magnificent themes, was never before given to the world.

The earliest epistles, in point of date, are generally held to be those to the Thessalonians, written from Corinth (52, 53 AD). The church, newly-founded, had passed through much affliction (1 Thess 1:6; 2:14; 3:3,4, etc.), and Paul writes to comfort and exhort it. His words about the Second Coming (1 Thess 4:13 ff) led to mistaken expectations and some disorders. His second epistle was written to correct these problems (2 Thess 2:1-3; 3:6, etc.).

Corinth itself received the next epistles — the 1st called forth by reports received at Ephesus of grave divisions and irregularities 1 Corinthians (1:11; 3:3; 11:18 ff, etc.), joined with pride of knowledge, doctrinal heresy (15:12 ff), and at least one case of gross immorality (chapter 5) in the church; the 2nd, written at Philippi, expressing joy at the repentance of the offender, and removing the severe sentence that had been passed upon him (2 Cor 2:1-10; compare ~~418~~ 1 Corinthians 5:3,4), likewise vindicating Paul's own apostleship 2 Corinthians (chapters 10 through 13). The date of both is 57 AD. 1 Corinthians contains the beautiful hymn on love (chapter 13), and the noble chapter on resurrection (chapter 15).

In the following year (58 BC) Paul penned from Corinth the Epistle to the Romans — the greatest of his doctrinal epistles. In it he develops his great theme of the impossibility of justification before God through works of law (Romans 1 through 3), and of the Divine provision for human salvation in a "righteousness of God" in Christ Jesus, received through faith. He exhibits first the objective side of this redemption in the deliverance from condemnation effected through Christ's reconciling death (Romans 3 through 5); then the subjective side, in the new life imparted by the spirit, giving deliverance from the power of sin (Romans 6 through 8). A discussion follows of the Divine sovereignty in God's dealings with Israel, and of the end of these dealings (Romans 9 through 11), and the epistle concludes with practical exhortations, counsels to forbearance and greetings (Romans 12 through 16).

Closely connected with the Epistle to the Romans is that to the Galatians, in which the same truths are handled, but now with a polemical intent in expostulation and reproach. The Galatian churches had apostatized from the gospel of faith to Jewish legalism, and the apostle, sorely grieved, writes this powerful letter to rebuke their faithlessness, and recall them to their allegiance to the truth. It is reasonable to suppose that the two epistles are nearly related in place and time. The question is complicated, however, by the dispute which has arisen as to whether the churches intended are those of Northern Galatia (the older view; compare Conybeare and Howson, Lightfoot) or those of Southern Galatia (Sir Wm. Ramsay), i.e. the churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, in Paul's time embraced in the Roman province of Galatia (*see GALATIA; GALATIANS*). If the latter view is adopted, date and place are uncertain; if the former, the epistle may have been written from Ephesus (circa 57 AD).

The 4 epistles of the imprisonment all fall within the years 60, 61 AD. That to the Philipplians, warmly praising the church, and exhorting to unity, possibly the latest of the group, was sent by the hand of Epaphroditus, who had come to Rome with a present from the Philippian church, and had there been overtaken by a serious illness (^{<50425>}Philippians 2:25-30; 4:15-18). The remaining 3 epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon) were written at one time, and were carried to their destinations by Epaphras. Ephesians and Colossians are twin epistles, similar in thought and style, extolling the preeminence of Christ, but it is doubtful whether the former was not really a "circular" epistle, or even, perhaps, the lost Epistle to the Laodiceans (^{<5046>}Colossians 4:16; *see EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS*). The Colossian epistle has in view an early form of Gnostic heresy (compare Lightfoot, Gal). Philemon is a personal letter to a friend of the apostle's at Colosse, whose runaway slave, Onesimus, now a Christian, is being sent back to him with warm commendations.

See CAPTIVITY EPISTLES.

Latest from Paul's pen are the Pastoral Epistles (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus), implying his liberation from his first imprisonment, and a new period of missionary labor in Ephesus, Macedonia and Crete (*see PASTORAL EPISTLES*). Timothy was left at Ephesus (1 Tim 1:3), Titus at Crete (^{<5005>}Titus 1:5), for the regulation and superintendence of the churches. The epistles, the altered style of which shows the deep impress of advancing years and changed conditions, contain admonitions to pastoral duty, with warnings as to perils that had arisen or would arise. 1 Timothy

and Titus were written while the apostle was still at liberty (63 AD); 2 Timothy is from his Roman prison, when his case had been partly heard, and the end was impending (2 Tim 4:6,26,27).

(b) Epistle to the Hebrews:

These are the Pauline Epistles proper. The Epistle to the Hebrews, though ascribed to Paul in the title of the King James Version, is not really his. It is an early writing (probably before the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD) of some friend of the apostle's (in Italy, ~~<8133>~~ Hebrews 13:23,24), designed, by a reasoned exhibition of the superiority of Jesus to Moses and the Levitical priesthood, and of the fulfillment of Old Testament types and institutions in His person and sacrifice, to remove the difficulties of Jewish Christians, who clung with natural affection to their temple and divinely appointed ritual. It was included by Eusebius, with others in the East (not, however, by Origen), among the epistles of Paul: in the West the Pauline authorship was not admitted. Many, nevertheless, with Origen, upheld a connection with Paul ("the thoughts are Paul's"). Ideas and style suggest an Alexandrian training: hence Luther's conjecture of Apollos as the writer. There can be no certainty on the subject. The value of the Epistle is unimpaired, whoever was the author.

(c) Catholic Epistles:

Of the seven so-called "Catholic" Epistles, James and Jude are by "brethren" of the Lord (James, "the Lord's brother," was head of the church at Jerusalem, ~~<4153>~~ Acts 15:13; 21:18; ~~<8019>~~ Galatians 1:19, etc.); Peter and John, to whom the others were ascribed, were apostles. James and 1 Peter are addressed to the Jews of the Dispersion (1 Pet 1:1; ~~<5000>~~ James 1:1). The doubts respecting certain of these writings have already been mentioned. The early date and acceptance of James is attested by numerous allusions (Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Didache). Many regard it as the earliest of the epistles — before Paul's. Its tone is throughout practical. The seeming conflict with Paul on faith and works, which led Luther to speak slightly of it, is only verbal. Paul, too, held that a dead faith avails nothing (1 Cor 13:2; ~~<8816>~~ Galatians 5:6). 1 John, like 1 Peter, was undisputed (if the Fourth Gospel is genuine, 1 John is), and, on internal grounds, the shorter epistles (2 John, 3 John) need not be doubted (*see EPISTLES OF JOHN*). Jude, rugged in style, with allusions to Jewish Apocalypses (1:9,24), is well attested, and 2 Peter seems to found on it.

The last-named epistle must rely for acceptance on its own claim (2 Pet 1:1,28), and on internal evidence of sincerity. It is to be observed that, though late in being noticed, it never appears to have been treated as spurious. The style certainly differs from 1 Peter; this may be due to the use of an amanuensis. If accepted, it must be placed late in Peter's life (before 65 AD). 1 Peter and Jude, in that case, must be earlier (*see CATHOLIC EPISTLES*).

(3) Prophecy.

The Book of Revelation:

The one prophetic book of the New Testament — the apocalyptic counterpart of Daniel in the Old Testament — is the Book of Revelation. The external evidence for the Johannine authorship is strong (*see APOCALYPSE*). Tradition and internal evidence ascribe it to the reign of Domitian (circa 95 AD). Its contents were given in vision in the isle of Patmos (~~Rev~~ Revelation 1:9). The theory which connects it with the reign of Nero through the supposed fitness of this name to express the mystic number 666 is entirely precarious (compare Salmon, Introduction to New Testament, 245-54). The main intent is to exhibit in symbolic form the approaching conflicts of Christ and His church with anti-Christian powers — with secular world-power (Beast), with intellectual anti-Christianism (False Prophet), with ecclesiastical anti-Christianism (Woman) — these conflicts issuing in victory and a period of triumph, preluding, after a sharp, final struggle, the last scenes (resurrection, judgment), and the eternal state. When the visions are taken, not as poetic imaginings, but as true apocalyptic unveilings, the change in style from the gospel, which may be regarded as already written, can readily be understood. These mighty revelations in Patmos brought about, as by volcanic force, a tremendous upheaval in the seer's soul, breaking through all previous strata of thought and feeling, and throwing everything into a new perspective. On the resultant high keynote: "Amen: Come, Lord Jesus" (~~Rev~~ Revelation 22:20), the New Testament closes.

(4) New Testament Canon.

The principal steps by which the books now enumerated were gradually formed into a New Testament "Canon," have been indicated in previous sections. The test of canonicity here, as in the Old Testament, is the presence of inspiration. Some would prefer the word "apostolic," which comes to the same thing. All the writings above reckoned were held to be

the works of apostles or of apostolic men, and on this ground were admitted into the list of books having authority in the church. Barnabas (circa 100-120 AD) already quotes ~~<4016>~~ Matthew 20:16 with the formula “it is written.” Paul quotes as “scripture” (1 Tim 5:18) a passage found only in Luke (10:7). Paul’s Epistles are classed with “other scriptures” in ~~<6016>~~ 2 Peter 3:16. Post-apostolic Fathers draw a clear distinction between their own writings and those of apostles like Paul and Peter (Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas). The Fathers of the close of the 2nd century treat the New Testament writings as in the fullest degree inspired (compare Westcott, Introduction to Study of Gospels, Appendix B). An important impulse to the formation of a definite canon came from the Gnostic Marcion (circa 140 AD), who made a canon for himself in 2 parts, “Gospel” and “Apostolicon,” consisting of one gospel (a mutilated Lk) and 10 epistles of Paul (excluding Pastorals). A challenge of this kind had to be taken up, and lists of New Testament writings began to be made (Melito, Muratorian Fragment, etc.), with the results previously described. By the commencement of the 4th century unanimity had practically been attained as regards even the Antilegomena. At the Council of Nicea (325 AD), Westcott says, “the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were silently admitted on all sides to have a final authority” (Bible in Church, 155).

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

5. UNITY AND SPIRITUAL PURPOSE — INSPIRATION.

1. Scripture a Unity:

Holy Scripture is not simply a collection of religious books: still less does it consist of mere fragments of Jewish and Christian literature. It belongs to the conception of Scripture that, though originating “by divers portions and in divers manners” (~~<8008>~~ Hebrews 1:1), it should yet, in its completeness, constitute a unity, evincing, in the spirit and purpose that bind its parts together, the Divine source from which its revelation comes. The Bible is the record of God’s revelations of Himself to men in successive ages and dispensations (~~<4008>~~ Ephesians 1:8-10; 3:5-9; ~~<5005>~~ Colossians 1:25,26), till the revelation culminates in the advent and work of the Son, and the mission of the Spirit. It is this aspect of the Bible which constitutes its grand distinction from all collections of sacred writings — the so-called “Bibles” of heathen religions — in the world. These, as the slightest inspection of

them shows, have no unity. They are accumulations of heterogeneous materials, presenting, in their collocation, no order, progress, or plan. The reason is, that they embody no historical revelation working out a purpose in consecutive stages from germinal beginnings to perfect close. The Bible, by contrast, is a single book because it embodies such a revelation, and exhibits such a purpose. The unity of the book, made up of so many parts, is the attestation of the reality of the revelation it contains.

2. The Purpose of Grace:

This feature of spiritual purpose in the Bible is one of the most obvious things about it (compare POT, 30 ff). It gives to the Bible what is sometimes termed its “organic unity.” The Bible has a beginning, middle and end. The opening chapters of Genesis have their counterpart in the “new heaven and new earth” and paradise restored of the closing chapters of Revelation (21; 22). Man’s sin is made the starting-point for disclosures of God’s grace. The patriarchal history, with its covenants and promises, is continued in the story of the Exodus and the events that follow, in fulfillment of these promises. Deuteronomy recapitulates the lawgiving at Sinai. Joshua sees the people put in possession of the promised land. Backsliding, rebellion, failure, do not defeat God’s purpose, but are overruled to carry it on to a surer completion. The monarchy is made the occasion of new promises to the house of David (2 Samuel 7). The prophets root themselves in the past, but, at the very hour when the nation seems sinking in ruin; hold out bright hopes of a greater future in the extension of God’s kingdom to the Gentiles, under Messiah’s rule. A critical writer, Kautzsch, has justly said: “The abiding value of the Old Testament lies above all in this, that it guarantees to us with absolute certainty the fact and the process of a Divine plan and way of salvation, which found its conclusion and fulfillment in the new covenant, in the person and work of Jesus Christ” (Bleibende Bedeutung des Altes Testament, 22, 24, 28-29, 30-31).

Fulfillment in Christ.

How truly all that was imperfect, transitional, temporary, in the Old Testament was brought to realization and completion in the redemption and spiritual kingdom of Christ need not here be dwelt upon. Christ is the prophet, priest and king of the New Covenant. His perfect sacrifice, “once for all,” supersedes and abolishes the typical sacrifices of the old economy (Hebrews 9 through 10). His gift of the Spirit realizes what the prophets

had foretold of God's law being written in men's hearts (^{<311>}Jeremiah 31:31-34; 32:39,40; ^{<311>}Ezekiel 11:19,20, etc.). His kingdom is established on moveless foundations, and can have no end (^{<311>}Philippians 2:9-11; ^{<312>}Hebrews 12:28; ^{<313>}Revelation 5:13, etc.). In tracing the lines of this redeeming purpose of God, brought to light in Christ, we gain the key which unlocks the inmost meaning of the whole Bible. It is the revelation of a "gospel."

3. Inspiration:

"Inspiration" is a word round which many debates have gathered. If, however, what has been said is true of the Bible as the record of a progressive revelation, of its contents as the discovery of the will of God for man's salvation, of the prophetic and apostolic standing of its writers, of the unity of spirit and purpose that pervades it, it will be difficult to deny that a quite peculiar presence, operation, and guidance of the Spirit of God are manifest in its production. The belief in inspiration, it has been seen, is implied in the formation of these books into a sacred canon. The full discussion of the subject belongs to a special article. (*see INSPIRATION*).

Biblical Claim.

Here it need only be said that the claim for inspiration in the Bible is one made in fullest measure by the Bible itself. It is not denied by any that Jesus and His apostles regarded the Old Testament Scriptures as in the fullest sense inspired. The appeal of Jesus was always to the Scriptures, and the word of Scripture was final with Him. "Have ye not read?" (^{<400>}Matthew 19:4). "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God" (^{<400>}Matthew 22:29). This because "God" speaks in them (^{<400>}Matthew 19:4). Prophecies and psalms were fulfilled in Him (^{<400>}Luke 18:31; 22:37; 24:27,44). Paul esteemed the Scriptures "the oracles of God" (^{<400>}Romans 3:2). They are "God-inspired" (2 Tim 3:16). That New Testament prophets and apostles were not placed on any lower level than those of the Old Testament is manifest from Paul's explicit words regarding himself and his fellow-apostles. Paul never faltered in his claim to be "an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God" (^{<400>}Ephesians 1:1, etc.) — "separated unto the gospel of God" (^{<400>}Romans 1:1) — who had received his message, not from man, but by "revelation" from heaven (^{<400>}Galatians 1:11,22). The "mystery of Christ" had "now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit," in consequence of which the church is declared to be "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus

himself being the chief corner stone” (~~402~~Ephesians 2:20; 3:5).

Marks of Inspiration.

It might be shown that these claims made by New Testament writers for the Old Testament and for themselves are borne out by what the Old Testament itself teaches of prophetic inspiration, of wisdom as the gift of God’s spirit, and of the light, holiness, saving virtue and sanctifying power continually ascribed to God’s “law,” “words,” “statutes,” “commandments,” “judgments” (see above). This is the ultimate test of “inspiration” — that to which Paul likewise appeals — its power to “make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus” (2 Tim 3:15) — its profitableness “for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness” (2 Tim 3:16) — all to the end “that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work” (2 Tim 3:17). Nothing is here determined as to “inerrancy” in minor historical, geographical, chronological details, in which some would wrongly put the essence of inspiration; but it seems implied that at least there is no error which can interfere with or nullify the utility of Scripture for the ends specified. Who that brings Scripture to its own tests of inspiration, will deny that, judged as a whole, it fulfils them?

4. Historical Influence of the Bible:

The claim of the Bible to a Divine origin is justified by its historical influence. Regarded even as literature, the Bible has an unexampled place in history. Ten or fifteen manuscripts are thought a goodly number for an ancient classic; the manuscripts of whole or parts of the New Testament are reckoned by thousands, the oldest going back to the 4th or 5th century. Another test is translation. The books of the New Testament had hardly begun to be put together before we find translations being made of them in Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, later into Gothic and other barbarous tongues (*see VERSIONS*). In the Middle Ages, before the invention of printing, translations were made into the vernacular of most of the countries of Europe. Today there is not a language in the civilized world, hardly a language among uncivilized tribes, wherever missions have gone, into which this word of God has not been rendered. Thanks to the labors of Bible Societies, the circulation of the Bible in the different countries of the world in recent years outstrips all previous records. No book has ever been so minutely studied, has had so many books written on it, has founded so vast a literature of hymns, liturgies, devotional writings, sermons, has been

so keenly assailed, has evoked such splendid defenses, as the Bible. Its spiritual influence cannot be estimated. To tell all the Bible has been and done for the world would be to rewrite in large part the history of modern civilization. Without it, in heathen lands, the arm and tongue of the missionary would be paralyzed. With it, even in the absence of the missionary, wondrous results are often effected. In national life the Bible is the source of our highest social and national aspirations. Professor Huxley, though an agnostic, argued for the reading of the Bible in the schools on this very ground. "By the study of what other book," he asked, "could children be so much humanized, and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities, and earns the blessings or the curses of all times, according to its effort to do good and to hate evil, even as they are also earning their payment for their work?" (Critiques and Addresses, 61).

6. ADDENDA.

A few notes may be added, in closing, on special points not touched in the preceding sections.

1. Chapters and Verses:

Already in pre-Talmudic times, for purposes of reading in the synagogues, the Jews had larger divisions of the law into sections called Para-shahs, and of the prophets into similar sections called HaphTarahs. They had also smaller divisions into Pecuqim, corresponding nearly with our verses. The division into chapters is much later (13th century). It is ascribed to Cardinal Hugo de St Caro (died 1248); by others to Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury (died 1227). It was adopted into the Vulgate, and from this was transferred by R. Nathan (circa 1440) to the Hebrew Bible (Bleek, Keil). Verses are marked in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) as early as 1558. They first appear in the New Testament in Robert Stephens' edition of the Greek Testament in 1551. Henry Stephens, Robert's son, reports that they were devised by his father during a journey on horseback from Paris to Lyons.

2. The King James Version and Revised Version:

The King James Version of 1611, based in part on earlier English Versions, especially Tyndale's, justly holds rank as one of the noblest monuments of

the English language of its own, or any, age. Necessarily, however, the Greek text used by the translators (“Textus Receptus”), resting on a few late manuscripts, was very imperfect. With the discovery of more ancient manuscripts, and multiplication of appliances for criticism, the need and call for a revised text and translation became urgent. Finally, at the instance of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, the task of revision was undertaken by Committees representing the best English and American scholarship. Their labors resulted in the publication, in 1881, of the Revised New Testament, and in 1885, of the Revised Old Testament (a revised edition of the Apocrypha was published in 1896). The preferencist of the American Revisers were printed in an appendix, a pledge being given that no further changes should be made for 14 years. The English Companies were disbanded shortly after 1885, but the American Committee, adhering to its own renderings, and believing that further improvements on the English the Revised Version (British and American) were possible, continued its organization and work. This issued, in 1901, in the production of the American Standard Revised Version, which aims at greater consistency and accuracy in a number of important respects, and is supplied, also, with carefully selected marginal references (*see AMERICAN REVISED VERSION*). Little could be done, in either the English Revised Version or the American Standard Revised Version, in the absence of reliable data for comparison, with the text of the Old Testament, but certain obvious corrections have been made, or noted in the margin.

3. Helps to Study:

In recent years abundant helps have been furnished, apart from Commentaries and Dictionaries, for the intelligent study of the English Bible. Among such works may be mentioned the Oxford Helps to the Study of the Bible; the valuable Aids to Bible Students (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898); Dr. Angus’ Bible Handbook (revised by Green); A. S. Peake’s Guide to Biblical Study (1897); W. F. Adeney’s How to Read the Bible (1896); R. C. Moulton’s The Modern Reader’s Bible (1907); The Sunday School Teachers’ Bible (1875); The Variorum Reference Bible and Variorum Teachers’ Bible (1880); Weymouth’s New Testament in Modern Speech (1909); The Twentieth Century New Testament (Westcott and Hort’s text, 1904); S. Lloyd’s The Corrected English New Testament (Bagster, 1905).

LITERATURE.

Compare articles in the Bible Dicts., specially Sanday on "Bible," and Dobschutz on "The Bible in the Church," in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, II; Westcott, The Bible in the Church (1875); W. H. Bennett, A Primer of the Bible (1897); A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Divine Library of the Old Testament (1896); J. Eadie, The English Bible; works on Introduction (Driver, etc.); books mentioned above under "Helps"; B. B. Warfield in Princeton Theological Review (October, 1910); C. A. Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture (Scribners, 1899); W. H. Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament (Scribners, 1899); E. C. Bissell, The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure (Scribners, 1885); Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament.

James Orr

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

See CRITICISM OF BIBLE.

BIBLICAL DISCREPANCIES

<bib'-li-kal diskrep'-an-siz>.

See DISCREPANCIES, BIBLICAL.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

<bib'-li-kal the-ol'-o-ji>:

1. BIBLICAL THEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE.

1. Definition:

Biblical theology seems best defined as the doctrine of Biblical religion. As such it works up the material contained in the Old Testament and the New Testament as the product of exegetical study. This is the modern technical sense of the term, whereby it signifies a systematic representation of Biblical religion in its primitive form.

Biblical theology has sometimes been taken to signify not alone this science of the doctrinal declarations of the Scriptures, but the whole group of sciences Concerned with the interpretation and exposition of the

Scriptures. In that wider view of Biblical theology, the term exegetical theology has been used to define and include the group of sciences already referred to. But the whole weight of preference seems, in our view, to belong to the narrower use of the term Biblical theology, as more strictly scientific.

2. Relation to Dogmatics:

This is not to confound the science of Biblical theology with that of dogmatics, for their characters are sharply distinguished. The science of dogmatics is a historico-philosophical one; that of Biblical theology is purely historic. Dogmatics declares what, for religious faith, must be regarded as truth; Biblical theology only discovers what the writers of the Old Testament and the New Testament adduce as truth. This latter merely ascertains the contents of the ideas put forward by the sacred writers, but is not concerned with their correctness or verification. It is the what of truth, in these documentary authorities, Biblical theology seeks to attain. The why, or with what right, it is so put forward as truth, belongs to the other science, that of dogmatics.

3. Place and Method of Biblical Theology:

Biblical theology is thus the more objective science; it has no need of dogmatics; dogmatics, on the other hand, cannot be without the aid of Biblical theology. The Biblical theologian should be a Christian philosopher, an exegete, and, above all, a historian. For it is in a manner purely historical that Biblical theology seeks to investigate the teaching, in whole, of each of the sacred writers. Each writing it studies in itself, in its relation to the others, and in its place in history taken as a whole. Its method is historical-genetic. The proper place of Biblical theology is at the head of historical theology, where it shines as a center of light. Its ideal as a science is to present a clear, complete and comprehensive survey of the Biblical teachings.

4. Relation to Scientific Exegesis:

In pursuance of this end, Biblical theology is served by scientific exegesis, whose results it presents in ordered form so as to exhibit the organic unity and completeness of Biblical religion. The importance of Biblical theology lies in the way it directs, corrects and fructifies all moral and dogmatic theology by bringing it to the original founts of truth. Its spirit is one of impartial historical inquiry.

2. HISTORY OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

1. Its Rise in Scientific Form:

Biblical theology, in any truly scientific form, dates only from the 18th century. Offspring as it was of German rationalism, it has yet been found deserving of cultivation and scientific study by the most orthodox theology. Indeed, Pietism, too, urged its claims as Biblical dogma, over against the too scholastic dogma of orthodoxy.

2. Patristic and Scholastic Periods:

The Patristic theology, no doubt, was Biblical, and the Alexandrian School deserves special praise. The scholastic theology of the Middle Ages leaned on the Fathers rather than on the Bible. Biblical theology, in spirit, though not in form, found a revival at the Reformation. But this was early followed by a 17th century type of scholasticism, polemical and confessional.

3. Biblical Efforts in 17th and 18th Centuries:

Even in that century, however, efforts of a more purely Biblical character were not wanting, as witness those of Schmidt, Witsius and Vitranga. But throughout the entire 18th century there were manifest endeavors to throw off the scholastic yoke and return to Biblical simplicity. Haymann (1708), Busching (1756), Zachariae (1772) and Storr (1793), are examples of the efforts referred to. But it was from the rationalistic side that the first vindication of Biblical theology as a science of independent rank was made. This merit belonged to Gabler (1787), who urged a purely historical treatment of the Bible, and was, later, shared by his colleague, G. L. Bauer, who issued a Biblical Theology of the New Testament (Ger) in four parts (1800-1802). More independent still was the standpoint assumed by C. F. Ammon in his *Biblische Theologie* (2nd edition, 1801-2). Ammon does not fail to apprehend the historical character of our science, saying that Biblical theology should deal only with the “materials, fundamental ideas, and results of Biblical teaching, without troubling itself about the connection of the same, or weaving them into an artificial system.”

4. Old Testament Theology in First Half of 19th Century:

The influence of Schleiermacher was hardly a fortunate one, the Old Testament being sundered from the New Testament, and attention centered

on the latter. Kayser (1813) and, still more, DeWette, who died in 1850, pursued the perfecting of our science, particularly in matters of method. Continuers of the work were Baumgarten-Crusius (1828), Cramer (1830) and Colln, whose work was posthumously presented by D. Schulz in 1836. It was in the second quarter of the 19th century that the Biblical theology of the Old Testament began to receive the full attention it deserved. It has been declared the merit of Hegel's philosophy to have taught men to see, in the various Biblical systems of doctrine, a complete development, and Hegel did, no doubt, exert a fertilizing influence on historical inquiry. But it must also be said that the Hegelian philosophy affected Biblical theology in a prejudicial manner, as may be seen in Vatke's a priori construction of history and doctrine in his work, *Die bib. Theologie* (1835), and in Bruno Bauer's *Die Religion des AT* (1838-39), which disputed but did not improve upon Vatke. Steudel (1840), Oehler (1845) and Havernick (1848) are worthy of particularly honorable mention in this Old Testament connection. In his *Theology of the Old Testament* (3rd edition, 1891; American edition, 1883) G. F. Oehler excellently maintained the close connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament, which Hengstenberg had already emphasized in 1829.

5. New Testament Theology in the 19th Century:

The Biblical theology of the New Testament was furthered by the memorable Neander. In 1832, he first issued his *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, while his *Life of Jesus* first appeared in 1837. In this latter work, he summarized the doctrine of the Redeemer, while the former presented the doctrinal teaching of the apostolic writers in such wise as to show the different shades of thought peculiar to each of them, pointing out, at the same time, "how, notwithstanding all difference, there was an essential unity beneath, unless one is deceived by the form, and how the form in its diversity is easily explained." C. F. Schmid improved in some respects upon Neander's work in his excellent *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, issued (1853) after his death by Weizsacker (new edition, 1864). In Schmid's work, the Biblical theology of the New Testament is presented with objectivity, clearness and penetrating sympathy.

Hahn's *Theology of the New Testament* (1854) came short of doing justice to the diverse types of doctrinal development in the New Testament. The work of G. V. Lechler on the apostolic and post-apostolic age, was, in its improved form of 1857, much more important. E. Reuss, in 1852, issued

his valuable History of the Christian Theology of the Apostolic Age, a complete and critical work, but not sufficiently objective in its treatment. The Prelections on New Testament Theology of F. C. Baur, head of the Tubingen school, exemplify both the merits and the defects of the school. They are critical, independent and suggestive, but lacking in impartiality. They were published by his son after his death (1864). A new edition of these lectures on New Testament theology was issued by Pfleiderer in 1893.

Having first dealt with the teachings of Jesus, Baur then set out the materials of the New Testament theology in three periods, making Paul well-nigh the founder of Christianity. For him only four epistles of Paul were genuine products of the apostolic age, namely, Romans, the two Corinthians, Galatians, together with the Revelation. To the growth and history of the New Testament Baur applied the method of the Hegelian dialectic, and, though powerful and profound, displayed a lack of sane, well-balanced judgment. Yet so conservative a scholar as Weiss gave Baur the credit of having "first made it the problem of criticism to assign to each book of the New Testament its place in the history of the development of primitive Christianity, to determine the relations to which it owes its origin, the object at which it aims, and the views it represents." Among Baur's followers may be noted Pfleiderer, in his Paulinism (1873).

The Theology of the New Testament, by J. J. Van Oosterzee (English edition, 1870), is a serviceable book for students, and the New Testament Theology of A. Immer (1878), already

famous for his hermeneutical studies, is noteworthy. Chief among subsequent cultivators of the Biblical theology of the New Testament must be reckoned B. Weiss, whose work in two volumes (English edition, 1882-83) constitutes a most critical and complete, thorough and accurate treatment of the subject in all its details: W. Beyschlag, whose New Testament Theology (English edition, in 2 volumes, 1895) is also valuable; H. Holtzmann, whose treatise on New Testament Theology (1897) dealt in a critical fashion with the doctrinal contents of the New Testament. Holtzmann's learning and ability are great, but his work is marred by naturalistic presuppositions. The French work on Theology of the New Testament, by J. Boron (2 volumes, 1893-94) is marked by great independence, skill and fairness. The Theology of the New Testament, by W. F. Adeney (1894), and the yet more recent, and very attractively

written, work with the same title, by G. B. Stevens (1899), bring us pretty well up to the present state of our science in respect of the New Testament.

6. Old Testament Theology in Second Half of the 19th Century:

Coming back to the Biblical theology of the Old Testament in the second half of the 19th century, we find A. Klostermann's *Investigations into the Old Testament Theology*, which appeared in 1868. The Old Testament theology, no less than that of the New Testament, was set forth by that great scholar, H. Ewald, in four volumes (1871-75; English edition (first part), 1888). His interest in New Testament theology was due to his strong feeling that the New Testament is really the second part of the record of Israel's revelation. A. Kuenen dealt with the Religion of Israel in two volumes (English edition, 1874-75), writing nobly but with defective insight into, and comprehension of, the higher religious ideas of Israel. F. Hitzig's *Prelections* (1880) deal with theology of the Old Testament, as part of their contents. H. Schultz treated of the Old Testament Theology in two volumes (1st edition, 1869; 5th edition, 1896; English edition, 1892), in a careful, mainly just, and, by comparison, well-balanced handling of the development of its religious ideas.

We have not touched upon writers like Smend, for example, in his *History of Old Testament Religion* (1893), and J. Robertson, in his *Early Religion of Israel* (2nd edition, 1892), who treat of the Biblical theology of the Old Testament only in a way subsidiary to the consideration of the historico-critical problems. The Conception of Revelation in the Old Testament was dealt with by F. E. Konig in 1882 in a careful and comprehensive manner, and with regard to the order and relation of the documents, revelation in Israel being taken by him in a supranaturalistic sense. Significant also for the progress of Old Testament Biblical theology was *The Theological and the Historical View of the Old Testament*, by C. Siegfried (1890), who insisted on the development of the higher religion of Israel being studied from the elder prophets as starting-point, instead of the law.

Mention should be made of *Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods and History*, by C. A. Briggs (1883; 4th edition, 1891); of the important *Compendium of the Biblical Theology of the Old and the New Testament* by K. Schlottmann (1889); of E. Riehm's valuable *Old Testament Theology* (1889); and of G. Dalman's *Studies in Biblical Theology* — the Divine name and its history — in 1889. Also, of the *Old Testament*

Theology of A. Duff (1891); A. Dillmann's Handbook of Old Testament Theology, edited by Kittel (189:5); and of Marti's edition of the Theology of the Old Testament of A. Kayser (3rd edition, 1897).

Of Theology of the Old Testament, by A. B. Davidson (1904), it may be said that it does full justice to the idea of a progressive development of doctrine in the Old Testament, and is certainly divergent from the view of those who, like Cheyne, treat the Old Testament writings as so many fragments, from which no theology can be extracted. Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, by B. Stade (1905), is the work of a distinguished representative of the modern critical views, already famous for his work on the history of Israel (1887). The Theology of the Old Testament by W. H. Bennett (1906) is a clear and useful compendium of the subject.

7. Bearings of Criticism on Old Testament Theology:

Recent works like The Problem of the Old Testament by James Orr (1905), Old Testament Critics by Thomas Whitelaw (1903), and Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, by Harold M. Wiener (1909), deal with the critical questions, and do not concern us here, save to remark that they are not without bearing, in their results, upon theology of the Old Testament. Such results are, e.g. the insistences, in Orr's work, on the unity of the Old Testament, the higher than naturalistic view of Israel's religious development, the discriminate use of Divine names like Elohim and Yahweh, and so forth; and the express contention in Whitelaw's work, that the critical hypotheses are not such as can yield "a philosophically reasonable theology" (p. 346). Indeed, it must not be supposed that even works, like that of S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (first issued in 1891), are without resultant influence on Biblical theology.

So far from that, the truth is that there is probably no result of the readjustment of the history and literature of the Old Testament so important as its bearings on the Biblical theology of the Old Testament. For the order and the method of revelation are most surely involved in the order and relation of the books or documents, and the course of the history. The progress of the revelation ran parallel with the work of God in Nature and in the growth of human society. Hence, the reconstruction of the historical theology of the Old Testament will take much time and study, that the full value of the Old Testament may be brought out as that of an independent and permanent revelation, with characteristic truths of its own.

Meantime, the reality of that revelation, and the teleological character of the Old Testament, have been brought out, in the most signal manner, by theological scholars like Dorner, Dillmann, Kittel, Kautsch, Schultz and others, who feel the inadequacy of natural development or “human reflection” to account for Old Testament theology, and the immediacy of God’s contact with man in Old Testament times to be alone sufficient to account for a revelation so weighty, organically connected, dynamically bound together, monotheistic and progressive.

3. DIVISIONS OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

1. Divergent Views of Old Testament Divisions:

The divisions of Old Testament theology are matters of grave difficulty. For the newer criticism has practically transformed that mode of representing the process of Israel’s religious development, which had been customary or traditional. On this latter view, the Patriarchal Age was succeeded by the Mosaic Age, with its law-giving under Moses, followed, after an intercalated period of Judges and monarchy, by the splendid Age of Prophecy. Then there was the Exile preparing the way, after the Return, for the new theocracy, wherein the Law of Moses was sought with more persistent endeavor, though not without darkly legalistic result. Such were the historic bases for Old Testament theology, but the modifications proposed by the new criticism are sufficiently serious. These it will be necessary to indicate, without going beyond the scope of this article and attempting criticism of either the one view or the other. It is the more necessary to do so, that finality has not been reached by criticism. We are only concerned with the difference which these divergent views make for Old Testament Biblical theology, whose reconstruction is very far from perfected.

2. Law and Prophecy:

That they do mean serious difference has been indicated in the historical part of this article. Most obtrusive of these differences is the proposal to invert the order of law and prophecy, and speak rather of the Prophets and the Law. For the Law is, on the newer view, taken to belong to the post-prophetic period — in short, to the period of the return from the Exile, whereas, in the traditional scheme of the order of revelation, the Law was found in full force both at the Exodus and the Return, with a dead-letter period between. The garment of legalism, the newer criticism asserts, could

not have suited the Israelite nation in its early and undeveloped stage, as it does after the teachings of the prophets and the discipline of the Exile. Against this, the older scheme prefers the objection that an external and legalistic system is made the outcome of the lofty spiritual teaching of the prophets; the letter appears super-imposed upon the spirit. Criticism, however, postulates for the ritual codes of the Pentateuch an influence parallel in time with that of prophetism.

3. Primal Prophetism and Final Judaism:

Besides the adjustments of prophecy and law just referred to, the critical views postulate a primal period in which the religion of the prophets, with their view of Israel's vocation, was inculcated; also, a final period of Judaism, intercalated between the Return and the Maccabees, in which are seen at work the Levitical law, and various anti-legal tendencies. It must be obvious that attempts to integrate the Old Testament theology amid the prevailing uncertainties of criticism must be far from easy or final, even if the need and importance be felt of keeping the religious interest before even the historical in Old Testament study. For the Old Testament writers, religion was primary, history secondary and incidental, we may well believe.

4. Place of Mosaism:

We must be content to know less of the remote beginnings and initial stages of Israel's religious development, for, as A. B. Davidson remarked, "in matters like this we never can get at the beginning." J. Robertson deems criticism wrong in not allowing "a sufficient starting-point for the development," by which he means that pure prophetic religion needs "a pure pre-prophetic religion" to explain its more than "germinal or elementary character." It may be noted, too, how much greater place and importance are attached to Mosaism or Moses by critics like Reuss, Schultz, Bredenkamp and Strack, than by Wellhausen, who yet allows a certain substratum of actual and historical fact.

5. Nature of Israel's Religious Development:

It may be observed, further, that no one is under any compulsion to account for such a transformation, as even Wellhausen allows, in the slow growth from very low beginnings of the idea of Yahweh up to pure and perfect monotheism — among a non-metaphysical people — by the simple supposition of naturalistic theory. Evolutionary the critical hypothesis of

the religious development of Israel may be, but that development was clearly not so exclusively controlled by human elements or factors as to exclude the presence of supernatural energy or power of revelation. It had God within it — had, in Dorner's phrase, "teleology as its soul." Thus, as even Gunkel declares, "Israel is, and remains, the people of revelation." This is why Israel was able to make — despite all retrograde tendencies — rectilinear progress toward a predestined goal — the goal of being what Ewald styled a "purely immortal and spiritual Israel." Old Testament theology does not seem to have sufficiently realized that the Old Testament really presents us with theologies rather than a theology — with the progressive development of a religion rather than with theological ideas resting on one historic plane.

LITERATURE.

I. Old Testament Literature:

B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des A T*, 1905; H. Schultz, *A T Theologie*, 5th edition, 1896; English edition, 1892; H. Ewald, *Revelation: Its Nature and Record*, English edition, 1884; G F. Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, English edition, 1874; A. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State*, English edition, 1875; E. Riehm, *AT Theologie*, 1889; S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 1st edition, 1891, A. B. Davidson, *Theology the Old Testament*, 1904; J. Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, 1905; A. Duff, *Old Testament Theology*, 1891; J. Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, 2nd edition, 1892; W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, new edition, 1892; W. H. Bennett; *The Theology of the Old Testament*, 1896; T. K. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, 1893; T. Whitelaw, *Old Testament Critics*, 1903; W. G. Jordan, *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought*, 1909; H. M. Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, 1909; E. C. Bissell, *The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure*, 1885; D. K. V. Orelli, *The Old Testament Prophecy*, Amer. edition, 1885, English edition, 1893; B. Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, 1875; E. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, 2nd English edition, 1891; C. I. Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Propheten*, 1881; W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1882; D. K. Schlottmann, *Kompendium der biblischen Theologie des A. u. N. Testaments*, 1889; A. T. Kirkpatrick, *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, 1891; J. Lindsay, *The Significance of the*

Old Testament for Modern Theology, 1896; R. Kittel, Scientific Study of the Old Testament, English edition, 1910.

II. New Testament Literature:

W. Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, 2nd edition, 1896; English edition, 1895; H. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der N T Theologie, 1897; B. Weiss, Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des New Testament, 7th edition, 1903; English edition, 1883; J. J. V. Oosterzee, Die Theologie des New Testament, 2nd edition, 1886; English edition, 1870; J. Boron, Theologie du Nouveau Testament, 1893-94; C. F. Schmid, Biblische Theologie des New Testament, new edition, 1864; G. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, 1899; F. C. Baur, Vorlesungen über New Testament Theologie, 1864; W. F. Adeney, The Theology of the New Testament, 1894; A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 1897; E. Reuss, History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, English edition, 1872; H. H. Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, English edition, 1892; A. B. Bruce, The Kingdom of God, 1890; J. Moorhouse, The Teaching of Christ, 1891; O. Pfleiderer, Der Paulinismus, 2nd edition, 1890; 2nd English edition, 1891; A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, English edition, 1891; G. B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, 2nd edition, 1897; G. Matheson, The Spiritual Development of Paul, 1890; E. Riehm, Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs, 1867; B. Weiss, Der petrinische Lehrbegriff, 1855; G. B. Stevens, The Johannine Theology, 1894; B. Weiss, Der johanneische Lehrbegriff in seinen Grundzügen untersucht, 1862.

James Lindsay

BICHRI

<bik'-ri> (yrkḇi[bikhri], “first born”; compare HPN, 88, 102): Father of Sheba who rebelled against David. Bichri is of the house of Benjamin and the word probably means a “descendant of Becher” (~~<im>~~2 Samuel 20:1 ff). Compare *BECHER* 1.

BID

Variously signifying, according to six Hebrew and as many Greek originals:

(1) “to command” (~~<0440>~~ Numbers 14:10; ~~<0024>~~ Matthew 1:24 the King James Version, [*προσάτω*, prostasso]);

(2) “to prescribe” or “order” (~~<B12>~~ John 2:2);

(3) “to consecrate,” and so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (Zeph 1:7; compare ~~<B16>~~ 1 Samuel 16:5);

(4) [ειπον, eipon], “to say” or “tell” (~~<B12>~~ Matthew 16:12);

(5) “to call” i.e. “invite” ([καλέω, kaleo]), conspicuously used in this sense in Christ’s parables of the Marriage Feast (~~<B18>~~ Matthew 22:3-9) and of the Great Supper (~~<B17>~~ Luke 14:7-24);

(6) “to take leave of,” [ἀποτάττω, appotasso] (~~<B16>~~ Luke 9:61).

BIDDEN

~~<bid’-n>~~: “Called,” “invited” (~~<B16>~~ 1 Samuel 9:13).

BIDE

~~<bid>~~: A variant of “abide” (which see); is the rendering of [περιμένω, perimeno], in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:12 (the Revised Version (British and American) “they shall wait for me”). In ~~<B17>~~ Acts 1:4 the same word is translated “wait for.”

BIDKAR

~~<bid’-kar>~~ (rq” d” Bi[bidhqar]; “son of Deker” (?); compare HPN, 69): A captain in the service of Jehu, formerly his fellow-officer (~~<B19>~~ 2 Kings 9:25).

BIER

~~<ber>~~:

(1) Found in the Old Testament only in ~~<B18>~~ 2 Samuel 3:31, “and king David followed the bier”; and in the New Testament in ~~<B17>~~ Luke 7:14, “and he (Jesus) came nigh and touched the bier.” The Hebrew word rendered “bier” ([miTTah]) and its Greek equivalent ([soros]) mean strictly “coffin.” The so-called “bier” among the ancient Hebrews was simply an open coffin or a flat wooden frame, on which the body of the dead was carried from the house to the grave.

(2) Closed coffins, so universal now in the West, were unknown to common usage among the Hebrews of olden times, though not unknown to Egyptians, Greeks and Romans.

At the burial of Abner the people were commanded to “rend their clothes” and “gird themselves with sackcloth,” and the king himself in token of his grief and royal regard, “followed the bier” in the procession to the grave (~~<big>~~2 Samuel 3:31).

(3) Of Jesus, when He met the procession that went out of the gate of the city of Nain, bearing to the grave the only son of the widowed mother, Luke says, “When the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her and he came nigh and touched the bier,” and commanded the young man to arise, etc. We should recall that contact with a dead body was forbidden by the law as a source of defilement (~~<big>~~Numbers 19:11 f); so Jesus here “came nigh” and “touched the bier” only in raising the young man, thus avoiding any criticism for infraction of the law. In ~~<big>~~John 11:35, as here, we have a miracle of Jesus which clearly pointed to a higher law — the eternal law of compassion which received its first full expression in the life of Jesus and forms one of the distinctive features of the gospel.

George B. Eager

BIGTHA

~~<big>~~*-tha* (<big>[bighetha’]; Septuagint [~~<big>~~Βαραζί, Barazi]; Codex Vaticanus, [~~<big>~~Βαραζή, Boraze]; Codex Alexandrinus, [~~<big>~~αρεβώ, Oareboa]): One of the seven eunuchs or chamberlains having charge of the harem of King Xerxes (“Ahasuerus”) and commanded to bring Vashti to the king’s banquet (Est 1:10).

BIGTHAN; BIGTHANA

~~<big>~~*-than* <big>*-tha’-na* (<big>[bighethan], <big>[bighethana’]; Septuagint omits name): One of the two chamberlains or eunuchs of Xerxes (“Ahasuerus”) who conspired against the king’s life, the conspiracy being detected by Mordecai and the culprits hanged (Est 2:21). Possibly these men had been partially superseded by the degradation of Vashti and were thus prompted to take revenge on Xerxes.

BIGVAI

<big'-va-i> (ywǵḄi[bighway]; [Βαογεί, Baogei], [Βαγούά, Bagoua]):

- (1) The head of one of the families who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<812D>}Ezra 2:2; ^{<810D>}Nehemiah 7:7), having a large number of his retainers (2,056, according to ^{<8124>}Ezra 2:14; 2,067, according to ^{<817D>}Nehemiah 7:19), besides 72 males later under Ezra (8:14).
- (2) One of those who subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (10:16).

BIKATH-AVEN

<bik-ath-a'-ven> (ˆwaʾAt [ḳḄi[biq`ath 'awen], “valley of vanity” (Amos 1:5 King James Version, margin)).

See *AVEN*; *BETH-EDEN*.

BILDAD

<bil'-dad> (dDl Ḅi[bildadh], “Bel has loved”): The second of the three friends of Job who, coming from distant regions, make an appointment together to condole with and comfort him in his affliction (^{<812D>}Job 2:11). He is from Shuah, an unknown place somewhere in the countries East and Southeast of Palestine (or the designation Shuhite may be intended to refer to his ancestor Shuah, one of Abraham’s sons by Keturah, ^{<812D>}Genesis 25:2), and from his name (compounded with Bel, the name of a Babylonian deity) would seem to represent the wisdom of the distant East. His three speeches are contained in Job 8; 18 and 25. For substance they are largely an echo of what Eliphaz has maintained, but charged with somewhat increased vehemence (compare 8:2; 18:3,4) because he deems Job’s words so impious and wrathful. He is the first to attribute Job’s calamity to actual wickedness; but he gets at it indirectly by accusing his children (who were destroyed, 1:19) of sin to warrant their punishment (8:4). For his contribution to the discussion he appeals to tradition (8:8-10), and taking Eliphaz’ cue of cause and effect (8:11) he gives, evidently from the literary stores of wisdom, a description of the precarious state of the wicked, to which he contrasts, with whatever implication it involves, the felicitous state of the righteous (8:11-22). His second speech is an intensified description of the wicked man’s woes, made as if to match Job’s

description of his own desperate case (compare 18:5-21 with 16:6-22), thus tacitly identifying Job with the reprobate wicked. His third speech (Job 25), which is the last utterance of the friends, is brief, subdued in tone, and for substance is a kind of Parthian shot, reiterating Eliphaz' depravity idea, the doctrine that dies hardest. This speech marks the final silencing of the friends.

John Franklin Genung

BILEAM

<bil'-e-am> (μ[ι] Βί[bil'am]; [Ιβλαόμ, Iblaam]): A town in the territory of Manasseh assigned to the Kohathite Levites (^{<1360>}1 Chronicles 6:70), probably the same as Ibleam (^{<1371>}Joshua 17:11, etc.), and identical with the modern [Bel'ameh], half a mile South of Jenin.

BILGAH; BILGAI

<bil'-ga> <bil'-ga-i> (hגל Βί[bilgah]; yגל Βί[bilgay], "cheerfulness"): A priest or priestly family in the time of the Return (^{<1375>}Nehemiah 12:5), and (under the form of "Bilgai," ^{<1308>}Nehemiah 10:8) in the time of Nehemiah. According to ^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 24:14, Bilgah is the 15th of the 24 divisions of the priests who officiated in the Temple. In the Septuagint, the names read [Βελγάι, Belgai], [Belga] and [Balgas]. The traditional explanation of the name is "rejuvenation"; modern exegetes explain it as "cheerfulness."

BILHAH (1)

<bil'-ha> (person) (hh[ι] Βί[bilbah]; [Βαλλά, Balla]): A slave girl whom Laban gave to Rachel (^{<1329>}Genesis 29:29), and whom the latter gave to Jacob as a concubine (^{<1308>}Genesis 30:3,4); the mother of Daniel and Naphtali (^{<1314>}Genesis 30:4,7; 35:25; 46:25; ^{<1371>}1 Chronicles 7:13); guilty of incest with Reuben (^{<1352>}Genesis 35:22).

BILHAH (2)

<bil'-ha> (place) (hh[ι] Βί[bilbah]; Codex Alexandrinus, [Βαλαά, Balaa]; Codex Vaticanus, [βελλά, Abella]): A city in Simeon (^{<1349>}1 Chronicles

4:29) = Baalah (^{<1659>}Joshua 15:29), Balah (^{<1698>}Joshua 19:3), and Baalath (^{<1694>}Joshua 19:44). Unidentified.

BILHAN (3)

<bil'-han> (ʿhl Bi[bilhan]; [Βαλαάν, Balaan]) :

(1) A Horite chief, son of Ezer (^{<1657>}Genesis 36:27; ^{<1344>}1 Chronicles 1:42).

(2) A descendant of Benjamin, son of Jediael, father of seven sons who were heads of houses in their tribes (^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 7:10).

BILL, BOND, ETC.

(1) In the parable of the Unjust Steward (^{<2166>}Luke 16:6 f) “bill,” the King James Version, better “bond,” the Revised Version (British and American), is used to translate the Greek [*grammata*], which is the equivalent of the contemporary Hebrew legal term [sheTar], “writing.” This “writing,” in the usage of the times, was an acknowledgment of the taking over or receiving of goods or money that had to be written and signed by the debtor himself. (See [Babha’ Bathra’] ^{<2108>}Luke 10:8.) Edersheim’s averment that the Greek word was adopted into the Hebrew (Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 272), is based, according to competent textual critics, upon a false reading. The Greek, according to Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, is [*ta grammata*], not [*to grammar*] (Textus Receptus of the New Testament). The word is indefinite, literally “the letter,” and determines nothing involved in controversy.

(2) A question much discussed is, Was “the bond” (the Revised Version (British and American)) merely an acknowledgment of debt, or was it an obligation to pay a fixed annual rental from the produce of a farm? Edersheim, for instance, holds the former view, Lightfoot the latter. That the obligation is stated in the parable in kind — wheat and oil — and not in money — seems to bear against the simple debt theory. Edersheim sets down the remissions spoken of as authorized by the steward as amounting in money value to only about 5 British pounds and 25 British pounds respectively, and thinks they represented not a single but an annual payment (compare Kennedy, 1-vol HDB, and Fraser, DCG, article “Bill”).

(3) Still another question has arisen: Was the old “bond” simply altered, or was a new one substituted for it? Here again Lightfoot and Edersheim are in the controversy and on opposite sides. The alteration of the old bond is suggested though not demanded by the language here, and, moreover, would be, Edersheim thinks, in accordance with the probabilities of the case. Such bonds were usually written, not on vellum or papyrus, but on wax-covered tablets, and so could be easily erased or altered by the stylus with its fiat, thick “eraser” ([mocheq]).

(4) It is probably safe to conclude:

(a) that the “bill” or “bond” had to be written and signed by the person assuming the obligation;

(b) that it was the only formal or legal evidence of the debt incurred; and

(c) that the supervision of the whole transaction belonged of right to “the steward.” Should “the steward” conspire with the debtor against the master, the latter, it would appear, would have no check against the fraud.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrew, edition L. and T., II, 268-73; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 272 ff; crit. commentary in the place cited.

George B. Eager

BILL OF DIVORCEMENT

<di-vors'-ment>.

See *DIVORCE IN OLD TESTAMENT*.

BILLOW

<bil'-o> (I G'[gal], “a great rolling wave”): Figuratively, of trouble, “All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me” (~~<bil'>~~ Psalm 42:7; compare Jon 2:3).

BILSHAN

<bil'-shan> (**^v** | **Bi**[bilshan]): An Israelite who returned with Zerubbabel (**<1312>** Ezra 2:2 = **<1002>** Nehemiah 7:7). The name may be explained as “inquirer” (new Hebrew and Aramaic), **ç** | **b** [balash], the **b** (“b”) being an abbreviation of **^B**, [ben], as in **r q**” **d**” **Bi**[bidhqar], and **l h m Bi** [bimhal]. Bilshan would then be a compound of **^B**, [ben], and **^wOI** ; [lashon]. J. Halevy (Revue etudes juives, X, 3) translates the name “pere de la langue,” [’abh lashon]. In 1 Esdras 5:8, he is called “Beelsarus,” which is akin to the form “Belshar” = “Belshar-uccur” or “O Bel, protect the king.” Bilshan points to “Belsun,” “his lord.” The rabbis take Bilshan as a surname to the preceding Mordecai.

H. J. Wolf

BIMHAL

<bim'-hal> (**l h m Bi**[bimhal]): A descendant of Asher (**<1373>** 1 Chronicles 7:33).

BIND; BOUND

<bind> ([**ðéw**, deo]): There are a number of Hebrew words used to express this word in its various meanings, [’alam] (**<1372>** Genesis 37:7), [’acar] (42:24), [qashar] (**<1018>** Deuteronomy 6:8). It sometimes means “to attach,” “to fasten” (**<1238>** Exodus 28:28; **<1642>** Deuteronomy 14:25). It was used also with reference to an agreement in a judicial sense (**<1012>** Numbers 30:2,3), or to make one a prisoner (**<17610>** Judges 16:10; **<1498>** Psalm 149:8). It means also “to control” (**<1831>** Job 38:31).

Figurative: In a figurative sense, to bind heavy and burdensome (extra) so-called religious duties on men (**<1234>** Matthew 23:4). This figurative use of the word in **<1619>** Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 has given special interest to it. Necessarily certain powers for administration must be conferred on this company of men to carry out the purpose of Christ. That this power was not conferred on Peter alone is evident from the fact that in **<1018>** Matthew 18:18 it is conferred on all the apostles. The use of the word in the New Testament is to declare a thing to be binding or obligatory (**<1013>** John 20:23). In this sense this authority is used by some denominations in the service in

preparation for the Lord's Supper, in which after the confession of sin by the people the ministers say, "I declare to you who have sincerely repented of your sins and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ the entire forgiveness of your sins." This statement is followed by the further declaration that if any have not so repented God will not forgive them, but will retain them and call them to account. The claim of the church of Rome that these statements of our Lord confer on the priests and bishops, or primarily on the pope, the power to retain or forgive sins, is without historical validity and does violence to the Scriptures.

See AUTHORITY; FORGIVENESS; PETER.

Jacob W. Kapp

BINEA

<bin'-e-a> (h[n]Bi[bin`ah]): A name in the genealogy of Benjamin (^{<1387>}1 Chronicles 8:37: = 9:43).

BINNUI

<bin'-u-i> (yWNBi[binnuy], a proper name, "a building up"):

(1) A Levite, living in the time of Ezra (^{<1383>}Ezra 8:33; ^{<1609>}Nehemiah 10:9; 12:8).

(2) One of the [bene Pachath-mo'abh] who had taken foreign wives (^{<1509>}Ezra 10:30 — Balnuus of 1 Esdras 9:31) and one of the [bene Bani] (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:38) who had also intermarried.

(3) The son of Henadad, who built part of the wall of Jerusalem (^{<1624>}Nehemiah 3:24), and sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1609>}Nehemiah 10:9). In all probability he is identical with "Bavvai, the son of Henadad" mentioned in ^{<1618>}Nehemiah 3:18. "Bavvai" is either a corruption of "Binnui," or is the name of the Levitical house of which Bavvai was the chief representative. Binnui is mentioned in ^{<1609>}Nehemiah 10:9 as a leading Levite, and, besides, the names in these verses are obviously those of priests and Levites; so the former theory is probably correct.

(4) Head of a family who returned with Zerubbabel (^{<1675>}Nehemiah 7:15; ^{<1820>}Ezra 2:10).

BIRD-CATCHER

<burd'-kach-er>

See *FOWLER*.

BIRDS

<burds> (ḥy [ˈayiT]; Greek variously [τὰ πετεινά, ta peteina] (^{<1134>}Matthew 13:4) [τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ta ornea tou ouranou] (^{<6917>}Revelation 19:17) [ὄρνις, ornis] (^{<4237>}Matthew 23:37; ^{<2134>}Luke 13:34) Latin, avis; Old English “brid”):

1. MEANING OF THE WORD.

All authorities agree that the exact origin of the word bird, as we apply it to feathered creatures, is unknown.

1. In Early Hebrew:

The Hebrew [ˈayiT] means to “tear and scratch the face,” and in its original form undoubtedly applied to birds of prey. It is probable that no spot of equal size on the face of the globe ever collected such numbers of vultures, eagles and hawks as ancient Palestine. The land was so luxuriant that flocks and herds fed from the face of Nature. In cities, villages, and among tent-dwellers incessant slaughter went on for food, while the heavens must almost have been obscured by the ascending smoke from the burning of sacrificed animals and birds, required by law of every man and woman. From all these slain creatures the offal was thrown to the birds. There were no guns; the arrows of bowmen or “throw sticks” were the only protection against them, and these arms made no noise to frighten feathered creatures, and did small damage. So it easily can be seen that the birds would increase in large numbers and become so bold that men were often in actual conflict with them, and no doubt their faces and hands were torn and scratched.

2. In Later Usage:

Later, as birds of song and those useful for food came into their lives, the word was stretched to cover all feathered creatures. In the King James Version [ˈayiT] is translated “fowl,” and occurs several times: “And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away”

(~~<0151>~~ Genesis 15:11). “They shall be left together unto the fowls of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth; and the fowls shall summer upon them, and all the beasts of the earth shall winter upon them” (~~<2816>~~ Isaiah 18:6). “There is a path which no fowl knoweth, and which the vulture’s eye hath not seen” (~~<8387>~~ Job 28:7). The American Standard Revised Version changes these and all other references to feathered creatures to “birds,” making a long list. The Hebrew [ʿayiT] in its final acceptance was used in Palestine as “bird” is with us.

3. In Old English:

Our earliest known form of the word is the Old English “brid,” but they applied the term to the young of any creature. Later its meaning was narrowed to young produced from eggs, and the form changed to “bird.”

2. NATURAL HISTORY OF BIRDS.

The first known traces of birds appear in the formation of the Triassic period, and are found in the shape of footprints on the red sandstone of the Connecticut valley.

1. Earliest Traces and Specimens:

This must have been an ancient sea bed over which stalked large birds, leaving deeply imprinted impressions of their feet. These impressions baked in the sun, and were drifted full of fine wind-driven sand before the return of the tide. Thus were preserved to us the traces of 33 species of birds all of which are proven by their footprints to have been much larger than our birds of today. The largest impressions ever found measured 15 inches in length by 10 in width, and were set from 4 to 6 ft. apart. This evidence would form the basis for an estimate of a bird at least four times as large as an ostrich. That a bird of this size ever existed was not given credence until the finding of the remains of the *dinornis* in New Zealand. The largest specimen of this bird stood 10 1/2 ft. in height. The first complete skeleton of a bird was found in the limestone of the Jurassic period in Solenhofen, Bavaria. This bird had 13 teeth above and 3 below, each set in a separate socket, wings ending in three-fingered claws much longer than the claws of the feet, and a tail of 20 vertebrae, as long as the body, having a row of long feathers down each side of it, the specimen close to the size of a crow. The first preserved likeness of a bird was found frescoed on the inside of a tomb of Maydoon, and is supposed to antedate the time of Moses 3,000

years. It is now carefully preserved in the museum of Cairo. The painting represents six geese, four of which can be recognized readily as the ancestors of two species known today. Scientists now admit that Moses was right in assigning the origin of birds to the water, as their structure is closer reptilian than mammalian, and they reproduce by eggs. To us it seems a long stretch between the reptile with a frame most nearly bird-like and a feathered creature, but there is a possibility that forms making closer connection yet will be found.

2. Structural Formation:

The trunk of a bird is compact and in almost all instances boat-shaped. Without doubt prehistoric man conceived his idea of navigation and fashioned his vessel from the body of a water bird, and then noticed that a soaring bird steered its course with its tail and so added the rudder. The structural formation of a bird is so arranged as to give powerful flight and perfect respiration. In the case of a few birds that do not fly, the wings are beaten to assist in attaining speed in running, as the ostrich, or to help in swimming under the water, as the auk. The skull of a young bird is made up of parts, as is that of man or animal; but with age these parts join so evenly that they appear in a seamless formation. The jaws extend beyond the face, forming a bill that varies in length and shape with species, and it is used in securing food, in defense, feather dressing, nest building — in fact it is a combination of the mouth and hand of man. The spine is practically immovable, because of the ribs attached to the upper half and the bony structure supporting the pelvic joints of the lower. In sharp contrast with this the neck is formed of from 10 to 23 vertebrae, and is so flexible that a bird can turn its head completely around, a thing impossible to man or beast. The breast bone is large, strong, and provided with a ridge in the middle, largest in birds of strong flight, smallest in swimmers, and lacking only in birds that do not fly, as the ostrich. The wings correspond to the arms of man, and are now used in flight and swimming only. Such skeletons as the *Archeopteryx* prove that the bones now combined in the tip of the wing were once claws. This shows that as birds spread over land and developed wing power in searching longer distances for food or when driven by varying conditions of climate, the wings were used more in flight, and the claws gradually joined in a tip and were given covering that grew feathers, while the bill became the instrument for taking food and for defense. At the same time the long tail proving an encumbrance, it gradually wore away and contracted to the present form. Studied in detail

of bony structure, muscle, and complicated arrangement of feathers of differing sizes, the wing of a bird proves one of Nature's marvels. The legs are used in walking or swimming, the thigh joint being so enveloped in the body that the true leg is often mistaken for it. This makes the knee of a man correspond to the heel of a bird, and in young birds of prey especially, the shank or tarsus is used in walking, until the bones harden and the birds are enabled to bear their weight on the feet and straighten the shank. The toes vary with species. Pliny classified birds by them: "The first and principal difference and distinction in birds is taken from their feet; for they have either hooked talons, as Hawkes, or long round claws as Hens, or else they be broad, flat and whole-footed as Geese." Flight is only possible to a bird when both wings are so nearly full-feathered that it balances perfectly. In sleep almost every bird places its head under its wing and stands on one foot. The arrangement by which this is accomplished, without tiring the bird in the least, is little short of miraculous and can be the result only of slow ages of evolution. In the most finished degree this provision for the comfort of the bird is found among cranes and other long-legged water birds. The bone of one part of the leg fits into the bone of the part above, so that it is practically locked into place with no exertion on the part of the bird. At the same time the muscles that work the claws, cross the joints of the leg so that they are stretched by the weight of the bird, and with no effort, it stands on earth or perches on a branch. This explains the question so frequently asked as to why the feet of a perching bird do not become so cramped and tired that it falls.

3. Birds' Food, Blood, etc.:

Birds feed according to their nature, some on prey taken alive, some on the carrion of dead bodies, some on fish and vegetable products of the water, some on fruit seed, insects and worms of the land. Almost every bird indulges in a combination of differing foods. Their blood is from 12 degrees to 16 degrees warmer than that of the rest of the animal kingdom, and they exhibit a corresponding exhilaration of spirits. Some indulge in hours of sailing and soaring, some in bubbling notes of song, while others dart near earth in playful dashes of flight. Birds are supposed to be rather deficient in the senses of taste and touch, and to have unusually keen vision. They reproduce by eggs that they deposit in a previously selected and prepared spot, and brood for a length of time varying with the species. The young of birds of prey, song birds, and some water birds, remain in the nests for differing lengths of time and are fed by the old birds; while others

of the water birds and most of the game birds leave the nest as soon as the down is dry, and find food as they are taught by their elders, being sheltered at night so long as needful.

3. BIRDS OF THE BIBLE.

The birds of the Bible were the same species and form as exist in Palestine today. Because of their wonderful coloring, powerful flight, joyous song, and their similarity to humanity in home-making and the business of raising their young, birds have been given much attention, and have held conspicuous place since the dawn of history. When the brain of man was young and more credulous than today he saw omens, signs and miracles in the characteristic acts of birds, and attributed to them various marvelous powers: some were considered of good omen and a blessing, and some were bad and a curse.

1. Earliest Mention:

The historians of the Bible frequently used birds in comparison, simile, and metaphor. They are first mentioned in ^{<0074>}Genesis 7:14,15, "They, and every beast after its kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and every bird after its kind, every bird of every sort." This is the enumeration of the feathered creatures taken into the ark to be preserved for the perpetuation of species after the flood abated. They are next found in the description of the sacrifice of Abram, where it was specified that he was to use, with the animals slaughtered, a turtle dove and a young pigeon, the birds not to be divided. It is also recorded that the birds of prey were attracted by the carcasses as described in ^{<0159>}Genesis 15:9-11, "And he said unto him, Take me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon. And he took him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each half over against the other: but the birds divided he not. And the birds of prey came down upon the carcasses, and Abram drove them away." Palestine abounded in several varieties of "doves" (which see) and their devotion to each other, and tender, gentle characteristics had marked them as a loved possession of the land; while the clay cotes of pigeons were reckoned in establishing an estimate of a man's wealth.

2. Used in Sacrifice:

In an abandon of gratitude to God these people offered of their best-loved and most prized possessions as sacrifice; and so it is not surprising to find the history of burnt offerings frequently mentioning these birds which were loved and prized above all others. Their use is first commanded in ~~<BR14>~~Leviticus 1:14-17, “And if his oblation to Yahweh be a burnt-offering of birds, then he shall offer his oblation of turtle-doves, or of young pigeons. And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off its head , and burn it on the altar; and the blood thereof shall be drained out on the side of the altar; and he shall take away its crop with the filth thereof, and cast it beside the altar on the east part, in the place of the ashes.” Again in ~~<BR15>~~Leviticus 5:7-10, we read: “And if his means suffice not for a lamb, then he shall bring his trespass-offering for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, unto Yahweh; one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering.” Throughout the Bible these birds figure in the history of sacrifice (~~<BR18>~~Leviticus 12:8; 14:4-8; ~~<BR19>~~Numbers 6:10, etc.).

3. Other References:

The custom of weaving cages of willow wands, in which to confine birds for pets, seems to be referred to when Job asks (41:5):

“Wilt thou play with him as with a bird? Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?” See ~~<BR17>~~Job 12:7:

“But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; And the birds of the heavens, and they shall tell thee.”

David was thinking of the swift homeward flight of an eagle when he wrote:

“In Yahweh do I take refuge: How say ye to my soul, Flee as a bird to your mountain?” (~~<BR100>~~Psalm 11:1).

His early days guarding the flocks of his father no doubt suggested to him the statement found in ~~<BR11>~~Psalm 50:11:

“I know all the birds of the mountains;
And the wild beasts of the field are mine”

(the Revised Version margin, “in my mind”).

In describing Lebanon, the Psalmist wrote of its waters:

“By them the birds of the heavens have their habitation; They sing among the branches” (^{<19412>}Psalm 104:12).

He mentioned its trees:

“Where the birds make their nests:
As for the stork, the fir-trees are her house” (^{<19417>}Psalm 104:17).

See also ^{<19827>}Psalm 78:27; 148:10.

The origin of the oft-quoted phrase, “A little bird told me,” can be found in ^{<2110>}Ecclesiastes 10:20: “Revile not the king, no, not in thy thought; and revile not the rich in thy bedchamber: for a bird of the heavens shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter.” In a poetical description of spring in the Song of Solomon, we read:

“The flowers appear on the earth; The time of the singing of birds is come, And the voice of the turtle-dove is heard in our land”
(Song 2:12).

In his prophecy concerning Ethiopia, Isaiah wrote, “They shall be left together unto the ravenous birds of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth; and the ravenous birds shall summer upon them, and all the beasts of the earth shall winter upon them” (^{<23806>}Isaiah 18:6). In foretelling God’s judgment upon Babylon, Isaiah (46:11) refers to Cyrus as “a ravenous bird (called) from the east, the man of my counsel from a far country”; “probably in allusion to the fact that the griffon was the emblem of Persia; and embroidered on its standard” (HDB, I, 632); (*see EAGLE*).

^{<24025>}Jeremiah 4:25 describes the habit of birds, which invariably seek shelter before an approaching storm. In His denunciation of Israel, Yahweh questions, in ^{<24119>}Jeremiah 12:9, “Is my heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey? are the birds of prey against her round about?” When Jeremiah threatened the destruction of Jerusalem, he wrote that Yahweh would “cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hand of them that seek their life: and their dead bodies will I give to be food for the birds of the heavens” (^{<24197>}Jeremiah 19:7): that is, He would leave them for the carrion eaters. Ezekiel threatens the same fate to the inhabitants of Gog (^{<23904>}Ezekiel 39:4,17). Hosea (9:11) prophesies of Ephraim, “Their glory shall fly away like a bird.” In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus mentions the birds, as recorded by ^{<41026>}Matthew 6:26: “Behold the birds of the heaven,

that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?" In the sermon from the boat where He spoke the parable of the Sower He again mentioned the birds: "As he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured them" (~~<0134>~~ Matthew 13:4). Mark describes the same sermon in ~~<0004>~~ Mark 4:4, and ~~<0042>~~ Mark 4:32 quotes the parable of the Mustard Seed: "Yet when it is sown, (it) groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof." In ~~<0185>~~ Luke 8:5, Luke gives his version of the parable of the Sower, and in ~~<0139>~~ Luke 13:19 of the Mustard Seed. See also ~~<6697>~~ Revelation 19:17,21. These constitute all the important references to birds in the Bible, with the exception of a few that seem to belong properly under such subjects as TRAPS; NETS; CAGES, etc..

Gene Stratton-Porter

BIRDS OF ABOMINATION

See ABOMINATION, BIRDS OF.

BIRDS OF PREY

~~<pra>~~: They were undoubtedly the first birds noticed by the compilers of Biblical records. They were camp followers, swarmed over villages and perched on the walls of cities. They were offensive in manner and odor, and of a boldness unknown to us in birds. They flocked in untold numbers, there was small defense against them, and the largest and strongest not only carried away meat prepared for food and sacrifice, but also preyed upon the much-prized house pigeons, newly born of the smaller animals, and even at times attacked young children. See ~~<0151>~~ Genesis 15:11, "And the birds of prey came down upon the carcasses, and Abram drove them away." Because they were attracted from above the clouds by anything suitable for food, people recognized that these were birds of unusual vision. When Job wanted to tell how perfectly the path to the gold mine was concealed, he wrote, "That path no bird of prey knoweth" (~~<0807>~~ Job 28:7). The inference is, that, if it were so perfectly concealed that it escaped the piercing eyes of these birds, it was not probable that man would find it. These birds were so strong, fierce and impudent that everyone feared them, and when the prophets gave warning that people would be left for birds of prey to ravage, they fully understood what was

meant, and they were afraid (²³⁸⁰⁶Isaiah 18:6). In His complaint against His heritage, Yahweh questions, “Is my heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey? are the birds of prey against her round about?” (²⁴¹²⁹Jeremiah 12:9). And when he prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem, Jeremiah painted a dreadful picture, but one no doubt often seen in that land of pillage and warfare: “Their dead bodies will I give to be food for the birds of the heavens, and for the beasts of the earth” (²⁴⁹⁰⁷Jeremiah 19:7).

Gene Stratton-Porter

BIRDS UNCLEAN

<un-klen’>: The lists of birds forbidden as food are given in ⁶⁸¹¹³Leviticus 11:13-19 and ⁶⁵⁴¹²Deuteronomy 14:12-18. The names are almost identical, Deuteronomy containing one more than Leviticus and varying the order slightly. In ⁶⁵⁴¹³Deuteronomy 14:13 the first name, [ha-ra’ah], is almost certainly a corruption of [ha-da’-ah], the first name in ⁶⁸¹¹⁴Leviticus 11:14. In the American Standard Revised Version it is translated “kite” in Leviticus, while in Deuteronomy it is translated “glede.” The additional one in Deuteronomy is [ha-dayyah], and is translated “kite.” Doubtless the three words, [ha-da’ah], [ha-’ayyah] and [ha-dayyah], are generic and refer to different birds of the kite or perhaps falcon family, so it is impossible to give specific meanings to them. There are twenty-one names in all, counting the extra one in Deuteronomy. The translation of many of these words is disputed. The American Standard Revised Version gives them as follows: eagle, gier eagle, osprey, kite, falcon, glede, every raven, ostrich, night-hawk, sea-mew, hawk, little owl, cormorant, great owl, horned owl, pelican, vulture, stork, heron, hoopoe and bat. It will be observed that all of them are either carrion-eaters, birds of prey, or water fowl. The names of those birds which may be eaten are not given, the principle of classification is that of elimination. No principle of separation is given as is the case with the animals. The reason for the prohibition doubtless lies in the unsanitary and repulsive nature of the flesh of these birds, the Divine command endorsing the instincts which were repelled by such food. For particulars, see separate articles on each of these birds.

See also ABOMINATION, BIRDS OF.

James Josiah Reeve

BIRSHA

<bur'-sha> ([v" r" Bi[birsha`]): King of Gomorrah (^{<0142>}Genesis 14:2), who joined the league against Chedorlaomer. The name is probably corrupt; some have tried to explain it as [v" rB][beresha`], “with wickedness,” a name purposely used by the writer in referring to this king.

BIRTH

<burth> ([γένεσις, genesis]):

(1) It was said by the angel beforehand of John the Baptist, “Many shall rejoice at his birth”; and when he was born Elisabeth said, “Thus hath the Lord done unto me to take away my reproach among men” (^{<0114>}Luke 1:14,25). Among the ancient Hebrews barrenness was a “reproach” and the birth of a child, of a son especially, an occasion for rejoicing.

(2) This, no doubt, was due in part to the Messianic hope inspired and sustained by prophecy (see ^{<0085>}Genesis 3:15, where it was foretold that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head; and subsequent prophecies too numerous to mention). Cases in point worth studying are found in ^{<0001>}Genesis 4:1, where Eve rejoices over the birth of her firstborn and cries, “I have gotten a man with the help of Yahweh”; and ^{<0013>}1 Samuel 1:20, where Hannah exults over her firstborn, calling his name “Samuel,” “because,” she says, “I have asked him of Yahweh.”

(3) The marvelous passage in ^{<0374>}Isaiah 7:14, “Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel,” must have intensified the longing and hope of every devout Jewish maiden to be a mother, if mayhap, under God, she might be the mother of Messiah — Immanuel! (Compare ^{<0102>}Matthew 1:22,23; ^{<0113>}Luke 1:13 f.)

See JESUS CHRIST; VIRGIN BIRTH.

George B. Eager

BIRTH, NEW

See REGENERATION.

BIRTH, VIRGIN

See *VIRGIN BIRTH*.

BIRTHDAY

<burth'-da>:

(1) The custom of observing birthdays of great men, especially of kings, was widespread in ancient times (see ^{<040>}Genesis 40:20 f, “the third day, which was Pharaoh’s birthday,” etc.; compare 2 Macc 6:7; and Herod. ix.110; in the New Testament, ^{<046>}Matthew 14:6; ^{<062>}Mark 6:21, “Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords,” etc., i.e. Herod Antipas). Here we see the ancient custom reflected in two conspicuous instances centuries apart:

(a) Pharaoh, on his birthday “made a feast unto all his servants,” etc., and

(b) Herod on his birthday “made a supper to his lords, and the high captains,” etc. The King James Version (^{<046>}Matthew 14:6) has it “when Herod’s birthday was kept,” etc.

The correct text here (Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort) has a very peculiar construction, but without material difference of meaning. The locative case gives the time of the principal action, “danced on Herod’s birthday, when it occurred.” The construction is not unexampled (see Jelf, section 699). This need not be called “a case absolute,” though it corresponds to the Latin ablative (locative) absolute; and the Greek genitive absolute is itself not really “absolute,” i.e. it is not cut loose from the rest of the construction, but gives some event to which the principal action is referred, for the indication of its circumstances.

(2) The term “birthday” ([τὰ γενέσια, ta genesia]) was applied also to the anniversary of a king’s accession to the throne (Edersheim); but Wieseler’s argument that such is the case here is not conclusive. It is easy to suppose that when Herod’s birthday approached he was sojourning at the castle of Macherus, accompanied by leading military and civil officials of his dominions (^{<062>}Mark 6:21). Petty ruler as he was, not properly “king” at all, he affected kingly ways (compare Est 5:3,6; 7:2).

(3) [*Genesia*], which in Attic Greek means the commemoration of the dead, in later Greek is interchangeable with [*genethlia*] = “birthday celebrations”; and there is no good reason why the rendering of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) here, “birthday,” should not be right (See Swete on ^{<4052>}Mark 6:21, and HDB, under the word) For date of Christ’s birth, etc., see *JESUS CHRIST; CALENDAR*, etc.

George B. Eager

BIRTHRIGHT

<burth’-rit> (**hrkḂ**) [bekhorah], from [bekhor], “firstborn”;

[**πρωτοτόκια**, prototokia]: Birthright is the right which naturally belonged to the firstborn son. Where there were more wives than one, the firstborn was the son who in point of time was born before the others, apparently whether his mother was a wife or a concubine. Sarah protests against Ishmael being heir along with Isaac, but it is possible that the bestowal of the rights of the firstborn on Isaac was not due to any law, but rather to the influence of a favorite wife (^{<0210>}Genesis 21:10). The birthright of the firstborn consisted in the first place of a double portion of what his father had to leave. This probably means that he had a double share of such property as could be divided. We have no certain knowledge of the manner in which property was inherited in the patriarchal age, but it seems probable that the lands and flocks which were the possession of the family as a whole, remained so after the death of the father. The firstborn became head of the family and thus succeeded to the charge of the family property, becoming responsible for the maintenance of the younger sons, the widow or widows, and the unmarried daughters. He also, as head, succeeded to a considerable amount of authority over the other members. Further, he generally received the blessing, which placed him in close and favored covenant-relationship with Yahweh. According to the accounts which have come down to us, all these gifts and privileges could be diverted from the firstborn son. This could happen with his own consent, as in the case of Esau, who sold his birthright to Jacob (^{<0259>}Genesis 25:29-34), or by the decision of the father, as in the case of Reuben (^{<0482>}Genesis 48:22; 49:3,4; ^{<0301>}1 Chronicles 5:1,2) and of Shimri (^{<0360>}1 Chronicles 26:10). In the Deuteronomic version of the law, a provision is made, prohibiting the father from making the younger son the possessor of the birthright, just

because his mother was specially beloved (^{<R215>}Deuteronomy 21:15-17). The blessing also could be diverted from the eldest son. This was done when Jacob blessed the children of Joseph, and deliberately put the younger before the elder (^{<O483>}Genesis 48:13,14,17-19); even when the blessing was obtained by the younger son in a fraudulent manner, it could not be recalled (Genesis 27). Jacob does not appear to have inherited any of the property of his father, although he had obtained both the birthright and the blessing.

In the New Testament “birthright,” [*prototokia*], is mentioned only once (^{<S3216>}Hebrews 12:16), where the reference is to Esau. In various passages where our Lord is spoken of as the firstborn, as in ^{<S1015>}Colossians 1:15-19; ^{<S3002>}Hebrews 1:2, the association of ideas with the Old Testament conception of birthright is easy to trace.

See also FIRST-BORN; FAMILY; HEIR; INHERITANCE; LAW.

J. Macartney Wilson

BIRTH-STOOL

^{<burth'-stool>}: Found only in ^{<R1016>}Exodus 1:16, in connection with Hebrew women in Egypt when oppressed by Pharaoh. The Hebrew ([’obhnayim]) here rendered “birth-stool” is used in ^{<2483B>}Jeremiah 18:3, and is there rendered “potter’s wheel.” The word is used in both places in the dual form, which points, no doubt, to the fact that the potter’s wheel was composed of two discs, and suggests that the birth-stool was similarly double.

See STOOL.

BIRZAITH

^{<bur-za'-ith>}, ^{<bur-za'-vith>} the King James Version Birzavith, (^{tẕẕr} " Bi[birzawith] or ^{tyẕr} " Bi[birzayith]; [^{Bηζαίθ}, Bezaith], or [^{Βερζαίε}, Berzaie]): The name of a town in Asher founded by Malchiel (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 7:31). It probably corresponds to the modern Bir ez-Zait, “well of olive oil,” near Tyre.

BISHLAM

<*bish'-lam*> (μῖ λῆ[mishlam], “peaceful” (?)): One of three foreign colonists who wrote a letter of complaint against the Jews to Artaxerxes (<1947> Ezra 4:7 = 1 Esdras 2:16). In 1 Esdras the reading is “Belemus.” “And in the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of his companions, unto Artaxerxes, king of Persia,” etc. (<1947> Ezra 4:7). The Septuagint renders Bishlam as [*en eirene*], “in peace,” as though it were a phrase rather than a proper name; this is clearly an error.

BISHOP

<*bish'-up*>: The word is evidently an abbreviation of the Greek [ἐπίσκοπος, episkopos]; Latin, episcopus.

GENERAL

1. Use in the Septuagint and Classic Greek:

The Septuagint gives it the generic meaning of “superintendency, oversight, searching” (<4046> Numbers 4:16; 31:14) in matters pertaining to the church, the state, and the army (<4028> Judges 9:28; <1221> 2 Kings 12:11; <4842> 2 Chronicles 34:12,17; 1 Macc 1:54; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:6). Nor is it unknown to classical Greek. Thus Homer in the Iliad applied it to the gods (xxii.255), also Plutarch, Cam., 5. In Athens the governors of conquered states were called by this name.

2. New Testament Use:

The word is once applied to Christ himself, “unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls” (1 Pet 2:25). It abounds in Pauline literature, and is used as an alternative for [*presbuteros*] or elder (<5005> Titus 1:5,7; <5001> 1 Timothy 3:1; 4:14; 5:17,19). The earliest ecclesiastical offices instituted in the church were those of elders and deacons, or rather the reverse, inasmuch as the latter office grew almost immediately out of the needs of the Christian community at Jerusalem (<4401> Acts 6:1-6). The presbyteral constitution of Jerusalem must have been very old (<4413> Acts 11:30) and was distinct from the apostolate (<4415> Acts 15:2,4,6,22,23; 16:4). As early as 50 AD Paul appointed “elders” in every church, with prayer and fasting (<4423> Acts 14:23), referring to the Asiatic churches before established. But in writing to the Philippians (1:1) he speaks of “bishops” and “deacons.” In the

Gentile Christian churches this title evidently had been adopted; and it is only in the Pastoral Epistles that we find the name “presbyters” applied. The name “presbyter” or “elder,” familiar to the Jews, signifies their age and place in the church; while the other term “bishop” refers rather to their office. But both evidently have reference to the same persons. Their office is defined as “ruling” (Romans 12:8), “overseeing” (Acts 20:17,28; 1 Peter 5:2), caring for the flock of God (Acts 20:28). But the word [*archein*], “to rule,” in the hierarchical sense, is never used. Moreover, each church had a college of presbyter-bishops (Acts 20:17,28; Philippians 1:1; 1 Timothy 4:14). During Paul’s lifetime the church was evidently still unaware of the distinction between presbyters and bishops.

Of a formal ordination, in the later hierarchical sense, there is no trace as yet. The word “ordained” used in the King James Version (Acts 1:22) is an unwarrantable interpolation, rightly emended in the Revised Version (British and American). Neither the word [*cheirotoneantes*] (Acts 14:23, translated “appointed” the American Standard Revised Version) nor [*katasteses*] (Titus 1:5, translated “appoint” the American Standard Revised Version) is capable of this translation. In rendering these words invariably by “ordain” the King James Version shows a [*vitium originis*]. No one doubts that the idea of ordination is extremely old in the history of the church, but the laying on of hands, mentioned in the New Testament (Acts 13:3; 1 Timothy 4:14; 2 Timothy 1:6; compare Acts 14:26; 15:40) points to the communication of a spiritual gift or to its invocation, rather than to the imparting of an official status.

3. Later Development of the Idea:

According to Rome, as finally expressed by the Council of Trent, and to the episcopal idea in general, the hierarchical organization, which originated in the 3rd century, existed from the beginning in the New Testament church. But besides the New Testament as above quoted, the early testimony of the church maintains the identity of “presbyters” and “bishops.” Thus, Clement of Rome (Ep. 1, chapters 42, 44, 57), the Didache, chapter 15; perhaps the Constitutions, II, 33, 34, in the use of the plural form; Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., iii.2, 3), Ambrosiaster (on 1 Timothy 3:10; Ephesians 4:11), Chrysostom (Hom 9 in Ep. ad Tim), in an unequivocal statement, the “presbyters of old were called bishops and the bishops presbyters,” equally unequivocally Jerome (Ad Tit, 1, 7), “the same is the presbyter, who is also the bishop.” Augustine and other Fathers

of the 4th and 5th centuries hold this view, and even Peter Lombard, who preceded Aquinas as the great teacher of the church of the Middle Ages. Hatch of Oxford and Harnack of Berlin, in the face of all this testimony, maintain a distinction between the presbyters, as having charge of the law and discipline of the church, and the bishops, as being charged with the pastoral care of the church, preaching and worship. This theory is built upon the argument of prevailing social conditions and institutions, as adopted and imitated by the church, rather than on sound textual proof. The distinction between presbyters and bishops can only be maintained by a forced exegesis of the Scriptures. The later and rapid growth of the hierarchical idea arose from the accession of the Ebionite Christian view of the church, as a necessary continuation of the Old Testament dispensation, which has so largely influenced the history of the inner development of the church in the first six centuries of her existence.

Henry E. Dosker

ANGLICAN VIEW

I. Episcopacy Defined.

Episcopacy is the government in the Christian church by bishops. The rule of the Orthodox churches in the East, of the Roman Catholics, and of the Anglicans is that the consecration of other bishops, and the ordination of priests and deacons can only be by a bishop; and with them, a bishop is one who claims historic descent from apostolic or sub-apostolic times.

II. Offices in the Early Church.

In the New Testament, the office of bishop is not clearly defined. Indeed there appear to have been many degrees of ministry in the infant church: apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, presbyters or elders, bishops or overseers, and deacons.

Due allowance is not generally made for the mental attitude of the apostles and early Christians. They were looking for the speedy return of Christ, and consequently did not organize the church in its infancy, as it was afterward found necessary to do. For this reason, while the different persons who composed the body of Christian ministers did not overlap or infringe on each other's work, yet the relative rank or priority of each minister was not clearly defined.

1. Apostles:

The apostles were undoubtedly first, and in them rested the whole authority, and they were the depository of the power committed unto them by Christ.

2. Prophets:

Next to the apostles in rank, and first in point of mention (~~4117~~ Acts 11:27), came the prophets. So important were these officers in the early church that they were sent from Jerusalem to warn the rapidly growing church at Antioch of an impending famine. Then it appears that there were resident prophets at Antioch, men of considerable importance since their names are recorded, Barnabas, Symeon, Lucius, Manaen and Saul (~~4118~~ Acts 13:1). These men received a command from the Holy Spirit to “separate me Barnabas and Saul,” on whom they laid their hands and sent them forth on their work. The election is conducted on the same lines as the election by the eleven apostles of Matthias, and Barnabas and Paul are hereafter called apostles. It is an ordination to the highest order in the Christian ministry by “prophets and teachers.” Whether “prophets and teachers” refers to two distinct ministries, or whether they are terms used for the same one is uncertain. It may be that of the five men mentioned, some were prophets, and others teachers.

In ~~4119~~ Acts 15:32 we have given us the names of two other prophets, Judas and Silas. Paul tells the Corinthians (1 Cor 12:28) that God hath set some in his church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, and writing to the Ephesians he places the prophets in the same rank. “He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry” (~~4120~~ Ephesians 4:11,12 the King James Version). And again, he says that the mystery of Christ is now “revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit” (~~4121~~ Ephesians 3:5). The same apostle in that wonderful imagery of Christians being built up for a habitation of God, says they are “being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone” (~~4122~~ Ephesians 2:20).

In the case of the ordination of Timothy, which Paul says distinctly was by his own laying on of hands and that of the presbytery, it is of great consequence to note that Paul says to Timothy that his ordination was “according to the prophecies which went before on thee” (1 Tim 1:18 the King James Version). From this it would appear that the prophets, as in the

case of Paul himself, guided by the Holy Ghost, chose Timothy for the overseership or bishopric, or it may be, which is just as likely, that Timothy was set apart by the laying on of hands by some prophets, to the rank of elder or presbyter which did not carry with it the “overseership.” It is at any rate evident that in the selection of Timothy, Paul is insistent on pointing out that it was through the prophets (compare ~~4018~~ 1 Timothy 1:18; 4:14; ~~5006~~ 2 Timothy 1:6).

In Revelation, the term prophet constantly occurs as a term denoting rank equivalent to that of apostle: “ye saints, and ye apostles, and ye prophets” (~~6830~~ Revelation 18:20); “blood of prophets and of saints” (~~6606~~ Revelation 16:6; 18:24). The angel calls himself “thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets” (~~6629~~ Revelation 22:9 the King James Version). The words prophesy and prophesying are used in a general sense, and it does not mean that they were in every case the formal utterances of prophets.

3. Elders or Presbyters:

The ministry of the elders of the Christian church was modeled after that of the synagogue in which there were elders and teachers. The Christian elders or presbyters were most likely a council of advice in each local Christian [*ekklesia*]. They appear to act conjointly and not separately (~~4450~~ Acts 15:4,6,22; 16:4; 20:17; ~~5054~~ James 5:14).

4. Teachers:

Teachers were the equivalent of those teachers or catechists of the synagogue before whom our Lord was found in the temple.

5. Evangelists:

Evangelists were persons who probably had the gift of oratory and whose function it was to preach the glad tidings. Philip was one of them (~~4208~~ Acts 21:8). In the instructions to Timothy he is bidden to do the work of an evangelist, that is to say, to preach the gospel. This was to be part of his work in the ministry.

In writing to Timothy, Paul twice says that he himself was ordained preacher, and apostle and teacher. This does not mean that he held three grades of the ministry, but that his duties as an apostle were to preach and to teach. The fact that the apostles called themselves elders does not thereby confirm the view that the bishops mentioned by them were not superior to elders, any more than the fact that the apostles called

themselves teachers, or preachers, makes for the view that teachers, or preachers, were the equals of apostles.

6. Bishops:

Bishops or overseers were probably certain elders chosen out of the body of local elders. Under the Jewish dispensation, the elders stayed at home, that is, they did no ministerial visiting, but it was soon found necessary as the Christian church grew to have someone to attend to outside work to win over by persuasion and exposition of the Scriptures those inclined to embrace Christianity. This necessitated visiting families in their own homes. Then, it became necessary to shepherd the sheep. Someone had to oversee or superintend the general work. The Jewish elders always had a head and in a large synagogue the conditions laid down for its head, or [*legatus*], were almost identical with those laid down by Paul to Timothy. He was to be a father of a family, not rich or engaged in business, possessing a good voice, apt to teach, etc.

The term [*episkopos*] was one with which the Hellenistic Jews and Gentiles were well acquainted; and it became thus a fitting term by which to designate the men called out of the body of elders to this special work of oversight. Then, again, the term [*episkopos*] was endeared to the early Christians as the one applied to our Lord — "the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (1 Pet 2:25). The duties of elders, or presbyters, are not clearly defined in the New Testament.

In the Acts, the term is found only twice, one in reference to Judas, "his bishopric (or overseership) let another take" (~~400~~ Acts 1:20 the King James Version), and in Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus, he warns them to feed the church over which they have been made overseers or bishops (~~400~~ Acts 20:28). It is impossible to say whether this "overseership" refers to all the elders addressed, or to such of those elders as had been made "overseers," or "bishops."

In the epistles, we find the church more clearly organized, and in these writings we find more definite allusions to bishops and their duties (~~500~~ Philippians 1:1; ~~500~~ 1 Timothy 3:1,2; ~~500~~ Titus 1:7; ~~402~~ 1 Peter 2:25).

Paul tells Timothy, "If a man desire the office of a bishop (or overseer) he desireth a good work." "A bishop (or overseer) must be blameless" (1 Tim 3:1,2 the King James Version). He tells Titus that "he is to ordain elders in

every city” and that a “bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God” (~~<500B>~~ Titus 1:5,7 the King James Version).

On the other hand, there are numerous texts where elders and their duties are mentioned and where there is no reference whatever to bishopric or oversight. The epistles show that of necessity there had grown to be a more distinct organization of the ministry, and that following the custom of the synagogue to some of the elders had been committed a bishopric or oversight. At the same time the rank of a bishop, or overseer, was not yet one of the highest. Paul does not enumerate it in the order of ministry which he gives to the Ephesians — apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers.

That Timothy had an oversight over the elders or presbyters is evident from the fact that Paul enjoins him to rebuke those that sin: “Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all” (1 Tim 5:19,20). This, of course, refers to a formal trial by one in authority of persons inferior to him in rank.

It has been asserted that the terms elder and bishop in the New Testament were equivalent and denoted the same office or grade in the ministry. This assertion seems unwarranted. They do not naturally denote the same grade any more than do apostle and teacher, or angel and prophet.

7. Deacons:

The deacons were the seven appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the church. Their appointment was perhaps suggested by the alms-collectors of the synagogue. In the New Testament they do not appear as deacons to have had any part in the sacred ministry, except, in the case of Philip the evangelist, if it be assumed that he was a deacon, which is uncertain. Nowhere is it recorded that they laid hands on anyone, or were considered as capable of bestowing any grace. In the epistles they are mentioned with the bishops — “bishops and deacons” (~~<500B>~~ Philippians 1:1), thus showing the nature of their influence as the helpers of the “bishops” in the management of the growing funds, or properties of the church.

III. Episcopacy according to the New Testament.

The passages where the Greek word occurs which has been translated

either as bishops, or overseers, are so few that they are enumerated: ~~<4017>~~ Acts 20:17,28: the Ephesian elders are stated to be bishops (or overseers) to feed the church; ~~<4006>~~ Philippians 1:1 the salutation of Paul and Timothy to bishops (or overseers) and deacons at Philippi; ~~<4006>~~ 1 Timothy 3:1,2 and ~~<4006>~~ Titus 1:7 give the exhortation to Timothy and Titus as holding the office of a bishop; ~~<4025>~~ 1 Peter 2:25, where the apostle referring to Christ says, “unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.”

IV. The “Didache.”

Passing out of the New Testament, we come to the early Christian writing, the so-called Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Setting aside the question for what class of Christians this document was intended, the clear fact stands out that at the date of its writing the two highest grades in the Christian ministry were still called apostles and prophets. Various dates have been assigned to this document ranging from 80 to 160 AD.

At the end of chapter 10, which deals with the thanksgiving or eucharist, the remark is made, “But permit the prophets to make thanksgiving as much as they desire.” Chapters 11 and 13 deal with apostles and prophets. They were to be treated “according to the ordinance of the gospel.” An apostle was not to be allowed to stay more than a couple of days at the utmost, and in no case was he to receive any money, else he was to be considered “a false prophet.” A prophet could beg on behalf of others, but not for himself; but a prophet could settle among a congregation, and in that case he was to receive the same first-fruits “of money and raiment and of every possession” as the chief priest did under the old dispensation. It is to be noted that in reality the prophets, though placed second in order, were to be treated with the greater respect. If the prophet settles down, he becomes the man of the first rank in that Christian community.

Chapter 15 deals with bishops and deacons, and we are told that if appointed they rendered the ministry of prophets and teachers, but the warning is given, “Despise them not, therefore, for they are your honored ones, together with the prophets and teachers.” This shows that bishops were localized; and that while they could be appointed over a community, they were not considered as of equal rank with the prophets.

V. Clement of Rome.

Clement of Rome in his Epistle to the Corinthians says that the apostles preaching through countries and cities appointed the first-fruits of their

labors to be bishops and deacons (chapter 42). It is usually said that Clement meant elders by the term “bishops,” but it is much more likely that he meant what he said; that according to the tradition received by him, the apostles appointed bishops, that is, appointed bishops out of the elders — mentioned in the Acts. In chapter 44 Clement warns against the sin of ejecting from the episcopate those who have presented the offerings, and says, “Blessed are those presbyters who have finished their course.”

The reason why the terms apostles and prophets fell into desuetude was, as regards the first, not so much out of respect to the original apostles, but because the apostles in the sub-apostolic age became apparently only wandering evangelists of little standing; while the prophets lowered their great office by descending to be soothsayers, as the Shepherd of Hermas plainly intimates. With the fall of the apostles and the prophets, there rose into prominence the bishops and deacons.

VI. Bishops and Deacons.

The deacons acted as secretaries and treasurers to the bishops. They were their right-hand men, representing them in all secular matters. As the numbers of Christians increased, it was found absolutely necessary for the bishops to delegate some of their spiritual authority to a second order.

VII. Bishops and Presbyters (Priests).

Thus very slowly emerged out of the body of elders the official presbyters or priests. To them the bishop delegated the power to teach, to preach, to baptize, to celebrate the Holy Eucharist; but how slowly is evidenced by the fact that so late as 755 AD the Council of Vern forbade priests to baptize, except by distinct permission of their bishop.

VIII. Ignatian Epistles on the Three Orders.

When we come to the Ignatian epistles written between 110-17 AD, we find a distinct threefold order. We have given us the names of Damas, for bishop, Bassus and Apollonius for presbyters, Zotion for deacon. Throughout these epistles there is no question that the bishop is supreme. Apostles and prophets are not even mentioned. The bishop succeeds to all the powers the apostles and prophets had. On the other hand, as with the Jewish elders, so with the Christian presbyters, they form a council with the bishop. Here we see in clear day what we had all along suspected to be the

case in apostolic times: a council of presbyters with a ruler at their head and deacons to attend to money matters.

It is quite immaterial as to whether a bishop had ten or a hundred presbyter-elders under him, whether he was bishop in a small town or in a large city. The question of numbers under him would not affect his authority as has been claimed. The greatness of the city in which he exercised this rule would add dignity to his position, but nothing to his inherent authority.

From this time on it is admitted by all that bishops, priests and deacons have been continuously in existence. Their powers and duties have varied, have been curtailed as one order has encroached on the power of the other, but still there the three orders have been. Gradually the presbyters or priests encroached on the power of the bishop, till now, according to Anglican usage, only the power of ordaining, confirming and consecrating churches is left to them.

IX. Views of Reformers.

At the time of the Reformation there was a great outcry against bishops. This was caused by the fact that under feudalism the bishops had come to be great temporal lords immersed in schemes of political and material aggrandizement, and often actually leading their armies in times of war. Many of the bishops were proud and arrogant, forgetful that their duties as fathers of the children of Christ were to look after those committed to them with fatherly kindness and charity or that as pastors they had to tend the erring sheep with Divine patience and infinite love.

The bulk of the adherents to the Reformed religion, looking upon the bishops as they were and as their fathers had known them, recoiled from retaining the office, although their principal men, like Calvin, deplored the loss of bishops, and hoped that bishops of the primitive order would some day be restored. The present modern Anglican bishop seems to sum up in his person and office the requirements laid down by Calvin.

Conclusion:

Thus the claim put forth by the Anglicans in the preface to the Ordinal may be considered as sound: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have

been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church — Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

LITERATURE.

Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; Clement of Rome; Shepherd of Hermas; Ignatian epistles; Muratorian Fragment; Works of John Lightfoot; Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chretien*; Pellicia, *Polity of the Christian Church*; Bishop MacLean, *Ancient Church Orders*; Cheetham, *Hist of the Christian Church during the First Six Centuries*; Salmon, *Introduction to New Testament*; Elwin, *The Minister of Baptism*; Cruttwell, *Literary History of Early Christianity*; Potter, *Church Government*; Lowndes, *Vindication of Anglican Orders*; E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*; C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*; Thompson, *Historic Episcopate (Presbyterian)*; Baird, *Huguenots*.

Arthur Lowndes

CONGREGATIONAL VIEW:

1. The New Testament Church a Spiritual Democracy:

As a spiritual and social democracy, Congregationalism finds no warrant or precedent in the New Testament for the episcopal conception of the words "bishop," "presbyter," and "elder." It interprets [ἐπίσκοπος, epi-skopos], literally as overseer — not an ecclesiastical dignitary but a spiritual minister. It finds the Romanist view of Peter's primacy, founded alone on ~~<1018>~~Matthew 16:18, contradicted by the entire trend of Christ's teaching, as e.g. when referring to the Gentiles exercising lordship and authority Christ says, "Not so shall it be among you" (~~<1018>~~Matthew 20:26 ff). He set the precedent of official greatness when He said "the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," and that "whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister (servant)." Paul's testimony confirms this in suggesting no primacy among the apostles and prophets, but making "Christ himself the chief corner stone" (~~<1021>~~Ephesians 2:20). The organization and history of the early Christian church establish this view of its simplicity and democracy. In ~~<1021>~~Acts 1:20 the Revised Version (British and American) corrects the rendering "bishopric" (given by the King James translators, who were officers in the Episcopal church) to "office," thus, relieving the verse of possible ecclesiastical pretensions.

The church formed on the day of Pentecost was the spontaneous coming together of the original 120 disciples and the 3,000 Christian converts, for fellowship, worship and work, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Its only creed was belief in the risen Christ and the renewing power of the Holy Spirit; its only condition of membership, repentance and baptism.

2. Election of Officers by Popular Vote:

The apostles naturally took leadership but, abrogating all authority, committed to the church as a whole the choice of its officers and the conduct of its temporal and spiritual affairs. Judas' place in the apostolate was not filled by succession or episcopal appointment (^{<4023>}Acts 1:23-26). The seven deacons were elected by popular vote (^{<4061>}Acts 6:1-6). One of the seven — Philip — preached and, without protest, administered the rite of baptism (^{<4082>}Acts 8:12,13).

The churches in the apostolic era were independent and self-governing, and the absence of anything like a centralized ecclesiastical authority is seen by the fact that the council at Jerusalem, called to consider whether the church at Antioch should receive the uncircumcised into membership, was a delegated body, composed in part of lay members, and having only advisory power (^{<4050>}Acts 15:1-29).

3. The Epistles not Official Documents:

The apostolic letters, forming so large a part of the New Testament, are not official documents but letters of loving pastoral instruction and counsel. The terms bishops, elders, pastors and teachers are used synonymously and interchangeably, thus limiting the officers of the early church to two orders: pastors and deacons.

See also CHURCH GOVERNMENT; DIDACHE.

4. Restoration of Primitive Ideals:

Under the spiritual tyrannies of the Church of England, during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, "bloody" Mary and 'Queen Elizabeth, the Dissenting bodies, chiefly the Congregationalists, returned to the simplicity and spiritual freedom of the primitive church. The issue was forced by two arbitrary acts of Parliament under Elizabeth: the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity. Emancipation from the intellectual and religious tyranny of these acts was won at the cost of many martyrdoms. These struggles

and persecutions wrought into the successors of Robert Browne, the father of modern Congregationalism, a deep-seated and permanent resentment against all forms of autocratic power in church and state. They challenged, at the cost of life, both the Divine Right of kings, and of bishops. They believed that in Christ Jesus all believers are literally and inalienably made “kings and priests unto God” (^{<600>}Revelation 1:6 the King James Version), actual spiritual sovereigns, independent of all human dictation and control in matters of belief and worship. The Pilgrims expatriated themselves to secure this spiritual liberty; and to their inherent antagonism to inherited and self-perpetuated power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, must be credited the religious freedom and civil democracy of America.

LITERATURE.

For further study see Henry M. Dexter, Congregationalism, chapter ii; Dunning’s Congregationalists in America, chapters i, ii; Rainy, The Ancient Catholic Church.

Dwight M. Pratt

BISHOPRICK

<bish’-up-rik> ([ἐπισκοπή, episkope]; ^{<400>}Acts 1:20 the King James Version, quoted from ^{<1908>}Psalms 109:8): the Revised Version (British and American) “office,” margin, “overseership.”

See BISHOP.

BISHOPS’ BIBLE

See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

BIT AND BRIDLE

<bri’-d’-l> (^{<sr>}Agtn, [methegh wa-recen]): The two words occur in conjunction (^{<1900>}Psalms 32:9 the King James Version, “Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee”; the Revised Version (British and American) “else they will not come near unto thee,” margin, “that they come not near.” [Methegh], translated “bit” above, is properly a bridle or halter in which the bit was a loop passed round the under jaw of the animal; [recen] has a similar meaning. The counsel in the

verse is that men should render a willing obedience to God and not be like the animals that man has to bridle and curb in order to get them to do his will. Compare ^{<318>}James 3:3, where we have “bit” as translation of *chalinós*, “a bit” or “curb,” “We put bits (the Revised Version (British and American) “bridles”) in the horses’ mouths that they may obey us.” “Bridle” occurs separately as translation of *metheg* (^{<101>}2 Samuel 8:1), “David took Metheg-ammah,” King James Version margin “the bridle of Ammah,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the bridle of the mother city,” margin, as the King James Version; the meaning may be that he took the control or dominion of it; “I will put my bridle in thy lips” (^{<128>}2 Kings 19:28; ^{<237>}Isaiah 37:29); “a bridle for the ass” (^{<183>}Proverbs 26:3); of [recen] (^{<811>}Job 30:11), “They have also let loose the bridle before me,” the Revised Version (British and American) “and they have cast off the bridle before me” (acted in an unbridled (unrestrained) manner); ^{<1413>}Job 41:13, said of “leviathan” (the Revised Version (British and American) “the hippopotamus”), “Who can come to him his double bridle?” the American Standard Revised Version “within his jaws?” the English Revised Version “within his double bridle,” others, “into the double row of his teeth”; ^{<238>}Isaiah 30:28, “a bridle in the jaws of the people causing them to err,” the Revised Version (British and American) “a bridle that causeth to err”; of [machcom], which means “a muzzle” (^{<1301>}Psalms 39:1), “I will keep my mouth with a bridle,” King James Version margins “Hebrew, a bridle, or muzzle for my mouth”; so the Revised Version, margin.

To “bridle” occurs (^{<5026>}James 1:26, “bridleth not his tongue”; 3:2 “able to bridle the whole body”; *chalinagogeó*, “to lead” or “guide with a bit”). In 1 Esdras 3:6, and 2 Macc 10:29, we have “bridles of gold” ([*chrosochalinós*]).

W. L. Walker

BITHIAH

^{<bi-thi'-a>} (*hyt* *Bi* [bithyah]; [*Bēthiá*, Beththia]; Codex Vaticanus, [*ελιά*, Gelia], “daughter of Yah”): The daughter of a Pharaoh who married Mered, a descendant of Judah (^{<1348>}1 Chronicles 4:18). Whether this Pharaoh was an Egyptian king, or whether it was in this case a Hebrew name, it is difficult to say. The name Bithiah seems to designate one who had become converted to the worship of Yahweh, and this would favor the

first supposition. If, as the Revised Version (British and American) reads, the other wife of Mered is distinguished as “the Jewess” (instead of the King James Version “Jehudijah”), this supposition would receive further support.

Frank E. Hirsch

BITHRON

<bi-thron> (ᾠθῤῥῶν [ha-bithron]; [ὄλην τὴν παρατείνουσαν, hōlen ten parateinousan], literally “the entire (land) extending”; ¹⁰²³2 Samuel 2:29, “the Bithron,” i.e. the gorge or groove): Does not seem to be a proper name; rather it indicates the gorge by which Abner approached Mahanaim. Buhl (GAP, 121) favors identification with Wady `Ajlun, along which in later times a Romans road connected `Ajlun and Mahanaim. Others (Guthe, Kurz. bib. Worterbuch, under the word) incline to Wady esh Sha`ib.

BITHYNIA

<bi-thin'-i-a> ([Βιθυνία, Bithunia]): A coast province in northwestern Asia Minor on the Propontis and the Euxine. Its narrowest compass included the districts on both sides of the Sangarius, its one large river, but in prosperous times its boundaries reached from the Rhyndacus on the west to and beyond the Parthenius on the east. The Mysian Olympus rose in grandeur to a height of 6,400 ft. in the southwest, and in general the face of Nature was wrinkled with rugged mountains and seamed with fertile valleys sloping toward the Black Sea.

Hittites may have occupied Bithynia in the remote past, for Priam of Troy found some of his stoutest enemies among the Amazons on the upper Sangarius in Phrygia, and these may have been Hittite, and may easily have settled along the river to its mouth. The earliest discernible Bithynians, however, were Thracian immigrants from the European side of the Reliespont. The country was overcome by Croesus, and passed with Lydia under Persian control, 546 BC. After Alexander the Great, Bithynia became independent, and Nicomedes I, Prusias I and II, and Nicomedes II and III, ruled from 278 to 74 BC. The last king, weary of the incessant strife among the peoples of Asia Minor, especially as provoked by the aggressive Mithridates, bequeathed his country to Rome. Nicomedia and

Prusa, or Brousa, were founded by kings whose names they bear; the other chief cities, Nicea and Chalcedon, had been built by Greek enterprise earlier. There were highways leading from Nicomedia and Nicea to Dorylaeum and to Angora (see Ramsay , Historical Geography of Asia Minor, and The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170). Under Rome the Black Sea littoral as far as Amisus was more or less closely joined with Bithynia in administration.

Paul and Silas essayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not (~~<4417>~~Acts 16:7). Other evangelists, however, must have labored there early and with marked success. Bithynia is one of the provinces addressed in ~~<400>~~1 Peter 1:1.

Internal difficulties and disorders led to the sending of Pliny, the lawyer and literary man, as governor, 111 to 113 AD. He found Christians under his jurisdiction in such numbers that the heathen temples were almost deserted, and the trade in sacrificial animals languished. A memorable correspondence followed between the Roman governor and the emperor Trajan, in which the moral character of the Christians was completely vindicated, and the repressive measures required of officials were interpreted with leniency (see E. G. Hardy, Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan, and Christianity and the Roman Government). Under this Roman policy Christianity was confirmed in strength and in public position. Subsequently the first Ecumenical Council of the church was held in Nicea, and two later councils convened in Chalcedon, a suburb of what is now Constantinople. The emperor Diocletian had fixed his residence and the seat of government for the eastern Roman Empire in Nicomedia.

Bithynia was for a thousand years part of the Byzantine Empire, and shared the fortunes and misfortunes of that state. On the advent of the Turks its territory was quickly overrun, and Orchan, sultan in 1326, selected Brousa as his capital, since which time this has been one .of the chief Ottoman cities.

G. E. White

BITTER; BITTERNESS

~~<bit'-er>~~, ~~<bit'-er-nes>~~ (~~rm~~" [mar], or ~~hrm~~:[marah] = "bitter" (literally or figuratively); also (noun) "bitterness" or (adverb) "bitterly"; "angry," "chafed," "discontented," "heavy" (~~<01273>~~Genesis 27:34; ~~<01523>~~Exodus

15:23; <0158> Numbers 5:18,19,23,24,27; Est 4:1; <0160> Job 3:20; <0163> Psalm 64:3; <0164> Proverbs 5:4; 27:7; <0176> Ecclesiastes 7:26; <0181> Isaiah 5:20; <0189> Jeremiah 2:19; 4:18; <0193> Ezekiel 27:31; <0198> Amos 8:10; <0206> Habakkuk 1:6); the derivatives **rrm**[marar], **rrm**[meror], and **hrrm**[merorah], used with the same significance according to the context, are found in <0214> Exodus 1:14; 12:8; <0216> Numbers 9:11; <0236> Job 13:26; <0249> Isaiah 24:9. The derivatives [meri] and [meriri] occur in <0262> Deuteronomy 32:24; <0270> Job 23:2 (margin); and **rWrmT** [tamrur], is found in <0285> Jeremiah 6:26; 31:15. In the New Testament the verb [**πικραίνω**, pikraino] = “to embitter”; the adjective [**πικρός**, pikros] = “bitter,” and the noun [pikria], “bitterness,” supply the same ideas in <0289> Colossians 3:19; <0301> James 3:11,14; <0301> Revelation 8:11; 10:9,10): It will be noted that the word is employed with three principal spheres of application:

- (1) the physical sense of taste;
- (2) a figurative meaning in the objective sense of cruel, biting words; intense misery resulting from forsaking God, from a life of sin and impurity; the misery of servitude; the misfortunes of bereavement;
- (3) more subjectively, bitter and bitterness describe emotions of sympathy; the sorrow of childlessness and of penitence, of disappointment; the feeling of misery and wretchedness, giving rise to the expression “bitter tears”;
- (4) the ethical sense, characterizing untruth and immorality as the bitter thing in opposition to the sweetness of truth and the gospel;
- (5) <0458> Numbers 5:18 the Revised Version (British and American) speaks of “the water of bitterness that causeth the curse.” Here it is employed as a technical term.

Frank E. Hirsch

BITTER HERBS

<hurbs>, or <urbs> (**pyrhm**[merorim]): Originally in the primitive Passover (<0218> Exodus 12:8; <0216> Numbers 9:11) these were probably merely salads, the simplest and quickest prepared form of vegetable accompaniment to the roasted lamb. Such salads have always been favorites in the Orient. Cucumbers, lettuce, water-cress, parsley and endive

are some of those commonly used. Later on the Passover ritual (as it does today) laid emphasis on the idea of “bitterness” as symbolical of Israel’s lot in Egypt. In modern Palestine the Jews use chiefly lettuce and endive for the “bitter herbs” of their Passover. In ~~ARIS~~ Lamentations 3:15 the same word is used: “He hath filled me with bitterness [merorim], he hath sated me with wormwood.” Here the parallelism with “wormwood” suggests some plant more distinctly bitter than the mild salads mentioned above, such, for example, as the colocynth (*Citrullus colocynthus*) or the violently irritating squirting cucumber (*Ecballium elaterium*).

E. W. G. Masterman

BITTERN

~~<bit'-ern>~~ (**dPqi**[qippodh]; Latin *Botaurus stellaris*; Greek [**ἐχίνος**, echinos]): A nocturnal member of the heron family, frequenting swamps and marshy places. Its Hebrew name means a creature of waste and desert places. The bittern is the most individual branch of the heron (ardeidae) family on account of being partially a bird of night. There are observable differences from the heron in proportion, and it differs widely in coloration. It is one of the birds of most ancient history, and as far back as records extend is known to have inhabited Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia and America. The African bird that Bible historians were familiar with was 2 1/2 ft. in length. It had a 4-inch bill, bright eyes and plumage of buff and chestnut, mottled with black. It lived around swamps and marshes, hunting mostly at night, and its food was much the same as that of all members of the heron family, frogs being its staple article of diet. Its meat has not the fishy taste of most members of the heron family, and in former times was considered a great delicacy of food. In the days of falconry it was protected in England because of the sport afforded in hunting it. Aristotle mentions that previous to his time the bittern was called [oknos], which name indicates “an idle disposition.” It was probably bestowed by people who found the bird hiding in swamps during the daytime, and saw that it would almost allow itself to be stepped upon before it would fly. They did not understand that it fed and mated at night. Pliny wrote of it as a bird that “bellowed like oxen,” for which reason it was called Taurus. Other medieval writers called it botaurus, from which our term “bittern” is derived. There seems to be much confusion as to the early form of the name; but all authorities agree that it was bestowed on the bird on account

of its voice. Turner states that in 1544 the British called it “miredromble,” and “botley bump,” from its voice. Rolland says the French called it, Boeuf d’eau. In later days “bog-bull,” “stake-driver” and “thunder-pumper” have attached themselves to it as terms fitly descriptive of its voice. Nuttall says its cry is “like the interrupted bellowing of a bull, but hollower and louder, and is heard at a mile’s distance, as if issuing from some formidable being that resided at the bottom of the waters.” Tristram says, “Its strange booming note, disturbing the stillness of night, gives an idea of desolation which nothing but the wail of a hyena can equal.” Thoreau thought its voice like the stroke of an ax on the head of a deeply driven stake. In ancient times it was believed the bird thrust its sharp beak into a reed to produce this sound. Later it was supposed to be made by pushing the bill into muck and water while it cried. Now the membrane by which the sound is produced has been located in the lungs of the bird. In all time it has been the voice that attracted attention to the bittern, and it was solely upon the ground of its vocal attainments that it entered the Bible. There are three references, all of which originated in its cry. Isaiah in prophesying the destruction of Babylon (~~2341B~~ Isaiah 14:23 in the King James Version) wrote: “I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water”; in other words he would make of it a desolate and lonely swamp. Again in ~~2341B~~ Isaiah 34:11 in the King James Version, in pronouncing judgment against Idumaea, he wrote, “But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it.” In the Revised Version (British and American), “cormorant” and “bittern” are changed to “pelican” and “porcupine.” The change from the cormorant to pelican makes less difference, as both are water birds, and the Hebrew [shalakh], which means “a plunging bird,” would apply equally to either of them. If they were used to bear out the idea that they would fill the ruins with terrifying sound, then it is well to remember that the cormorant had something of a voice, while the pelican is notoriously the most silent of birds. The change from bittern to porcupine is one with which no ornithologist would agree. About 620 BC, the prophet Zephaniah (2:14) clearly indicates this bird: “And herds shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations: both the pelican and the porcupine 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 work.” This should forever settle the question raised by some modern commentators as to whether a bird or beast is intended by the word qippodh. In some instances it seems to have been confounded with qunfudh, the hedgehog or porcupine. No natural historian ever would

agree to this, because these animals are not at home in the conditions that were known to exist here. Even granting that Nineveh was to be made dry, it must be remembered that the marshes of the Tigris lay very close, and the bird is of night, with a voice easily carrying over a mile. Also it was to “sing” and to “lodge” on the “upper lintels” which were the top timbers of the doors and windows. These formed just the location a bittern would probably perch upon when it left its marshy home and went booming through the night in search of a mate. It was without doubt the love song of the bittern that Isaiah and Zephaniah used in completing prophecies of desolation and horror, because with the exception of mating time it is a very quiet bird. For these reasons the change from bittern to porcupine in the Revised Version (British and American), of the paragraph quoted, is a great mistake, as is also that of cormorant to pelican.

Gene Stratton-Porter

BITTERNESS

<*bit'-er-ness*>.

See BITTER.

BITTERNESS, WATER OF

See ADULTERY (2).

BITTER WATER

See ADULTERY (2); MARAH.

BITUMEN

<*bi-tu'-men*>.

See SLIME.

BIZIOTHIAH

<*biz-yo-thi'-a*>, <*biz-joth'-ja*> (*hytjōzbi* [bizyotheyah]; Septuagint [αἱ κῶμαι αὐτῶν, *hai komai auton*], literally “their villages”; the King James Version Bizjothjah, “place of Jah’s olives” (Young), or “contempt of Jah” (Strong)): According to Massoretic Text, a town in the south of Judah,

near Beersheba (^{<6158>}Joshua 15:28). Septuagint reads “and her daughters,” only one consonant of Massoretic Text being read differently; and so We, Hollenberg, Di and others The Septuagint has probably preserved the original text (compare ^{<6127>}Nehemiah 11:27).

BIZTHA

<biz'-tha> (Septuagint [*Μαζάν*, Mazan]; also [Bazan] and [Bazea]): One of the seven eunuchs or chamberlains of King Ahasuerus (Xerxes). It is possible that the name is derived from the Persian besteh, “bound,” hence, “eunuch” (Est 1:10).

BLACK

See *COLORS*.

BLACKNESS

(*μυρῖνῃ* *κι* [kimririm], “obscurations”; *tWrd" q"* [qadhruth], “darkness”; [*γνόφος*, gnophos], “darkness” [*ζόφος*, zophos] “blackness”): Terms rarely used but of special significance in picturing the fearful gloom and blackness of moral darkness and calamity. Job, cursing, the day of his birth, wishes that it, a dies ater (“dead black day”), might be swallowed up in darkness (^{<8075>}Job 3:5). Because of Israel’s spiritual infidelity Yahweh clothes the heavens with the blackness of sackcloth (^{<2808>}Isaiah 50:3), the figure being that of the inky blackness of ominous, terrifying thunder clouds. The fearful judgment against sin under the old dispensation is illustrated by the appalling blackness that enveloped smoking, burning, quaking Sinai at the giving of the law (^{<8128>}Hebrews 12:18; compare ^{<1916>}Exodus 19:16-19; 20:18). The horror of darkness culminates in the impenetrable blackness of the under-world, the eternal abode of fallen angels and riotously immoral and ungodly men (^{<8013>}Jude 1:13; see also 1:6 and ^{<6004>}2 Peter 2:4,17). Human language is here too feeble to picture the moral gloom and rayless night of the lost: “Pits (the King James Version “chains”) of darkness” (compare the ninth plague of Egypt, “darkness which may be felt” (^{<1019>}Exodus 10:21)). Wicked men are “wandering stars,” comets that disappear in “blackness of darkness reserved for ever.” In art this figurative language has found majestic and awe-inspiring expression in Dore’s illustrations of Dante’s Purgatory and Milton’s Paradise Lost.

BLAINS

<blanz> (h[Būb" a][abha`bu`ah]: only in <1819> Exodus 9:9,10): Pustules containing fluid around a boil or inflamed sore. It is an Old English word “bleyen,” used sometimes as a synonym for boil. Wyclif (1382) uses the expression “stinkende bleyne” for Job’s sores. The Hebrew word is from a root which means that which bubbles up.

See BOIL.

BLASPHEMY

<blas'-fe-mi> ([βλασφημία, blasphemia]): In classical Greek meant primarily “defamation” or “evil-speaking” in general; “a word of evil omen,” hence, “impious, and irreverent speech against God.”

(1) In the Old Testament as substantive and vb.:

(a) (𐤁𐤁;[barakh]) “Naboth did blaspheme God and the king” (<1210> 1 Kings 21:10,13 the King James Version);

(b) (dḠL [gadhaph]) of Senna-cherib defying Yahweh (<1296> 2 Kings 19:6,22 = <23706> Isaiah 37:6,23; also <19416> Psalm 44:16; <3317> Ezekiel 20:27; compare <0450> Numbers 15:30), “But the soul that doeth aught with a high hand (i.e. knowingly and defiantly), the same blasphemeth (so the Revised Version (British and American), but the King James Version “reproacheth”) Yahweh; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people.” Blasphemy is always in word or deed, injury, dishonor and defiance offered to God, and its penalty is death by stoning;

(c) (ʿrj ;[charaph]) of idolatry as blasphemy against Yahweh (<23817> Isaiah 65:7);

(d) (bq" n:[naqabh]) “And he that blasphemeth the name of Yahweh, he shall surely be put to death” (<03411> Leviticus 24:11,16);

(e) (Åa" n:[na'ats]) David's sin is an occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme (~~1024~~ 2 Samuel 12:14; also ~~1740~~ Psalm 74:10,18; ~~2816~~ Isaiah 52:5; compare ~~2852~~ Ezekiel 35:12; ~~1298~~ 2 Kings 19:3 the King James Version; ~~2308~~ Isaiah 37:3).

(2) In the New Testament blasphemy, substantive and vb., may be

(a) of evil-speaking generally, (~~4136~~ Acts 13:45; 18:6); The Jews contradicted Paul "and blasphemed," the Revised Version, margin "railed." (So in the King James Version of ~~4159~~ Matthew 15:19 = ~~4172~~ Mark 7:22; ~~5008~~ Colossians 3:8, but in the Revised Version (British and American) "railings"; ~~6119~~ Revelation 2:9 the Revised Version, margin "reviling"; so perhaps in ~~5002~~ 1 Timothy 1:20; or Hymeneus and Alexander may have blasphemed Christ by professing faith and living unworthily of it.)

(b) Speaking against a heathen goddess: the town clerk of Ephesus repels the charge that Paul and his companions were blasphemers of Diana (~~4167~~ Acts 19:37).

(c) Against God:

(i) uttering impious words (~~6301~~ Revelation 13:1,5,6; 16:9,11,21; 17:3);

(ii) unworthy conduct of Jews (~~6124~~ Romans 2:24) and Christians (1 Tim 6:1; ~~5116~~ Titus 2:5, and perhaps ~~5002~~ 1 Timothy 1:20);

(iii) of Jesus Christ, alleged to be usurping the authority of God (~~4118~~ Matthew 9:3 = ~~4117~~ Mark 2:7 = ~~4151~~ Luke 5:21), claiming to be the Messiah, the son of God (~~4176~~ Matthew 26:65 = ~~4146~~ Mark 14:64), or making Himself God (~~6083~~ John 10:33,36).

(d) Against Jesus Christ: Saul strove to make the Christians he persecuted blaspheme their Lord (~~4191~~ Acts 26:11). So was he himself a blasphemer (1 Tim 1:13; compare ~~5116~~ James 2:7).

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN:

(3) Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit: "Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come" (~~4028~~ Matthew 12:31,32 = ~~4138~~ Mark 3:28,29; ~~4210~~ Luke 12:10). As in the Old Testament "to sin with a high hand" and to blaspheme the name of God incurred the death penalty, so the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit

remains the one unpardonable sin. These passages at least imply beyond cavil the personality of the Holy Spirit, for sin and blasphemy can only be committed against persons. In Matthew and Mark a particular case of this blasphemy is the allegation of the Pharisees that Jesus Christ casts out devils by Beelzebub. The general idea is that to attribute to an evil source acts which are clearly those of the Holy Spirit, to call good evil, is blasphemy against the Spirit, and sin that will not be pardoned. "A distinction is made between Christ's other acts and those which manifestly reveal the Holy Spirit in Him, and between slander directed against Him personally as He appears in His ordinary acts, and that which is aimed at those acts in which the Spirit is manifest" (Gould, Mark at the place). Luke does not refer to any particular instance, and seems to connect it with the denial of Christ, although he, too, gives the saying that "who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven." But which of Christ's acts are not acts of the Holy Spirit, and how therefore is a word spoken against Him not also blasphemy against the Holy Spirit? John identifies the Holy Spirit with the exalted Christ (~~4113~~ John 14:16-18,26,28). The solution generally offered of this most difficult problem is concisely put by Plummer (Luke ad loc.): "Constant and consummate opposition to the influence of the Holy Spirit, because of a deliberate preference of darkness to light, render repentance and therefore forgiveness morally impossible." A similar idea is taught in ~~4114~~ Hebrews 6:4-6, and ~~4115~~ 1 John 5:16: "A sin unto death." But the natural meaning of Christ's words implies an inability or unwillingness to forgive on the Divine side rather than inability to repent in man. Anyhow the abandonment of man to eternal condemnation involves the inability and defeat of God. The only alternative seems to be to call the kenotic theory into service, and to put this idea among the human limitations which Christ assumed when He became flesh. It is less difficult to ascribe a limit to Jesus Christ's knowledge than to God's saving grace (~~4113~~ Mark 13:32; compare ~~4112~~ John 16:12,13). It is also noteworthy that in other respects, at least, Christ acquiesced in the view of the Holy Spirit which He found among His contemporaries.

See HOLY SPIRIT.

T. Ress

BLAST

(hmy~~yn~~)[neshamah], j " Wr [ruach]):

(1) The blowing of the breath of Yahweh, expressive of the manifestation of God's power in Nature and Providence. "With the blast of thy nostrils the waters were piled up" (^{<0158>}Exodus 15:8), referring to the east wind (^{<0142>}Exodus 14:21; compare ^{<0216>}2 Samuel 22:16 and ^{<0815>}Psalms 18:15). "I will send a blast upon him" (^{<0207>}2 Kings 19:7 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "put a spirit in him," i.e. "an impulse of fear" (Dummelow in the place cited.); compare ^{<2307>}Isaiah 37:7). "By the blast of his anger are they consumed" (^{<0809>}Job 4:9; compare ^{<2326>}Isaiah 37:36).

(2) The word [ruach] is used with reference to the tyranny and violence of the wicked (^{<2374>}Isaiah 25:4).

(3) The blowing of a wind instrument: "When they make a long blast with the ram's horn" (^{<0805>}Joshua 6:5).

M. O. Evans

BLAST; BLASTING

^{<blast'-ing>} (^{ⲡⲉⲃⲓ}[shiddaphon] — root, ^{ⲃⲩ}[shadhaph], literally "scorching"): This is the effect produced upon grain or other plants by the hot east winds which blow from the desert of Arabia. They usually continue to blow for two or three days at a time. If they occur in the spring near ripening time, the grain is often turned yellow and does not properly mature. The farmers dread this wind. In some localities, if they suspect that the east wind is coming, they set up a great shouting and beating of pans, hoping to drive it off. Sometimes this wind is a double pestilence, when it brings with it a cloud of locusts (^{<0628>}2 Chronicles 6:28). The writer, while journeying in the northern part of the Arabian desert, the source of these winds, witnessed such a cloud of locusts on their way toward habitable regions. It did not call for a very vivid imagination on the part of the children of Israel to realize the meaning of the curses and all manner of evil which would befall those who would not hearken to the voice of Yahweh. ^{<0322>}Deuteronomy 28:22-24 could easily be considered a poetic description of the east winds (Arabic howa sharki'yeh) which visit Palestine and Syria at irregular intervals today. The heat is fiery: it dries up the vegetation and blasts the grain; the sky is hazy and there is a glare as if the sun were reflected from a huge brass tray. Woodwork cracks and warps; the covers of books curl up. Instead of rain, the wind brings dust and sand which

penetrate into the innermost corners of the dwellings. This dust fills the eyes and inflames them. The skin becomes hot and dry. To one first experiencing this storm it seems as though some volcano must be belching forth heat and ashes. No other condition of the weather can cause such depression. Such a pestilence, only prolonged beyond endurance, was to be the fate of the disobedient. This word should not be confused with mildew. Since the words blasting and mildew occur together it may be inferred that mildew (literally “a paleness”) must mean the sickly color which plants assume for other causes than the blasting of the east wind, such, as for instance, fungus diseases or parasites (~~1087~~ 1 Kings 8:37; ~~1049~~ Amos 4:9; ~~3017~~ Haggai 2:17).

James A. Patch

BLASTUS

<blas'-tus> ([Βλάστος, Blastos], “shoot”): The chamberlain of Herod Agrippa I, whose services as an intermediary between them and the king were gained by the people of Tyre and Sidon. These cities were dependent on Palestine for corn and other provisions, and when Herod, on the occasion of some commercial dispute, forbade the export of foodstuffs to Tyre and Sidon, they were at his mercy and were compelled to ask for peace. “Having made Blastus the king’s chamberlain their friend,” probably by means of a bribe, the Phoenician embassy was given an opportunity of setting their case before Herod (~~4120~~ Acts 12:20 ff).

S. F. Hunter

BLAZE

<blaz> (“to publish”): Found only in the King James Version of ~~4045~~ Mark 1:45, for Greek [diaphemizein], translated by the Revised Version (British and American) “spread abroad,” as in ~~1081~~ Matthew 9:31; 28:15.

BLEMISH

<blem'-ish>:

(1) μῦμ [mum], μῦμᾰμ [me'um]; [μῶμος, momos]: This word signifies no particular skin disease, as has been supposed; but is used generally for any and all disfiguring affections of the skin, such as eczema, herpes, scabies, etc., even for scratches and scars, as in ~~1249~~ Leviticus 24:19,20; and

thence for moral defects, as in ^{<4167>}Ephesians 5:27. The existence of a blemish in a person of priestly descent prevented him from the execution of the priestly office; similarly an animal fit for sacrifice was to be without blemish. In the New Testament Christ is presented as the antitype of a pure and ritually acceptable sacrifice “as a lamb without blemish and without spot” (^{<8144>}Hebrews 9:14; ^{<4019>}1 Peter 1:19), and the disciples are admonished to be blameless, “without blemish” (^{<4167>}Ephesians 5:27). Rarely the word is used to designate a reprobate person (2 Pet 2:13).

(2) Blemish in the eye, **l Lb" T**[tebhallul] (from a root **l l " B**; [balal], “to overflow”; Arabic balla, balal, “to moisten”), cataract, white spots in the eye (^{<8231>}Leviticus 21:20).

H. L. E. Luering

BLESS

(bB)[barakh]): This word is found more frequently in the Old Testament than in the New Testament, and is used in different relations.

(1) It is first met in ^{<0022>}Genesis 1:22 at the introduction of animal life upon the earth, where it is written, “And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply,” etc. The context furnishes the key to its meaning, which is the bestowal of good, and in this particular place the pleasure and power of increase in kind. Thus it is generally employed in both Testaments, the context always determining the character of the bestowal; for instance (where man is the recipient), whether the good is temporal or spiritual, or both.

Occasionally, however, a different turn is given to it as in ^{<0035>}Genesis 2:3 the King James Version, where it is written, “And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it.” Here the good consists in the setting apart and consecrating of that day for His use.

(2) In the foregoing instances the Creator is regarded as the source of blessing and the creature the recipient, but the order is sometimes reversed, and the creature (man) is the source and the Creator the recipient. In ^{<0248>}Genesis 24:48, for example, Abraham’s servant says, “I bowed my head, and worshipped Yahweh, and blessed Yahweh, the God of my master Abraham,” where the word evidently means to worship God, to exalt and praise Him.

(3) There is a third use where men only are considered. In ^{<0240>}Genesis 24:60, her relatives “blessed Rebekah, and said unto her, Our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of ten thousands” (the King James Version “millions”), where the word expresses the wish or hope for the bestowal of the good designated. There are also instances where such a blessing of man by man may be taken in the prophetic sense, as when Isaac blessed Jacob (^{<0270>}Genesis 27:4,27), putting himself as it were in God’s place, and with a sense of the Divine concurrence, pronouncing the good named. Here the word becomes in part a prayer for, and in part a prediction of, the good intended. Balaam’s utterances are simply prophetic of Israel’s destiny (^{<0230>}Numbers 23:9,10,11,23 margin,24).

Although these illustrations are from the Old Testament the word is used scarcely differently in the New Testament; “The blessing of bread, of which we read in the Gospels, is equivalent to giving thanks for it, the thought being that good received gratefully comes as a blessing”; compare ^{<0149>}Matthew 14:19 and 15:36 with ^{<0124>}1 Corinthians 11:24 (Adeney, HDB, I, 307).

See also BENEDICTION.

James M. Gray

BLESSED

^{<0000>}*<bles’-ed>* (^U^r^B;[;][barukh]): Where God is referred to, this word has the sense of “praise,” as in ^{<0250>}1 Samuel 25:32, “Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel.” But where man is in mind it is used in the sense of “happy” or “favored,” and most frequently so in the Psalms and the Gospels, as for example, “Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the wicked” (^{<0000>}Psalms 1:1); “Blessed art thou among women” (^{<0142>}Luke 1:42); “Blessed are the poor in spirit” (^{<0183>}Matthew 5:3).

See BEATITUDES.

BLESSEDNESS

^{<0000>}*<bles’-ed-nes>*: This translation of [^{μακαρισμός}, makarismos] (a word signifying “beatification” or “the ascription of blessing”), is used but three times, in ^{<0006>}Romans 4:6,9, and ^{<0015>}Galatians 4:15, in the King James Version only. In the first two instances it refers to the happy state or condition of a man to whom Christ’s righteousness is imputed by faith, and

in the last to a man's experience of that condition.

See **HAPPINESS**.

BLESSING

(**hkrB**)[berakhah]; [**εὐλογία**, eulogia]): Sometimes means the form of words used in invoking the bestowal of good, as in ^{<630>}Deuteronomy 33:1; ^{<683>}Joshua 8:34; and ^{<5080>}James 3:10. Sometimes it means the good or the benefit itself which has been conferred, as in ^{<0273>}Genesis 27:36, "Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me?" and ^{<0002>}Proverbs 10:22, "The blessing of Yahweh, it maketh rich." "The cup of blessing" ([**τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας**, to poterion tes eulogias], a special use of the word in ^{<6016>}1 Corinthians 10:16), means the cup for which we bless God, or which represents to us so much blessing from God.

James M. Gray

BLESSING, CUP OF

([**τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας**, to poterion tes eulogias], "the consecrated cup," ^{<6016>}1 Corinthians 10:16): A technical term from the Jewish liturgy transferred to the Lord's Supper, and signifying the cup of wine upon which a blessing was pronounced. The suggestion that it carries with it a higher significance, as a cup that brings blessing, is not without force. The succeeding words, "we bless," are equivalent to "for which we give thanks." It was consecrated by thanksgiving and prayer.

See also **CUP**.

BLESSING, VALLEY OF

See **BERACAH**.

BLINDFOLD

<blind'-fold> ([**περικαλύπτω**, perikalupto]): A sport common among the children of ancient times, in which the blindfolded were struck on the cheek, then asked who had struck them, and not let go until they had correctly guessed. This treatment was accorded Christ by his persecutors (^{<0226>}Luke 22:64).

BLINDING

<blind'-ing>.

See *PUNISHMENTS*.

BLINDNESS

<blind'-ness> (רָאָה [ʾāwar], and variants; τυφλός, tuphlos): The word blind is used as a verb, as ^{<6124>}John 12:40, usually in the sense of obscuring spiritual perception. In reference to physical blindness it is used as a noun frequently or else as an adjective with the noun man. There are 54 references to this condition, and there is no reason to believe, as has been surmised, that blindness was any less rife in ancient times than it is now, when defective eyes and bleared, inflamed lids are among the commonest and most disgusting sights in a Palestine crowd. In the Papyrus Ebers (1500 BC) there are enumerated a number of diseases of the eye and a hundred prescriptions are given for their treatment. That the disease occurred in children and caused destruction and atrophy of the eyeball is testified to by the occurrence of a considerable number of mummy heads, in which there is marked diminution in size of one orbit. The commonest disease is a purulent ophthalmia, a highly infectious condition propagated largely by the flies which can be seen infesting the crusts of dried secretion undisturbed even on the eyes of infants. (In Egypt there is a superstition that it is unlucky to disturb them.) This almost always leaves the eyes damaged with bleared lids, opacities of the cornea, and sometimes extensive internal injury as well. Like other plagues, this disease was thought to be a Divine infliction (^{<1141>}Exodus 4:11). Minor forms of the disease destroy the eyelashes and produce the unsightly tender-eyes (in ^{<1237>}Genesis 29:17 the word rakh may mean simply “weak”).

Blindness from birth is the result of a form of this disease known as ophthalmia neonatorum which sets in a few days after birth. I have seen cases of this disease in Palestine. Sometimes ophthalmia accompanies malarial fever (^{<1336>}Leviticus 26:16). All these diseases are aggravated by sand, and the sun glare, to which the unprotected inflamed eyes are exposed. Most of the extreme cases which one sees are beyond remedy — and hence, the giving of sight to the blind is generally put in the front of the mighty works of healing by our Lord. The methods used by Him in these miracles varied probably according to the degree of faith in the blind man; all were merely tokens, not intended as remedies. The case of the man in

^{<1082>}Mark 8:22 whose healing seemed gradual is an instance of the phenomenon met with in cases where, by operation, sight has been given to one congenitally blind, where it takes some time before he can interpret his new sensations.

The blindness of old age, probably from senile cataract, is described in the cases of Eli at 98 years of age (^{<1082>}1 Samuel 3:2; 4:15), Ahijah (^{<1140>}1 Kings 14:4), and Isaac (^{<1271>}Genesis 27:1). The smiting of Elymas (^{<4431>}Acts 13:11) and the Syrian soldiers (^{<1168>}2 Kings 6:18) was either a miraculous intervention or more probably a temporary hypnotism; that of Paul (^{<4408>}Acts 9:8) was doubtless a temporary paralysis of the retinal cells from the bright light. The “scales” mentioned were not material but in the restoration of his sight it seemed as if scales had fallen from his eyes. It probably left behind a weakness of the eyes (*see THORN IN THE FLESH*). That blindness of Tobit (Tobit 2:10), from the irritation of sparrows’ dung, may have been some form of conjunctivitis, and the cure by the gall of the fish is paralleled by the account given in Pliny (xxxii.24) where the gall of the fish *Callionymus Lyra* is recommended as an application in some cases of blindness. The hypothesis that the gall was used as a pigment to obscure the whiteness of an opaque cornea (for which Indian ink tattooing has been recommended, not as a cure but to remove the unsightliness of a white spot) has nothing in its favor for thereby the sight would not be restored. The only other reference to medicaments is the figurative mention of eyesalve in ^{<618>}Revelation 3:18.

Blindness unfitted a man for the priesthood (^{<1218>}Leviticus 21:18); but care of the blind was specially enjoined in the Law (^{<1094>}Leviticus 19:14), and offenses against them are regarded as breaches of Law (^{<1271>}Deuteronomy 27:18).

Figuratively, blindness is used to represent want of mental perception, want of prevision, recklessness, and incapacity to perceive moral distinctions (^{<2916>}Isaiah 42:16,18,19; ^{<1216>}Matthew 23:16 ff; ^{<109>}John 9:39 ff).

Alex. Macalister

BLINDNESS, JUDICIAL

<ju-dish’-al>, *<joo-dish’-al>*: Among the ancient Israelites in the pre-Canaanite period disputes within the family or clan or tribe would be settled by the natural head of the family or clan or tribe. According to Exodus 18 Moses, as the leader of the tribes, settled all disputes. But he

was compelled to appoint a body of magistrates — heads of families — to act in conjunction with himself, and under his judicial oversight. These magistrates settled ordinary disputes while he reserved for himself the more difficult cases. After the conquest of Canaan, the conditions of life became so complex, and questions of a difficult nature so constantly arose, that steps were taken

(1) to appoint official judges — elders of the city (^{<0083>}Joshua 8:33; ^{<0083>}Judges 8:3; ^{<0208>}1 Kings 21:8);

(2) to codify ancient custom, and

(3) to place the administration of justice on an organized basis.

It is significant that in one of the oldest documents in the Pentateuch — namely, in the Book of the Covenant (^{<0200>}Exodus 20:20 through 23:33) — the miscarriage of justice was of such frequent occurrence as to require special mention (23:1-3,6-8). In fact the Old Testament abounds with allusions to the corruption and venality of the magisterial bench (^{<0069>}Deuteronomy 16:19; ^{<0095>}Leviticus 19:15; ^{<0062>}Amos 5:12; ^{<0061>}Micah 3:11; 7:3; ^{<0023>}Isaiah 1:23; 5:23; Zeph 3:3; ^{<0056>}Psalms 15:5; ^{<0073>}Proverbs 17:23). According to the Book of the Covenant (^{<0238>}Exodus 23:8) ‘a bribe blindeth the eyes of the open-eyed.’ This descriptive phrase indicates a prolific cause of the miscarriage of justice — an exceedingly common thing in the East, in the present no less than in the past. The prohibition in ^{<0238>}Exodus 23:3, “Neither shalt thou favor a poor man in his cause,” is rather remarkable and many scholars are of opinion that “a great man” should be read for “a poor man” as, according to 23:6 the King James Version, the common fault was “wresting the judgment of the poor.” The rich alone could offer a satisfactory bribe. But it should be pointed out that Leviticus (19:15) legislates in view of both tendencies — “respecting the person of the poor:” and “honoring the person of the mighty.” Sympathy with the poor no less than a bribe from the well-to-do might affect the judgment of the bench. Deuteronomy (16:19) reproduces the words of the Book of the Covenant with a slight alteration — namely, “eyes of the wise” for “eyes of the open-eyed” (“them that have sight”). Both phrases vividly bring out the baneful effect of bribery — a magistrate otherwise upright and honest — open-eyed and wise — may be unconsciously yet effectively influenced in his judicial decisions by a gift sufficiently large. A similar phrase is found in the story of Abraham’s life (^{<0066>}Genesis 20:16). A gift of a thousand shekels to Abraham was intended to be a “covering of the eyes”

for Sarah, i.e. compensation or reparation for the wrong which had been done. For a gift of such magnitude she ought to wink at the injury. Job (9:24) declares in his bitterness that God “covereth the faces of the judges” — inflicts judicial blindness on them so that justice in this world is out of the question. Judicial corruption was the burden of the prophets’ preaching — “judges loved bribes, and followed after rewards,” with the result that “the fatherless” and “the widow” were helpless to have their grievances redressed (^{<20123>}Isaiah 1:23). A satisfactory reward would always secure the acquittal of the offender (^{<23523>}Isaiah 5:23). Micah combines judges, priests and prophets under a similar charge; they are all guilty of gross venality (3:11). Proverbs (17:23) defines the wicked person as one who is always prepared to take a “bribe out of the bosom, to pervert the ways of justice”; on the other hand the good man is he who will not take a reward against the innocent (^{<19155>}Psalms 15:5) or “shaketh his hands from taking a bribe” (^{<23315>}Isaiah 33:15). In regard to Yahweh alone is absolute incorruptibility affirmed — he “regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward” (^{<6107>}Deuteronomy 10:17). — *T. Lewis*

BLOOD

<blud> (μD:[dam], probably from μda;[’adham] “to be red”; [αἷμα, haima]): Used in the Old Testament to designate the life principle in either animal or vegetable, as the blood of man or the juice of the grape (^{<18711>}Leviticus 17:11, et al.); in the New Testament for the blood of an animal, the atoning blood of Christ, and in both Old Testament and New Testament in a figurative sense for bloodshed or murder (^{<11373>}Genesis 37:26; ^{<2042>}Hosea 4:2; ^{<16116>}Revelation 16:6).

1. PRIMITIVE IDEAS:

Although the real function of the blood in the human system was not fully known until the fact of its circulation was established by William Harvey in 1615, nevertheless from the earliest times a singular mystery has been attached to it by all peoples. Blood rites, blood ceremonies and blood feuds are common among primitive tribes. It came to be recognized as the life principle long before it was scientifically proved to be. Naturally a feeling of fear, awe and reverence would be attached to the shedding of blood. With many uncivilized peoples scarification of the body until blood flows is practiced. Blood brotherhood or blood friendship is established by African tribes by the mutual shedding of blood and either drinking it or rubbing it

on one another's bodies. Thus and by the inter-transfusion of blood by other means it was thought that a community of life and interest could be established.

2. HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT CUSTOMS:

Notwithstanding the ignorance and superstition surrounding this suggestively beautiful idea, it grew to have more than a merely human significance and application. For this crude practice of inter-transference of human blood there came to be a symbolic substitution of animal blood in sprinkling or anointing. The first reference in the Old Testament to blood (^{<0040>}Genesis 4:10) is figurative, but highly illustrative of the reverential fear manifested upon the shedding of blood and the first teaching regarding it.

The rite of circumcision is an Old Testament form of blood ceremony. Apart from the probable sanitary importance of the act is the deeper meaning in the establishment of a bond of friendship between the one upon whom the act is performed and Yahweh Himself. In order that Abraham might become "the friend of God" he was commanded that he should be circumcised as a token of the covenant between him and God (^{<0170>}Genesis 17:10-11; *see CIRCUMCISION*).

It is significant that the eating of blood was prohibited in earliest Bible times (^{<0004>}Genesis 9:4). The custom probably prevailed among heathen nations as a religious rite (compare ^{<0104>}Psalms 16:4). This and its unhygienic influence together doubtless led to its becoming taboo. The same prohibition was made under the Mosaic code (^{<0126>}Leviticus 7:26; *see SACRIFICE*).

Blood was commanded to be used also for purification or for ceremonial cleansing (^{<0145>}Leviticus 14:5-7,51,52; ^{<0194>}Numbers 19:4), provided, however, that it be taken from a clean animal (*see PURIFICATION*).

In all probability there is no trace of the superstitious use of blood in the Old Testament, unless perchance in ^{<1228>}1 Kings 22:38 (*see BATHING*); but everywhere it is vested with cleansing, expiatory, and reverently symbolic qualities.

3. NEW TESTAMENT TEACHINGS:

As in the transition from ancient to Hebrew practice, so from the Old Testament to the New Testament we see an exaltation of the conception of

blood and blood ceremonies. In Abraham's covenant his own blood had to be shed. Later an expiatory animal was to shed blood (^{<886>}Leviticus 5:6; *see ATONEMENT*), but there must always be a shedding of blood. "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (^{<802>}Hebrews 9:22). The exaltation and dignifying of this idea finds its highest development then in the vicarious shedding of blood by Christ Himself (^{<600>}1 John 1:7). As in the Old Testament "blood" was also used to signify the juice of grapes, the most natural substitute for the drinking of blood would be the use of wine. Jesus takes advantage of this, and introduces the beautiful and significant custom (^{<1038>}Matthew 26:28) of drinking wine and eating bread as symbolic of the primitive intertransfusion of blood and flesh in a pledge of eternal friendship (compare ^{<1246>}Exodus 24:6,7; ^{<1063>}John 6:53-56). This is the climactic observance of blood rites recorded in the Bible.

LITERATURE.

Trumbull, The Blood Covenant and The Threshold Covenant;
Westermarck, The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas; Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites.

Walter G. Clippinger

BLOOD AND WATER

([αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, haima kai hudor]): The remarkable passage (^{<884>}John 19:34) from which this expression is taken refers to the piercing of the Savior's side by the soldier. The evangelist notes here what he, as an eyewitness of the crucifixion, had seen as a surprising fact. Whereon this surprise was founded cannot now be more than guessed at. Nor is it necessary here to discuss the reason or reasons why the apostle mentions the fact at all in his report, whether merely for historical accuracy and completeness, or as a possible proof of the actual death of Christ, which at an early date became a subject of doubt among certain Christian sects, or whether by it he wished to refer to the mystical relation of baptismal cleansing ("water") and the atonement ("blood") as signified thereby. Let it suffice to state that a reference often made to ^{<686>}1 John 5:6,8 is here quite out of place. This passage, though used by certain Fathers of the church as a proof of the last-named doctrine, does not indeed refer to this wonderful incident of the crucifixion story. The argument of ^{<688>}1 John 5:8 concerns the Messiahship of Jesus, which is proved by a threefold witness, for He is the one whom at the baptism of John ("water") God attested as the

Messiah by the heavenly voice, “This is my beloved Son,” who at the crucifixion (“blood”) had the testimony that the Father had accepted His atoning sacrifice, and whose promise of sending the Comforter fulfilled on Pentecost (“spirit”) presented us with the final proof of the completed Messianic task. The same expression in ~~1~~ John 5:6 refers probably to the same argument with the implied meaning that Jesus came not only by the merely ceremonial water of baptism, but also by the more important, because vivifying, blood of atonement.

The physiological aspect of this incident of the crucifixion has been first discussed by Gruner (*Commentatio de morte Jesu Christi vera*, Halle, 1805), who has shown that the blood released by the spear-thrust of the soldier must have been extravasated before the opening of the side took place, for only so could it have been poured forth in the described manner. While a number of commentators have opposed this view as a fanciful explanation, and have preferred to give the statement of the evangelist a symbolical meaning in the sense of the doctrines of baptism and eucharist (so Baur, Strauss, Reuss and others), some modern physiologists are convinced that in this passage a wonderful phenomenon is reported to us, which, inexplicable to the sacred historian, contains for us an almost certain clue to the real cause of the Savior’s death. Dr. Stroud (*On the Physiological Cause of the Death of Christ*, London, 1847) basing his remarks on numerous postmortems, pronounced the opinion that here we had a proof of the death of Christ being due not to the effects of crucifixion but to “laceration or rupture of the heart” as a consequence of supreme mental agony and sorrow. It is well attested that usually the suffering on the cross was very prolonged. It often lasted two or three days, when death would supervene from exhaustion. There were no physical reasons why Christ should not have lived very much longer on the cross than He did. On the other hand, death caused by laceration of the heart in consequence of great mental suffering would be almost instantaneous. In such a case the phrase “of a broken heart,” becomes literally true. The life blood flowing through the aperture or laceration into the pericardium or caul of the heart, being extravasated, soon coagulates into the red clot (blood) and the limpid serum (water). This accumulation in the heart-sac was released by the spear-thrust of the soldier (which here takes providentially the place of a postmortem without which it would have been impossible to determine the real cause of death), and from the gaping wound there flow the two component parts of blood distinctly visible.

Several distinguished physicians have accepted Dr. Stroud's argument, and some have strengthened it by the observation of additional symptoms. We may mention Dr. James Begbie, fellow and late president of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, Sir J. Y. Simpson, professor at the University of Edinburgh, and others (see Dr. Hanna, *Our Lord's Life on Earth*, Appendix I). The latter refers to the loud cry, mentioned by the Synoptists (^{<4251>}Matthew 27:50; ^{<4153>}Mark 15:37; ^{<0236>}Luke 23:46), which preceded the actual death of Jesus, as a symptom characteristic of cases of "broken heart." He adds that Dr. Walshe, professor of medicine in University College, London, one of the greatest authorities on the diseases of the heart, says that a "piercing shriek" is always uttered in such cases immediately before the end.

While we may never reach a state of absolute certainty on this subject, there is no valid reason to deny the probability of this view of the death of Christ. It certainly gives a more solemn insight into Christ's spiritual anguish, "the travail of his soul" on our behalf, which weighed upon Him so heavily that long before the usual term of bodily and therefore endurable suffering of crucified persons Christ's loving heart broke, achieving the great atoning sacrifice for all mankind.

H. L. E. Luering

BLOOD, AVENGER OF

See AVENGER.

BLOOD, ISSUE OF

<ish'-u>.

See BLOODY FLUX.

BLOODGUILTINESS

<blud-gilt'-i-nes>: Found in the King James Version only in ^{<49514>}Psalm 51:14. The Revised Version (British and American) adds ^{<0221>}Exodus 22:2,3; ^{<0253>}1 Samuel 25:26,33. ^{<3883>}Ezekiel 18:13 seems to indicate that the phrase does not necessarily signify bloodshed, but any grievous sin which, if it remains, will block God's favor to His land and people (compare ^{<6208>}Deuteronomy 21:8; ^{<3015>}Isaiah 1:15). Psalm 51 is to be interpreted in this light.

BLOOD-REVENGE

<blud-re-venj'>:

See *AVENGER*.

BLOODSHEDDING

<blud'-shed-ing> ([αἱματεκχυσία, haimatekchusia], ^{<802>}Hebrews 9:22):

In this passage the indispensability of expiating sacrifice is positively set forth.

BLOODTHIRSTY

<blud'-thurs-ti> (μυμD:yvæ" a" [ʾanshe damim], “men of blood”):

This occurs in the King James Version only in ^{<1990>}Proverbs 29:10; in the Revised Version (British and American), ^{<1906>}Psalms 5:6; 55:23; 59:2; 139:19.

See *BLOODY*.

BLOODY

<blud'-i> (μD:[dam] = “blood” of man or an animal; and where the King James translators have rendered with the adjective “bloody,” the Hebrew employs the noun in the construct case, “of blood”): “A bridegroom of blood” (^{<1045>}Exodus 4:25,26, the King James Version bloody husband). Zipporah, not being an Israelite, probably objected to the circumcision of infants, if not to the rite altogether; apprehending, however, that her husband’s life was imperiled possibly through some grievous sickness (^{<1045>}Exodus 4:24) because of their disobedience in this particular, she performed the ceremony herself upon her son, saying, “A bridegroom of blood art thou to me.”

In the Revised Version (British and American) the expression (the King James Version “bloody”) is variously rendered, “man of blood” (^{<1047>}2 Samuel 16:7,8); “men of blood” (^{<1906>}Psalms 26:9); “bloodthirsty” (^{<1906>}Psalms 5:6; 59:2; 139:19). In ^{<1906>}2 Samuel 21:1, “It is for Saul, and for his bloody house,” might be rendered “Upon Saul and his house rests bloodshed.”

Ezekiel calls Jerusalem “the bloody city” (~~<370>~~Ezekiel 22:2; 24:6; compare 7:23), referring to those unjustly put to death by the wicked rulers of Jerusalem. Nineveh also is called “the bloody city” (Nah 3:1). The capital here virtually stands for the kingdom, and history bears witness to the enormous cruelties perpetrated by the Assyrian rulers. It is siege on siege, pools of blood everywhere, the flaying of men alive, “great baskets stuffed with the salted heads of their foes.” For two hundred years it is the story of brute force and ruthless cruelty. “The prey departeth not.” And now every cruelty which they have visited upon others is to be turned upon themselves (Nah 3:19).

M. O. Evans

BLOODY FLUX

~~<fluks>~~ ([~~πυρετὸς καὶ δυσεντερία~~, puretos kai dusenteria], literally “fever and dysentery”): The disease by which the father of Publius was afflicted in Malta (~~<408>~~Acts 28:8). the Revised Version (British and American) calls it “dysentery”; a common and dangerous disease which in Malta is often fatal to soldiers of the garrison even at the present day (Aitken, Pract. of Medicine, II, 841). It is also prevalent in Palestine at certain seasons, and in Egypt its mortality was formerly about 36 percent. Its older name was due to the discharge of blood from the intestine. Sometimes portions of the bowel become gangrenous and slough, the condition described as affecting Jehoram (~~<4219>~~2 Chronicles 21:19). There seems to have been an epidemic of the disease at the time of his seizure (~~<4214>~~2 Chronicles 21:14,15), and in the case of the king it left behind it a chronic ulcerated condition, ending in gangrene. Somewhat similar conditions of chronic intestinal ulceration following epidemic dysentery I have seen in persons who had suffered from this disease in India.

Alex. Macalister

BLOODY SWEAT

~~<swet>~~ [~~ῥοσεῖ θρόμβοι αἱματος~~, hosei thromboi haimatos]): Described in ~~<224>~~Luke 22:44 as a physical accompaniment of our Lord’s agony at Gethsemane (on the passage, which is absent in some manuscripts, see Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek). Many old writers take this to mean that the perspiration dropped in the same manner as clots of blood drop from a wound, regarding the Greek word prefixed as

expressing merely a comparison as in ^{<1818>}Matthew 28:3, where [leukon hos chion] means “white as snow.” Cases of actual exudation of blood are described in several of the medieval accounts of stigmatization, and Lefebvre describes the occurrence of something similar in his account of Louise Lateau in 1870. For references to these cases see the article “Stigmatization” in Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), XXII, 550. It is perhaps in favor of the older interpretation that the word used by Aeschylus for drops of blood is stagon (Agam. 1122) and by Euripides stalagmos, not thromboi. None of the instances given by Tissot (Traite des nerfs, 279), or Schenck (Observ. med., III, 45:5), can be said to be unimpeachable; but as the agony of our Lord was unexampled in human experience, it is conceivable that it may have been attended with physical conditions of a unique nature.

Alex. Macalister

BLOOM; BLOSSOM

<bloom>, <blos'-um>.

See FLOWERS.

BLOT

<blot> (μῶμ [mum], contracted from μῶμᾱ [me'um], “spot”): Occurs in the sense of scorn (^{<2100>}Proverbs 9:7). In ^{<1830>}Job 31:7 (the King James Version) it is used figuratively of a moral defect; the Revised Version (British and American) has “spot.” Blot out (h̄j m̄ [machah], “to wipe out,” [ἐξάλειφω, exaleipho], “to smear out”), to obliterate or destroy: “That a tribe be not blotted out” (the King James Version “destroyed,” ^{<1721>}Judges 21:17). To blot men out of God’s book is to cut them off by an untimely death (^{<1232>}Exodus 32:32).

Figuratively: “To blot out sin” is to forgive sin fully (^{<1510>}Psalms 51:1,9; ^{<489>}Acts 3:19; ^{<5124>}Colossians 2:14). Not to blot out sin is to reserve for punishment (^{<1645>}Nehemiah 4:5). The names of those who inherit eternal life are not blotted out of the “book of life” (^{<618>}Revelation 3:5).

See BOOK OF LIFE; BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE; FORGIVENESS.

L. Kaiser

BLOW

<blo> (**ṽ" n**:[nashaph]): Used with reference to the wind (^{<12510>}Exodus 15:10; ^{<1983>}Psalms 78:26; 147:18; [**πνέω**, pneo], “to breathe,” ^{<1275>}Luke 12:55; ^{<1888>}John 3:8; ^{<1171>}Revelation 7:1); [**q" T**:[taqa`], with reference to trumpet sound (^{<11018>}Numbers 10:3-10; 31:6 the King James Version; ^{<11078>}Judges 7:18,20; ^{<11034>}1 Kings 1:34; ^{<13534>}1 Chronicles 15:24; ^{<1818>}Psalms 81:3; ^{<1718>}Ezekiel 33:3,6; ^{<1818>}Hosea 5:8; ^{<1101>}Joel 2:1,15); **j " WT**:[puach], with reference to the strong expulsion of the breath (^{<1213>}Ezekiel 21:31; 22:20,21; ^{<11019>}Haggai 1:9; ^{<11017>}Isaiah 40:7; 54:16; ^{<1818>}Job 20:26); **ṽ" n**: [nashaph], with reference to a forcible slap or stroke with hand or an instrument (^{<1910>}Psalms 39:10; ^{<11014>}Isaiah 40:24; ^{<11017>}Jeremiah 14:17 the King James Version).

Frank E. Hirsch

BLUE

<bloo>.

See *COLORS*.

BOANERGES

<bo-a-nur'-jez> ([**Βοανηργές**, Boanerges]; **vgk <ynB**)[bene reghesh], “sons of thunder”): The surname bestowed by Jesus upon James and John, the sons of Zebedee, when they were ordained to the apostleship (^{<11017>}Mark 3:17). See *JAMES, SON OF ZEBEDEE*. It has also been regarded as an equivalent of the “Heavenly Twins,” the Sons of Zeus or Thunder. According to this interpretation, the name Boanerges would represent the Dioscuri in some form or other of their varied presentation in the cults of the Mediterranean (compare Professor J. Rendel Harris in *The Expositor*, series vii, III, 146). — *C. M. Kerr*

BOAR

<bor> (**ryzj**)[chazir]: In lamenting the troubled state of the Jewish nation the Psalmist (^{<1818>}Psalms 80:13) says: “The boar out of the wood doth ravage it, and the wild beasts of the field feed on it,” with evident reference to Israel’s enemies, the Assyrians, etc. The wild boar is abundant in certain

parts of Palestine and Syria, especially in the thickets which border the lakes and rivers, as about the [Chuleh], the sea of Galilee, the Jordan, and in the deltas of streams flowing into the Dead Sea, as Ghaur-us-Cafiyeh. Several fountains in Lebanon bear the name, `Ain-ul-Chazir, though [chazir] is not an Arabic word, khazir being the Arabic for “swine.”

See SWINE.

Alfred Ely Day

BOARD

<bord> (**vrq**, [qeresh], “a slab or plank,” “deck of a ship,” “bench,” “board”): This word is found in ^{<0256>}Exodus 26:16-21; 36:21 ff; its plural occurs in ^{<0255>}Exodus 26:15,17-29; 35:11; 36:20-34; 39:33; 40:18; ^{<0086>}Numbers 3:36; 4:31. This word also is used in translation of **j w** [luach] (^{<0278>}Exodus 27:8; 38:7; Song 8:9; ^{<3276>}Ezekiel 27:5 the King James Version) = “a tablet” (of stone, wood or metal), “board,” “plate,” “table”; also of [tsla`] = “rib,” hence, a “side,” “timber,” “plank” (^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:15 f). In ^{<1069>}1 Kings 6:9, **hrde** [sedherah] = “a rank,” “a row,” hence, “a range” or “board” is used. In the New Testament we find the expression “on board” in ^{<0744>}Acts 27:44 the King James Version, in translation of [epi sanisin] = “planks.”

Frank E. Hirsch

BOAST

<bost> (**l l " h**; [halal], “to praise”; [**καυχάομαι**, kauchaomai], “to vaunt oneself,” used both in a good and a bad sense): To praise God: “In God have we made our boast all the day long” (^{<1948>}Psalm 44:8); to praise oneself, to vaunt (^{<1908>}Psalm 10:3). In the New Testament the Revised Version (British and American) frequently translates “glory,” where the King James Version has “boast,” in a good sense (2 Cor 7:14). In the sense of self-righteousness (^{<4019>}Ephesians 2:9; ^{<6117>}Romans 2:17,23). Boaster ([**ἀλαζών**, alazon], “a braggart”) occurs in the King James Version (^{<6110>}Romans 1:30; ^{<5812>}2 Timothy 3:2); the Revised Version (British and American) has “boastful.”

BOAT

<bot>.

See *SHIPS*.

BOAZ

<bo'-az> (z[Boo]bo`az; [Bóoζ, Booz]; “quickness” (?) Ruth 2 through 4; ~~<321>~~ 1 Chronicles 2:11,12; ~~<406>~~ Matthew 1:5; ~~<482>~~ Luke 3:32):

(1) A resident of Bethlehem and kinsman of Elimelech, Naomi’s husband. In ~~<891>~~ Ruth 2:1 he is described as a [gibbor chayil], a phrase which can mean either “a mighty man of valor” or else “a man of position and wealth.” The latter is probably the sense in which the phrase is applied to Boaz (compare ~~<991>~~ 1 Samuel 9:1). He had fields outside the town, and to them Ruth went to glean. Boaz noticed her and extended special kindness and protection to her, bidding her remain with his female workers, and charging the men not to illtreat her, and also giving her of the reapers’ food at mealtime. Boaz awoke one night and found Ruth lying at his feet. He praised her virtue, and promised to take charge of her if her dead husband’s next-of-kin failed to do so. He laid her case before the next-of-kin, and finally redeemed the family property himself and bought as well the right to take Ruth in marriage. The son of Boaz and Ruth was Obed, father of Jesse, and grandfather of David. ~~<321>~~ 1 Chronicles 2:11,12 makes Boaz a descendant of Hezron, and so probably a chief of the Hezronite clan in Bethlehem. Jewish tradition identifies Boaz with Ibzan (~~<978>~~ Judges 12:8-10).

Boaz “is set before us as a model of piety, generosity and chastity” (H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History*, 398). He found virtue and rewarded it. HPM, sections 501-8, gives a picture of the life of “a well-to-do landed proprietor of central Palestine,” much of which could aptly be taken as a description of Boaz.

(2) The name of one of the two bronze pillars erected in front of Solomon’s temple, the other being Jachin (~~<1021>~~ 1 Kings 7:21; ~~<487>~~ 2 Chronicles 3:17).

See *JACHIN AND BOAZ; TEMPLE*.

David Francis Roberts

BOCCAS

<bo'-as> ([Βοκκάς, Bokkas]): A priest in the line of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2) called Bukki in ^{<19704>}Ezra 7:4 and Borith in 2 Esdras 1:2.

BOCHERU

<bo'-ke-roo> (WrkḲḲ [bokheru]): A son of Azrikam, Saul's descendant (^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 8:38 = 9:34). For the ending ("u"), compare the forms WmvḲ' [gashmu] (^{<1401>}Nehemiah 6:1,6) and Wkyl m [melikhu] (^{<16214>}Nehemiah 12:14 the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin).

BOCHIM

<bo'-kim> (μykBb" [ha-bokhim]: A place on the mountain West of Gilgal said to have been so named (literally "the weepers") because Israel wept there at the remonstrance of the angel (^{<1001>}Judges 2:1,5). No name resembling this has been discovered. Given on the occasion mentioned, it may not have endured. Many, following Septuagint, identify it with Bethel.

BODY

<bod'-i>:

1. PHILOLOGICAL:

Generally speaking, the Old Testament language employs no fixed term for the human body as an entire organism in exact opposition to "soul" or "spirit." Various terms were employed, each of which denotes only one part or element of the physical nature, such as "trunk," "bones," "belly," "bowels," "reins," "flesh," these parts being used, by synecdoche, for the whole: μx [etsem] = "bone," or "skeleton," hence, "body," is found in ^{<12410>}Exodus 24:10 the King James Version; ^{<23417>}Lamentations 4:7; vpp< [nephesh] = "living organism" (^{<13211>}Leviticus 21:11; ^{<14016>}Numbers 6:6,7,11; 19:11,13,16; ^{<37213>}Haggai 2:13); hl bœ [nebhelah] = "a flabby thing," "carcass" (^{<15123>}Deuteronomy 21:23; ^{<23519>}Isaiah 26:19; ^{<24573>}Jeremiah 26:23; 36:30); ^fβ [beTen] = "womb" (^{<15304>}Deuteronomy 28:4,11,18,53; 30:9;

<1897> Job 19:17 the King James Version; <1921> Psalm 132:11; <3167> Micah 6:7);
 יָרֵךְ [yarekh] = “thigh,” “generative parts,” “body” (<0830> Judges 8:30);
 הַיָּוֶה [gewiyah] = “a body, whether alive or dead” (<0810> 1 Samuel
 31:10,12; <1865> 2 Kings 8:5 the King James Version; <2006> Daniel 10:6);
 מַיְמֵי [me`im], “body” (Song 5:14); הַגֹּחַל [guphah] = “corpse” (<3102> 1
 Chronicles 10:12); הַגֶּחַל [gewah] = “the back,” i.e. (by extension) “person”
 (<1825> Job 20:25); רֶשֶׁת [she`er] = “flesh, as living or for food,” “body”
 (<3102> Ezekiel 10:12); מִגֶּשֶׁם [geshem] = “a hard shower of rain” hence, “a
 body” (<2083> Daniel 4:33; 5:21; 7:11); הַנֶּחֱל [nidhneh] = “a sheath,”
 hence, the receptacle of the soul, “body” (<2075> Daniel 7:15).

The Greek word which is used almost exclusively for “body” in the New Testament is [σῶμα, soma], Latin corpus (<1052> Matthew 5:29,30; 6:22,23,25; 26:26; <8121> John 2:21; <4191> Acts 9:40; <4555> 1 Corinthians 15:35,37,38,44; <6023> Ephesians 1:23; 2:16; 4:4,12,16; 5:23,30). [χρῶς, chros], signifying primarily the “surface” or “skin,” occurs in <4192> Acts 19:12. A compound word with [soma], as its base, [σύσσωμος, sussomos] = “a member of the same body,” occurs in <4195> Ephesians 3:6. From the above, it appears that the New Testament places the body as a whole into opposition to the spirit or the invisible nature. Paul, of course, employs the term also to designate the sublimated substance with which we are to be clothed after the resurrection when he speaks of the “spiritual body” (1 Cor 15:44).

Frank E. Hirsch

2. GENERAL:

1. In the Old Testament:

[σῶμα, soma], Latin corpus: The term “body” is not found in the Hebrew of the Old Testament in the sense in which it occurs in the Greek “The Hebrew word for ‘body’ is הַיָּוֶה [gewiyah], which is sometimes used for the ‘living’ body (<3101> Ezekiel 1:11), ‘bodies of the cherubim’ (<0478> Genesis 47:18; <1087> Nehemiah 9:37), but usually for the dead body or carcass. Properly speaking the Hebrew has no term for ‘body.’ The Hebrew term around which questions relating to the body must gather is flesh” (Davidson, Old Testament Theology, 188). Various terms are used

in the Old Testament to indicate certain elements or component parts of the body, such as “flesh,” “bones,” “bowels,” “belly,” etc., some of which have received a new meaning in the New Testament. Thus the Old Testament “belly” (Hebrew [beTen], Greek [koilia]), “Our soul is bowed down to the dust; our belly cleaveth unto the earth” (^{<B1425>}Psalm 44:25 the King James Version) — as the seat of carnal appetite — has its counterpart in the New Testament: “They serve their own belly” (^{<B1618>}Romans 16:18). So also the word translated “bowels” ([meim], [rachamim]) in the sense of compassion, as in ^{<B2431>}Jeremiah 31:20, King James Version: “Therefore my bowels are troubled for him,” is found in more than one place in the New Testament. Thus in ^{<B1008>}Philippians 1:8 the King James Version, “I long after you all in the bowels [splagchna] of Christ,” and again, “if there be any bowels [splagchna] and mercies” (^{<B1001>}Philippians 2:1 the King James Version).

2. In the New Testament:

“Body” in the New Testament is largely used in a figurative sense, either as indicating the “whole man” (^{<B1612>}Romans 6:12; ^{<B1015>}Hebrews 10:5), or as that which is morally corrupt — “the body of this death” (^{<B1616>}Romans 6:6; 7:24). Hence, the expression, “buffet my body” (1 Cor 9:27, [hupopiazō], a word adopted from the prize-ring, palaestra), the body being considered as the lurking-place and instrument of evil. (Compare ^{<B1613>}Romans 8:13 the King James Version “Mortify the deeds of the body.”)

3. Other Meanings:

Between these two the various other meanings seem to range. On the one hand we find the church called “the body of Christ” (^{<B1016>}Ephesians 4:16; ^{<B1213>}1 Corinthians 12:13), with diversity of gifts, enjoying the “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” On the other we read of a spiritual, incorruptible body, a resurrection-body as opposed to the natural body, which is doomed to corruption in death (1 Cor 15:44). Not only do we find these meanings in the word itself, but also in some of its combinations. On the one hand we read in ^{<B1616>}Ephesians 3:6 of the Gentiles as “partakers of the promise in Christ” as “fellow-heirs,” and “of the same body” ([sussoma]) in corporate union with all who put their trust in the Redeemer of mankind; on the other, we read of mere “bodily (somatic) exercises,” which are not profitable. (1 Tim 4:8) — where “body” evidently is contrasted with “spirit.” And again, we read of the Holy Ghost descending in “bodily” (somatic) shape upon the “Son of God” (^{<B1612>}Luke 3:22), in whom dwelt the “fullness of the Godhead bodily” (somatically)

(~~511D~~ Colossians 2:9). So, too, the “body” is called a temple of the Holy Ghost: “Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit?” (1 Cor 6:19).

4. The Body and Sin:

From all this it is apparent that the body in itself is not necessarily evil, a doctrine which is taught in Greek philosophy, but nowhere in the Old Testament and New Testament. The rigid and harsh dualism met with in Plato is absent from Paul’s writings, and is utterly foreign to the whole of Scripture. Here we are distinctly taught, on the one hand, that the body is subordinated to the soul, but on the other, with equal clearness, that the human body has a dignity, originally conferred upon it by the Creator, who shaped it out of earth, and glorified it by the incarnation of Christ, the sinless One, though born of a woman. Julius Muller has well said: “Paul denies the presence of evil in Christ, who was partaker of our fleshly nature (~~480D~~ Galatians 4:4), and he recognizes it in spirits who are not partakers thereof (~~482D~~ Ephesians 6:12 the King James Version, ‘spiritual wickedness in high places’). Is it not therefore in the highest degree probable that according to him evil does not necessarily pertain to man’s sensuous nature, and that [sarx] (say body) denotes something different from this?” (The Christian Doctrine of Sin, I, 321, English edition). He further shows that the derivation of sin from sense is utterly irreconcilable with the central principle of the apostle’s doctrine as to the perfect holiness of the Redeemer, and that “the doctrine of the future resurrection — even taking into account the distinction between the [soma psuchikon] and the [soma pneumatikon] (1 Cor 15:44) — is clearly at variance with the doctrine that sin springs from the corporal nature as its source” (318).

5. The First Sin:

The very first sin was spiritual in its origin — an act of rebellion against God — the will of the creature in opposition to the will of the Creator (Genesis 3). It was conceived in doubt — “Hath God said?”; it was born in desire — “The tree was good for food”; it was stimulated by a rebellious hankering after equality with God: “Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil”; it was introduced from without, from the spiritual world, through the agency of a mysterious, supernatural being, employing “a beast of the field more subtle than any which Yahweh God had made.” That the serpent in the Old Testament is not identified with Satan, and that the clearest utterance in pre-Christian times on the subject is to be found in the Book of The Wisdom of Solomon 2:24 (“by the envy of the devil death entered into

the world”), may be true. That the narrative of the Fall is figurative or symbolical may also be granted. But the whole tendency of the early narrative is to connect the first human sin with a superhuman being, employing an agent known to man, and making that agent its representative in the “subtlety” of the great temptation as a prelude to the mighty fall. The New Testament is clear on this point (^{<B04>}John 8:44; 16:11; ^{<7118>}2 Corinthians 11:3; ^{<S1214>}1 Timothy 2:14; ^{<S1214>}Hebrews 2:14; ^{<6129>}Revelation 12:9). Great historic truths are imbedded in that narrative, whatever we may think of the form which that narrative has assumed. There can be no doubt that the oldest and truest traditions of the human race are to be found there. It is not denied that sin has desecrated the temple of the living God, which is the body. That body indeed has become defiled and polluted by sin. Paul recognizes “an abnormal development of the sensuous in fallen man, and regards sin as having in a special manner entrenched itself in the body, which becomes liable to death on this very account (^{<B123>}Romans 6:23; 7:24)” (Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I, 761). But we may safely say that theory which connects sin with the physical body, and gives it a purely sensuous origin, is alien to the whole spirit and letter of revelation.

J. I. Marais

3. FIGURATIVE:

In the New Testament ([^{<S06>}σωμα, soma], “the body” both of men and animals) the word has a rich figurative and spiritual use:

- (1) the temporary home of the soul (2 Cor 5:6);
- (2) “the temple of the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor 6:19);
- (3) “temple” (^{<B121>}John 2:21);
- (4) “the old man,” the flesh as the servant of sin or the sphere in which moral evil comes to outward expression (^{<B116>}Romans 6:6; 7:7; compare Paul’s use of [sarx], “flesh”);
- (5) the “church” as Christ’s body, the organism through which He manifests His life and in which H is spirit dwells (^{<B123>}Ephesians 1:23; ^{<S1024>}Colossians 1:24);
- (6) the spiritual “unity” of believers, one redeemed society or organism (^{<B126>}Ephesians 2:16; a corpus mysticum, ^{<B104>}Ephesians 4:4);
- (7) “substance” (spiritual reality or life in Christ) versus “shadow”

(~~5127~~Colossians 2:17);

(8) the ascended and glorified body of Jesus (~~5192~~Philippians 3:21);

(9) the resurrection or “spiritual” (v. natural) body of the redeemed in heaven (1 Cor 15:44);

(10) the whole personality, e.g. the spiritual presence, power and sacrificial work of Christ, the mystical meaning of “the body and the blood” symbolized in the bread and cup of the sacrament (1 Cor 11:27). The term body is exceptionally rich in connection with the selfgiving, sacrificial, atoning work of Christ. It was the outward sphere or manifestation of His suffering. Through the physical He revealed the extent of His redeeming and sacrificial love. He “bare our sins in his body upon the tree” (1 Pet 2:24), thus forever displacing all the ceaseless and costly sacrifices of the old dispensation (~~5194~~Hebrews 9:24-28). Special terms, “body of his flesh” (~~5102~~Colossians 1:22); “body of sin” (~~5106~~Romans 6:6); “body of this death” (~~5124~~Romans 7:24); “body of his glory” (~~5192~~Philippians 3:21).

[πτῶμα, ptoma], used only of fallen, i.e. dead bodies (~~5118~~Revelation 11:8,9).

Dwight M. Pratt

BODY-GUARD

<bod'-i-gard>: The expression occurs in Apocrypha (1 Esdras 3:4), “the body-guard that kept the king’s person.”

BODY OF DEATH

<deth> ([σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου, soma tou thanatou]): These words are found in Paul’s impassioned argument on the reign of the law, which dooms man to continuous disappointment and convinces him of the terrible power of indwelling sin. “O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (~~5124~~Romans 7:24 the King James Version). It is the “picture of the still unredeemed man in his relation to the law” (Meyer). The translation, “this body of death,” though grammatically possible, is logically impermissible. The picture here before the mind of the apostle is not physical but ethical. Death points to the dominion of sin, to the reign of the law, as revealed in his physical life, from which he is delivered only through regeneration, by faith in Christ. It points to the “I must” and to the “I cannot.” It is therefore the bondage under the law of sin, the body as the seat of this conscious and bitter struggle, that the figure

points at. And yet the ethical may have a physical background. There may be a distant reference here to the dreadful punishment of the ancients of chaining the living body to a corpse, that the constant corruption of death might extinguish the life of the victim of this exquisite torture.

Henry E. Dosker

BODY OF HEAVEN

The King James Version translates the Hebrew idiom, מַיִם וְהַמָּוֶלֶת [etsem ha-shamayim], by “the body of heaven” (^{<1240>}Exodus 24:10). A more correct rendering is given in the Revised Version (British and American), “the very heaven,” taking the word [etsem] in its idiomatic use as an intensive, which is derived from its literal meaning, “bone,” as “strength,” “substance,” and then as “self” (compare ^{<1023>}Job 21:23); the substance of the blue, unclouded sky, hence, the clear sky itself.

BODY, SPIRITUAL

^{<spir'-it-u-al>}: Paul describes the body after the resurrection as a spiritual body ([soma psuchikon]) and contrasts it with the natural (psychical body, [soma pneumatikon], ^{<154>}1 Corinthians 15:44). Our present natural body has for its life-principle the soul ([psuche]) but the resurrection body is adapted and subordinated to the spirit ([pneuma]). *See PSYCHOLOGY.* The apostle does not argue for a literal and material identity of that future body with the present one, but thinks of it as the counterpart of the present animal organism so conditioned as to be adapted to a state of existence which lies wholly within the sphere of the spirit. Against his Corinthian readers he argues that the resurrection cannot be succeeded by a state of non-existence, nor is he willing to admit a mere etherealized state. There must be a body, but between it and our present body there is a similar difference to that between the first and second Adam. The present body and the first Adam were alike dominated by the soul ([psuche]); but as the second Adam became a life-giving spirit, so will the resurrection body be a spiritual one. Christ became a life-giving spirit through the resurrection (Meyer on ^{<156>}1 Corinthians 15:45); and since we are to bear His image (1 Cor 15:49), it becomes evident that Christ's resurrection-body is the nearest possible approach to a sensible representation of the spiritual body. For this Paul argues more directly when he affirms that our resurrection-body shall be transformed according to the body of His glory

(^{<182>}Philippians 3:21; compare ^{<182>}1 John 3:2). The body of Christ after the resurrection was conformed in many respects to the body of His earthly life, yet with some marked differences. He ate (^{<242>}Luke 24:42,43); He breathed (^{<182>}John 20:22); possessed flesh and bones (^{<243>}Luke 24:39), and could be apprehended by the bodily senses (^{<244>}Luke 24:40; ^{<182>}John 20:27). His body possessed characteristics which differentiated it entirely from the popular fancy of ghosts or apparitions (^{<245>}Luke 24:36-43). Yet His body was superior to the usual barriers which restrict human movements. Barred doors and distances did not impede His going (^{<182>}John 20:19-26; ^{<246>}Luke 24:31-36). The context shows that the purpose of His eating was to convince the disciples that it was really He (^{<244>}Luke 24:41-43), and not to sustain life which His body was probably capable of maintaining in other ways. John speaks of His appearances after His resurrection as “manifestations” (^{<182>}John 21:1-21). A change in His person and appearance had certainly taken place, for those who knew Him best did not at once recognize Him (^{<246>}Luke 24:16; ^{<182>}John 20:14). It is evident therefore that the post-resurrection-body of Jesus was one that had the power of materializing itself to natural senses, or withdrawing itself at will. It was this same body which was taken into the heavens at the ascension, and which remains in heaven (^{<411>}Acts 1:11; 3:21). There is no hint that it underwent any change in its removal from earth. Hence, the spiritual body of which Paul speaks is not to be unlike the body which Jesus possessed after His resurrection. There is to be an absence of the desires and passions which belong naturally to the present bodily existence (^{<223>}Matthew 22:30; ^{<218>}Luke 20:35,36).

William Charles Morro

BOHAN

^{<bo'-han>} (^h B [bohan], “thumb,” “stumpy”): A son of Reuben according to ^{<18516>}Joshua 15:6; 18:17. No mention is made of Bohan in the genealogies of Reuben. “The stone of Bohan” ([’ebhen bohan]) was a boundary mark on the Northeast frontier of Judah, separating it from Benjamin. Site unidentified.

BOIL (1)

(noun) (^{yj} ^v) [shechin]; [^{ελκος}, helkos]): A localized inflamed swelling. The Hebrew word is derived from a root probably meaning “to burn,” and

is used as a generic term for the sores in the sixth plague of Egypt (~~Exodus~~ Exodus 9:9-11); for a sore which might be confounded with leprosy (~~Leviticus~~ Leviticus 13:18-23); for Job's malady (~~Job~~ Job 2:7) and Hezekiah's disease (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 20:1; ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 38:21). Our English word is derived from the verb "to beal," i.e. to suppurate, now obsolete except as a dialect word in Scotland and Ireland. Wyclif uses the name f or Lazarus' sores (~~Luke~~ Luke 16:20), "houndis lickeden his bylis." The Egyptian word *schn* is the name of an abscess, and occurs in the reduplicated form *chnchnt* in Papyr. Ebers, CV. The plague of boils in Egypt came without warning immediately after the insect plagues of [kinnim] (sandflies) and that of [arobh] or flies, and followed the epizootic murrain, which is suggestive in the light of the transmission of toxic germs by insects. It has been supposed by some to be elephantiasis, as Pliny says that this di sease was peculiar to Egypt (xxvi.5). A stronger case has been made out for its identity with confluent smallpox; but as it is not described as being a fatal disease, it may more probably have been an aggravated form of the ordinary gregarious furuncles or boils, due to the microbe *streptococcus pyogenes*.

Job's body is said to have been covered with itchy, irritating sores which made his face unrecognizable, (~~Job~~ Job 2:12, caused continual burning pain (3:24; 6:4), and which were infested with maggots (7:5) and exhaled a nauseous fetor (19:17). His sleep was destroyed and his nervous system enfeebled (3:26) so that he required assistance to move, as he sat in the ashes (2:8). Various diagnoses have been made of his malady, but it is most probable that it was a form of the disease known as "oriental sore," or "Bagdad boil," called in Algeria "Biskra batton," in which the intensely itchy sores are often multiple, affecting the face, hands, and other exposed parts. The cases which I have seen have been very intractable and disfiguring.

Hezekiah's boil was apparently more localized, and the indefinite description would accord with that of a carbuncle. It seems to have rendered him unclean (~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 38:22), though the reference may be to the practice referred to in (~~Leviticus~~ Leviticus 13:18 f. The "botch" of Egypt (~~Deuteronomy~~ Deuteronomy 28:27,35 the King James Version) is translation of the same word, as is "boil" in the Revised Version (British and American). Botch is an old English name for boil and occurs in *Piers Plowman*, and the adjective "botchy" is used in *Troilus and Cressida* (II, 1, 6). The word is cognate to the old French *boche* or *poche*, a form of our later word "pock." The sores of Lazarus (~~Luke~~ Luke 16:20) were probably old varicose

ulcers, such as are as common on the legs of the old and poor in the East as they are in the West.

Alex. Macalister

BOIL (2)

(verb) (**l v" B**;[bashal], **j t" r**:[rathach]): “Boil” is the translation of [bashal], “to bubble up,” “to boil,” “to be cooked,” Piel, “to cause to boil,” “to cook” (~~888~~ Leviticus 8:31; ~~1192~~ 1 Kings 19:21; ~~1169~~ 2 Kings 6:29; ~~3461~~ Ezekiel 46:20,24 [bis]); of [rathach], to be hot,” “to boil,” “to be made to boil,” “to be greatly moved” under strong emotion (the bowels), Hiphil “to cause to boil” (~~887~~ Job 30:27 the King James Version “My bowels boiled, and rested not,” the English Revised Version “My bowels boil.” the American Standard Revised Version “My heart is troubled”; ~~8463~~ Job 41:31, “He maketh the deep to boil like a pot”; ~~3465~~ Ezekiel 24:5, “make it boil well”); of [ba`ah], “to bubble” or “well up” (~~2612~~ Isaiah 64:2 (1, in Hebrew) “The fire causeth the waters to boil”); in King James Version, margin of ~~951~~ Psalm 45:1 (“My heart is inditing a good matter”) we have Hebrew “boileth” or “bubbleth up” ([rachash], “to boil” or “bubble up,” the Revised Version (British and American) text, “My heart overfloweth with a goodly matter”).

“Boiling-places,” occurs in ~~3463~~ Ezekiel 46:23 as the translation of [mebhashsheloth], “hearths,” “boiling-places.” The American Standard Revised Version has “boiling-houses” for “places of them that boil” (~~3463~~ Ezekiel 46:24), “boil well” for “consume” (24:10); the American Standard Revised Version has “boiling over” for “unstable” (~~1440~~ Genesis 49:4; the English Revised Version, margin “bubbling over”).

W. L. Walker

BOLDNESS

<bold'-nes> ([παρρησία, parresia], “confidence,” “fearlessness,” “freedom of speech”): This was one of the results of discipleship (~~4083~~ Acts 4:13,29,31; ~~4182~~ Ephesians 3:12; ~~3003~~ Philippians 1:20; ~~5483~~ 1 Timothy 3:13; ~~6147~~ 1 John 4:17). It was a necessary qualification for the work assigned them. They were not only subject to violent persecutions, but also were the constant subject of ridicule and contempt. Paul uses the word in the sense of plainness in ~~4182~~ 2 Corinthians 3:12. In ~~3809~~ Hebrews 10:19; ~~6173~~ 1 John

2:28; 4:17, it has the sense of freeness resulting from confidence. In Philem 1:8, the reference is to the authority which Paul claims in this case.

Jacob W. Kapp

BOLLED

<bold> (𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 [gibh`ol], “the calyx of flowers”): Hence, “in bloom,” and so rendered, in the Revised Version (British and American), of flowering flax (𐤁𐤏𐤁 Exodus 9:31).

BOLSTER

<bol’-ster>: Found in the King James Version only in 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 1 Samuel 19:13,16, “Behold, the teraphim was in the bed, with the pillow of goat’s hair at the head thereof” (the King James Version “for his bolster”), and 26:7,11,12,16, “Saul lay sleeping with his spear stuck in the ground at his head.” “Bolster” in these passages in the King James Version was used to translate a Hebrew word whose true significance is “the place of the head,” or “the head-place.” It will be noted that it has disappeared from the Revised Version (British and American), which rightly has throughout “head,” instead of “bolster.”

See CUSHION.

BOLT

<bolt> (𐤁 𐤁𐤏 [ḥi:[na`al], “to bind up”): The ancient Hebrews had fastenings of wood or iron for the doors of houses (𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 2 Samuel 13:17,18; Song 5:5), city gates (𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 Nehemiah 3:3,6,13-15), prison doors, etc. (𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 Isaiah 45:2), which were in the form of bolts. These were sometimes pushed back from within; but there were others which, by means of a key, could be unfastened and pushed back from without (𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 Judges 3:23 ff). These were almost the only form of locks known.

See BAR; LOCK.

In 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤅𐤁 Habakkuk 3:5, [resheph] (a poetic word for “flame”) is rendered “fiery bolts” (the King James Version “burning coals”). It seems to denote “the fiery bolts, by which Yahweh was imagined to produce pestilence or fever” (Driver, Deuteronomy, 367). — *M. O. Evans*

BOND

See *BAND*; *BILL*; *CHAIN*.

BONDAGE

<bon'-daj>: Used in two senses in Scripture, a literal and a metaphorical sense.

(1) In the former sense it refers

(a) to the condition of the Hebrews (**hdb**) [ʾabhodhah] in Egypt (^{Exodus 1:14} the King James Version; ^{Exodus 2:23} and often) which is frequently called “the house of bondage” (“slaves,” **μυδβ**) [ʾabhadhim], ^{Exodus 13:3,14; 20:2}; ^{Deuteronomy 5:6} and often. It also refers to the condition of the Hebrews in Babylonia (^{Isaiah 14:3}, the King James Version) and in Persia (^{Ezra 9:8 f}), where a slightly different form of the same root (**twdb**) [ʾabhedhuth] is used in the original. In both these cases the bondage was not so much personal as national. As a rule individuals were not subject to individuals, but the whole Hebrew people were subject to the Egyptian, Babylonian and the Persian states. They were forced to labor on public works, and otherwise, and were denied their own freedom when the exigencies of state seemed to demand it. The former word [ʾabhodhah] is also used in ^{Nehemiah 5:18} as descriptive of the subject and depressed conditions of the Hebrews in Palestine during the earlier years after their return from captivity, when they were still living under Persian suzerainty.

(b) The word bondage ([ʾabhadhim]) is also used to describe the slavery into which the poor Jews were being forced by their more prosperous brethren in the earlier years under the Persians in Palestine (^{Nehemiah 5:5}). Here true personal, though temporary, slavery is meant.

(c) Marriage is once referred to as a bondage (1 Cor 7:15) (verb **δουλόω**, *doulōō*).

(2) It is used in the metaphorical sense only in New Testament. [**ἡ δουλεία**, *he douleia*], “bondage,” is the power of physical corruption as

against the freedom of life (~~<R12>~~ Romans 8:21), the power of fear as over against the confidence of Christian faith (~~<R15>~~ Romans 8:15; ~~<R25>~~ Hebrews 2:15), and especially is it the bondage of the letter, of the elements, of a ceremonial and institutional salvation which must be scrupulously and painfully observed, as contrasted with the freedom of the sons of God, emancipated by faith in Jesus Christ. This bondage is a peculiarly Pauline idea since he was fighting for Christian freedom (~~<R14>~~ Galatians 2:4; 4:3,9,24,25; 5:1). In ~~<G19>~~ 2 Peter 2:19 the idea is essentially different. Libertinism, masquerading under the name of freedom, is branded as bondage, in contrast with the true freedom of righteous living.

See SLAVERY.

William Joseph McGlothlin

BONDMAID

<bond'-mad>: Occurs but three times in the King James Version (~~<R19>~~ Leviticus 19:20; 25:44; ~~<R02>~~ Galatians 4:22 (the Revised Version (British and American) "handmaid")). The first instance is that of Hebrew girl who has by birth, purchase or otherwise come into temporary slavery. The word here is **hj p̄yi**[shiphchah]. It occurs often in the Old Testament, but is elsewhere translated "maid," "handmaid," "woman servant," "maidservant," etc. The other instance (~~<R54>~~ Leviticus 25:44) refers to foreign slave girls and has different word, **hma;**['amah], which also occurs number of times, but is elsewhere translated "handmaid," etc. The New Testament instance (~~<R02>~~ Galatians 4:22) refers to Hagar, Abraham's Egyptian slave girl. The original word [**παῖς**κη, paidiske], occurs several other times, but in the King James Version is elsewhere translated "maid," "damsel," etc. It means a slave girl.

See SLAVERY.

William Joseph McGlothlin

BONDMAN

<bond'-man>: One of the translations of the word **db**['ebhedh], very common in the Old Testament. It refers to the ordinary slave, either foreign (~~<R18>~~ Genesis 43:18; 44:9,33; ~~<R54>~~ Leviticus 25:44,46) or Hebrew (~~<R52>~~ Leviticus 25:42; ~~<D01>~~ 2 Kings 4:1). Hebrews were forbidden to enslave

Hebrews, but did it nevertheless. It also refers to the Israelites in the bondage of Egypt (^{<0515>}Deuteronomy 15:15, and often), and in the exile of Babylonia (^{<0909>}Ezra 9:9). The intended treatment of the men of Judah in Samaria (^{<0810>}2 Chronicles 28:10) was apparently to sell them into ordinary slavery or bondage. The word is used once in the New Testament (^{<0615>}Revelation 6:15) to translate [δοῦλος, *doulos*], where it evidently means a slave in contrast with a freeman.

See SLAVERY.

William Joseph McGlothlin

BONDSERVANT

<bond'-sur-vant>: Appears only once in the King James Version (^{<0239>}Leviticus 25:39) where it translates *db* [,[ʿebhedh], “a slave”: “Thou shalt not cause him to render the service of a bondservant” or slave. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently uses bondservant ([δοῦλος, *doulos*]) instead of the word “servant” of the King James Version (^{<0834>}John 8:34,35; ^{<0121>}1 Corinthians 7:21; ^{<0007>}Galatians 4:7).

See SLAVERY.

BONE; BONES

<bon> (*μῡ* [,[etsem], *μῡ* [etsem]; Aramaic [gerem], by extension used for “bony frame,” “body,” “strength,” ^{<0310>}Psalms 35:10; “the whole man”; ^{<0239>}Luke 24:39, “flesh and bones = the solid and tangible framework of the body; figuratively the substance, the idea of a thing, the thing, per se): Figurative: Very often we find the use of these words in metaphorical phrases, in which a disease or a discomfort of the body denotes certain emotions or mental attitudes. Thus the expression “rotteness of the bones” (^{<0121>}Proverbs 12:4; 14:30) signifies the feelings of a man whose wife causes him shame and confusion, or is equivalent to “envy,” “jealousy.” The translation of the Septuagint in these passages by [σκόληξ, *skolex*], “worm,” and [σῆς, *ses*], “maggot,” “moth,” is incorrect. The same phrase is used in ^{<0316>}Habakkuk 3:16 for utter dejectedness through the anticipation of approaching evil. Similarly the “shaking of the bones” (^{<0044>}Job 4:14) is expressive of fear, and denotes dejection and sadness in ^{<0239>}Jeremiah 23:9. The “burning of the bones” is found as a symptom of Job’s disease (^{<0030>}Job 30:30), and stands for grief,

depression of spirits in ^{<1947B>}Psalm 102:3 and ^{<2013>}Lamentations 1:13, and also for the feeling of Jeremiah, when he attempted to hold back the Divine message (^{<2919>}Jeremiah 20:9), while “dryness of bones” (^{<2072>}Proverbs 17:22) is the opposite of “good health.” Other similar expressions of mental distress are the “piercing of the bones” (^{<1807>}Job 30:17), the bones are “troubled” (^{<1916>}Psalm 6:2), “out of joint” (^{<1924>}Psalm 22:14), “consumed” (^{<1910>}Psalm 31:10 the King James Version), “wasted away” or “waxed old” (^{<1913>}Psalm 32:3), “broken” (^{<1508>}Psalm 51:8; ^{<2074>}Lamentations 3:4), “ill at rest” (^{<1913>}Psalm 38:3), “bone of my bones,” etc. (^{<1023>}Genesis 2:23), having the same nature, and the nearest relation (^{<1011>}2 Samuel 5:1) and affection (^{<1913>}Ephesians 5:30). In the last-mentioned passage, the Revised Version (British and American) omits “of his flesh, and of his bones” as an interpolation from ^{<1023>}Genesis 2:23. The figs. in ^{<3072>}Micah 3:2,3 are expressive of the most cruel oppression and murder.

H. L. E. Luering

BONNET

<bon'-et>: In the King James Version the designation of the special headdress of the rank and file of the priesthood, the Revised Version (British and American) “head-tire” (^{<0280>}Exodus 28:40). It consisted of a long swath of fine white linen wound around the head in oriental fashion. The Hebrew word found in ^{<0291>}Exodus 29:9 the Revised Version (British and American), “to bind head-tires,” literally “to wind head-tires,” means, in the light of usage, “to form an egg-shaped turban.” Compare Josephus, Ant, III, vii, 3; and see Rich, Dict. Roman and Greek Ant, under the word pileus, for illustration of the egg-shaped cap of Ulysses, with which Jerome compared the priestly turban.

See DRESS; MITRE, etc.

BOOK

<book> (^{<1913>}εφθερ]; [ἡ βίβλος, he biblos]):

A book is any record of thought in words. It consists of a fixed form of words embodied in some kind of substance.

1. DEFINITION:

The form of words is the main factor, but it has no existence without the record. The kind of record is indifferent; it may be carved on stone, stamped on clay, written or printed on vellum, papyrus or paper, or only stamped on the mind of author or hearer, if so be it keeps the words in fixed form. Looked on as a form of words the book is called a work, and looked on as a record it is called a volume, document, inscription, etc., as the case may be; but neither volume nor work has any real existence as book save as united.

The Biblical words for book, both Greek and Hebrew, oscillate in meaning (as they do in all languages) between the two elements, the form of words and the material form. The common words for book in the New Testament, from which too the word “Bible” comes, refer back to the papyrus plant or the material on which the book is written, just as the English word “book” was long supposed to be derived from the beech tree, on whose bark the book was written. The usual word in the Hebrew of the Old Testament ([cepher]) may possibly refer to the act of writing, just as the Greek word [grammata] and the English “writings” do, but more likely, as its other meanings of “numbering” and “narration” or even “missive” indicate, it refers neither to the material nor to the writing process but to the literary work itself. It suggests at least the fact that the earliest books were, indeed, books of tallies. The knot-books and various notchbook tallies are true books. In the King James’ version the “word” ([dabhar]) is sometimes translated book, and, although h changed in these places in the Revised Version (British and American) to “acts” or “deeds,” it was nevertheless quite properly translated a book, just as the “word” in Greek is used for book, and indeed in English when the Bible is called the Word. Besides these terms commonly translated book in the English Versions of the Bible, various book forms are referred to in the Bible as roll or volume (which is the same in origin), tablet, and perhaps rock inscription (~~Job~~ Job 19:23,24).

The fact that the Bible is a book, or indeed a library of many kinds of books, makes necessary that to approach its study one should have some systematic idea of the nature of the book; the origin of new forms and their survival, oral and manuscript transmission, the nature of the inward book and the various kinds of inward books. Apart from the matter of general archaeological use for historical interpretation, the questions of inspiration, the incarnate, creative, and indwelling word and many other doctrines are

wholly bound up with this question of the nature of the book, and many phrases, such as the Book of Life, can hardly be understood without knowing with some degree of clearness what a book is.

The archaeology, text criticism and higher criticism of the past few years have revolutionized book history and theory in their respective fields. Above all the young science of experimental psychology has, in its short life, contributed more even than the others to an understanding of the book and The Book, the word of God and the Word of God, the Bible and Jesus Christ.

2. INWARD BOOKS:

Modern experimental psychology by its study of inward images, inward speech, inward writings and other kinds of inward book forms has, in particular, thrown on Biblical inspiration, higher criticism and text criticism and the various aspects of the doctrine of the word, an unexpected light. Inward books, it appears, are not only real, but of many kinds, visual and auditory, oral and written, sensory and motor, and these different kinds have perhaps a material basis and local habitation in different parts of the brain. At least they have real existence; they are real records which preserve a fixed form of words, to be brought out of the recesses of the mind from time to time for re-shaping, re-study or utterance. (See Dittrich, *Sprachpsychologie*, 1903; LeRoy, *Leviticus langage*, Paris, 1905; Van Ginneken, *Principes de linguistique psychol.*, 1907; A. Marty, *Untersuch. Sprachphilosophie*, 1908; Macnamara, *Human Speech*, 1909; the classical work is Wundt, *Volkerpsychologie: Die Sprache*, Leipzig, 1900.)

Inward books may be originals or copies. Every book is, to begin with, inward. Men sometimes speak of an autograph as the "original," but it is in fact only a first-hand copy of the original, which is inward, and never by any chance becomes or can become outward. Besides these originals there are also inward copies of the books of others. The fact that a book may be memorized is no new thing, but the analysis of the process is. It seems that a book may be inwardly copied through eye or ear or touch or any sense from some outward book; or again it may be copied back and forth within, from sense copy to motor copy, from visual to oral, auditory to inward writing. In reading aloud the visual image is copied over into oral; in taking dictation the auditory image is copied over into inward writing. Many men, even in reading from print, cannot understand unless they translate as they

go into oral images or even move their lips. Many others either hearing or reading a French book, e.g. have to translate inwardly into English and have in the end two memory copies, one French and one English, both of which may be recalled. In whatever way they are recorded, these memory impressions are real copies of outward books, and in the case of tribal medicine men, Vedic priests, the ancient minstrels, village gossips, and professional story-tellers of all kinds, the inward collection of books may become a veritable library.

3. PUBLICATION:

The end for which a book is created is in general to reach another mind. This means the utterance or copying into some outward material and the re-copying by another into memory. The commonest modes of utterance are oral speech and writing; but there are many others, some appealing to eye, some to ear, some to touch: e.g. gesture language of the Indian and the deaf mute, pressure signs for the blind and deaf, signal codes, drum language, the telegraph click, etc. If the persons to be reached are few, a single oral speech or manuscript may be enough to supply all needs of publication, but if there are very many the speech or writing must somehow be multiplied. This may be done by the author himself. Blind Homer, it is alleged, repeated the Iliad in many cities; and the modern political orator may repeat the same speech several times in the same evening to different audiences. So too the author may, as many Latin writers did, copy out several autographs. If the audience is still too great to be reached by authors' utterances, the aid of heralds, minstrels, scribes and the printing-press must be called in to copy from the autographs or other author's utterances; and in case of need more help yet is called in, copies made from these copies, and copies again, and so on to perhaps hundreds of copyings. This process may be represented as x plus x_1 plus x_2 plus x_2 plus x_3 plus x_n where x = an original, x_1 a first-hand copy of author's utterance, x_2 a second-hand copy, x_3 a third-hand, etc.

Books may thus be divided into originals, first-hand or authors' copies and re-copies. Re-copies in turn whether at second-, third-, fourth- or nth-hand, may be either mechanical or personal, according as the copy is direct from outward material to outward material or from the outward material to a human memory.

(1) *Mechanical Copies:*

Mechanical copies include photographic copies of manuscripts, or of the lips in speaking, or of gesture, or any other form of utterance which may be photographed. They include also phonographic records, telegraph records, and any other mechanical records of sound or other forms of utterance. Besides photographic and phonographic processes, mechanical copies include founding, stamping by seal or die, stereographic, electrotpe, stencil, gelatine pad and printing-press processes, any processes, in short, which do not pass via the human mind, but direct from copy to copy by material means. They do not include composition in movable types or by type-setting machines, typewriting machines and the like, which, like writing, require the interposition of a human mind. These mechanical copies are subject to defects of material, but are free from psychological defects and error, and defect of material is practically negligible.

(2) *Personal Copies:*

Personal copies include inward copies, or memory books, and the re-uttered copies from these copies, to which latter class belong all copied manuscripts. The memory copy may be by eye from writing, or from the lips of a speaker in the case of the deaf. Or it may be by ear from oral speech, telegraph key, drum or other sound utterances. Or it may be again from touch, as in the case of finger-tip lip-reading or the reading of raised characters by the blind. Each of these kinds may perhaps be located in a different part of the mind or brain, and its molecular substratum may be as different from other kinds of inward record as a wave of light is different from a wave of sound, or a photograph from the wax roll of a phonograph; but whatever the form or nature, it somehow records a certain fixed form of words which is substantially equivalent to the original. This memory copy, unlike the mechanical copy, is liable to substantial error. This may arise from defects of sense or of the inward processes of record and it is nearly always present. Why this need be so is one of the mysteries of human nature, but that it is, is one of the obvious facts; and when memory copies are reuttered there is still another crop of errors, "slips of tongue and pen," equally mysterious but equally inevitable. It comes to pass, therefore, that where oral or manuscript transmission exists, there is sure to be a double crop of errors between the successive outward copies. When thus a form of words is frequently re-copied or reprinted via the human mind the resulting book becomes more and more unlike the original as to

its form of words, until in the late manuscript copies of early works there may often be thousands of variations from the original. Even an inspired revelation would thus be subject to at least one and perhaps two or three sets of errors from copying before it reached even the autograph stage.

4. ORAL TRANSMISSION:

Before the knowledge of handwriting became general, oral publication was usual, and it is still not uncommon. The king's laws and proclamations, the works of poets and historians, and the sacred books were in ancient times published orally by heralds and minstrels and prophets; and these primitive publishers are survived still by town criers, actors, reciters, and Scripture readers.

Up to the point of the first impression on another mind, oral publication has many advantages. The impression is generally more vivid, and the voice conveys many nice shades of feeling through inflection, stress, and the delicate variations in tone quality which cannot be expressed in writing. When it comes to transmission, however, oral tradition tends to rapid deterioration with each re-copy. It is true that such transmission may be quite exact with enough painstaking and repetition; thus the modern stage affords many examples of actors with large and exact repertoires, and the Vedas were, it is alleged, handed down for centuries by a rigidly trained body of memorizers. The memorizing of Confucian books by Chinese students and of the Koran by Moslem students is very exact. Nevertheless, exact transmission orally is rare, and exists only under strictly artificial conditions. Ear impressions, to begin with, tend to be less exact than eye impressions, in any event, because they depend on a brief sense impression, while in reading the eye lingers until the matter is understood. Moreover, the memory copy is not fixed and tends to fade away rapidly; unless very rigidly guarded and frequently repeated it soon breaks up its verbal form. This is readily seen by the great variety in the related legends of closely related tribes; and in modern times in the tales of village gossips and after-dinner stories, which soon lose their fixed verbal form, save as to the main point.

There is great difference of opinion as to the part which oral transmission played in the composition of the Old Testament. The prevailing theory of the higher critics of the 19th century made this the prime factor of transmission to at earliest the 8th century BC, but the recent remarkable

revelations of archaeology regarding the use of written documents in Palestine at the time of the Exodus and before has changed the situation somewhat. The still more recent developments as to the Semitic character of Palestine before the invasion of the Israelites, together with the growing evidence of the prevailing use of handwriting all over Palestine by not later than the 9th century, point in the same direction. It is now even asserted (Clay, Amorites) that the Semitic wave was from the north rather than the south, in which case the only possible ground for ascribing illiteracy to the Hebrews at the time of the conquest, and therefore exclusive oral tradition, would be removed.

Whatever may be the facts, it may be said with some definiteness that theory which implies two sets of traditions, handed down for several centuries and retaining a considerable amount of verbal likeness, implies written tradition, not oral, for no popular tradition keeps identical verbal forms for so long a time, and there is little ground for supposing artificial transmission by professional memorizers. The schools of the prophets might, indeed, have served as such, but there is no evidence that they did; and it would have been curious if, writing being within easy reach, this should have been done. As in almost all literatures, it is far more likely that the popular traditions are derived from and refreshed by literary sources, than that literature was compiled from traditions with long oral transmission.

Biblical references to oral publication are found in the references to heralds (see under the word), to Solomon's wisdom as "spoken" (~~<106>~~1 Kings 4:32-34), proclamations and edicts, the public reading of the law in the Old Testament, and the reading in the synagogue in the New Testament. All the oracles, "thus saith the Lord" and "the word of Yahweh," to Moses, etc., and all allusions to preaching the word, belong to this class of oral publication and transmission. A direct allusion to oral transmission is found in ~~<941>~~ Psalm 44:1, "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us."

5. MANUSCRIPTS:

The distinction of handwriting as against oral utterance lies first in the permanence of the record, but it has also a curious psychological advantage over speech. The latter reaches the mind through hearing one letter at a time as uttered. With writing, on the other hand, the eye grasps

three to six letters at a time, and takes in words as wholes instead of spelling them out. The ear always lags, therefore, the eye anticipates, although it may also linger if it needs to. While therefore impressions from hearing may perhaps be deeper, one may gather many more in the same time from reading.

When it comes to transmission, the advantage of handwriting is obvious. In the first place, even the poorest ink hardly fades as rapidly as memory. Then at best few men reach a hundred years, and therefore no memory, copy, while on the other hand the limit to the life of writing has never been reached. We have writings that have lasted 6,000 years, at least; while if the Palermo stone, e.g. had been orally transmitted it must needs have passed through some 200 copyists at least, each producing two sets of errors. The advantage of manuscript transmission over oral tradition in its permanence is thus very great. It is true, of course, that in the case of fragile material like papyrus, paper, or even leather, transmission ordinarily implies many re-copyings and corresponding corruption, but even at worst these will be very much better than the best popular oral tradition.

In the broad sense manuscripts include all kinds of written books without regard to material, form or instruments used. In the narrowest sense they are limited to rolls and codices, i.e. to literary manuscripts. Inscriptions are properly written matter engraved or inscribed on hard material. Documents, whether private letters or official records, are characteristically folded in pliable material. Literary works again are usually rolls or else codices, which latter is the usual form of the printed books as well. These three classes of written books have their corresponding sciences in epigraphy, diplomatics and paleography.

(1) Epigraphy:

Epigraphy has to do primarily with inscriptions set up for record in public places. These include published laws, inscriptions, biographical memorials like the modern gravestone inscriptions and those on memorial statues, battle monuments and the like. It includes also votive inscriptions, inscriptions on gems, jewels, weights and measures, weapons, utensils, etc. Seals and coins from all points of view belong here and form another division under printing. These have their own sciences in numismatics and sphragistics. The chief Biblical reference is to the “tables of stone” (^{<12412>}Exodus 24:12).

See **TABLE; ALPHABET; WEIGHT; WRITING; etc.**

(See Lidzbarski, Handb. nordsemit. Epigr., 1898-.)

(2) Sphragistics:

Sphragistics is the science of seals. Scripture references to the seal or signet (~~<0388>~~Genesis 38:18; ~~<0384>~~Job 38:14; ~~<0301>~~Revelation 5:1; etc.) are many.

See **SEAL; SIGNET.**

(3) Numismatics:

Numismatics has to do with inscriptions on coins and medals, and is becoming one of the greatest sources of our knowledge of ancient history, especially on account of the aid derived from coins in the matter of dating, and because of the vast quantity of them discovered.

See **MONEY.**

(4) Diplomatics:

Diplomatics, or the science of documents, has to do with contracts of sale and purchase (~~<0388>~~Jeremiah 3:8; 32:14), bills of divorce (~~<0301>~~Deuteronomy 24:1) and certificates of all sorts of the nature of those registered in the modern public records. These may be on clay tablets, as in Babylonia and the neighboring regions, or on ostraca as found especially in Egypt, but everywhere in the ancient Mediterranean world, and notably for Biblical history, in Samaria, as discovered by the Harvard expedition. Multitudes of the Egyptian papyri discovered in modern times are of this character as well as the Italian papyri until papyrus was succeeded by vellum. Many are also found on wax, gold, silver, brass, lead tablets, etc.

See **LETTERS; OSTRACA; PYPYRI.**

(5) Paleography:

Paleography has to do with volumes or books of considerable bulk, chiefly. It has, therefore, to do mainly with literary works of all sorts, but it shades into diplomatics when official documents, such as collections of laws (e.g. Deuteronomy), treatises, such as the famous treaty between the Hittites and Egypt, and modern leases are of such bulk as to be best transmitted in volume form. It has to do chiefly with the clay tablets, papyrus, leather, vellum and paper volumes. The clay tablet is mentioned in the Old

Testament at various points (*see* **TABLET**), the roll in both Old Testament and New Testament (*see* **ROLL**). The leather roll is the traditional form for the Hebrew Scriptures up to the present day, although the codex or modern volume form had been invented before the conclusion of the New Testament, and the earliest extant copies are in this form. The books of the Old Testament and New Testament were all probably first written on rolls. For the different methods of producing these various forms — graving, casting, pressing, pen and ink, etc., *see* **WRITING**.

6. PRINTED BOOKS:

Printing differs from writing chiefly in being executed in two dimensions. In writing, a chisel or brush or pen follows a continuous or interrupted line, while printing stamps, a letter or a part of a letter, a line, a page, or many pages at a stroke. The die, the wedge for clay tablets, seals, molds, xylographic plates, as well as the typewriter, movable type or electrotype plates, etc., belong properly to printing rather than writing. The wedge stamp, or single-letter die, the typewriter, the matrix and movable type form, however, a sort of transition between the pen point and the printing-press in that they follow letter after letter. Coins and seals, on the other hand, differ little from true printing save in the lengths of the writings; Babylonian seals and the rotary press are one in principle. Sphragistics, or the science of seals, and numismatics, or the science of coins, medals, etc., belong thus with printing from this point of view, but are more commonly and conveniently classed with epigraphy, on the principle that they depend on the light and shade of incision or relief in one color as distinguished from the color contrasts of ink or paint. Printed books include the xylographic process of Chinese and early European printing, page and form printing from movable type, and all electrotype, stencil, gelatine pad, etc., processes.

The advantage of printing over writing is in the more rapid multiplication of copies, and still more in the accuracy of the copies. The first setting in movable type is as liable to error as any written copy, but all impressions from this are wholly without textual variations. For printed editions of the Bible *see* **TEXT**; **VERSIONS**, etc.

7. VARIATIONS:

In the natural process of transmission all reprints in movable type, manuscripts or oral repetitions accumulate variations with each re-copying. These are, in general, errors, and the process is one of degeneration. In oral transmission the average error with each generation is very great, and it is only with incredible pains that the best copies are made equal to even the average manuscript, which in turn at its best only equals the first type-set copy. The same expenditure of care on this type-set copy produces thousands of copies in printing where it produces one in manuscript. The phonograph, the typewriter, type-bar composition, photographic and electrotype methods have reduced the average error in modern books to a very low point. But even after incredible pains on the part of the authors and professional proofreaders, the offered reward of a guinea for each detected error in the Oxford revised version of the Bible brought several errors to light. This version is however about as nearly free from textual error as any large book ever made, and millions of copies of it are now printed wholly without textual variation.

But textual errors are not the only variations. It often happens that the author or someone else undertakes to correct the errors and makes substitutions or additions of one sort or another. The result is a revised edition, which is, in general, an improvement, or evolution upward. Variations are thus of two kinds: involuntary and intentional, corresponding pretty well with the words “copies” and “editions” of a work.

Strictly speaking, every book with intentional changes is a new work, but colloquially it is counted the “same work” until the changes become so great that the resemblance of the form of words to the original is hard to recognize. It is a common thing for a work to be edited and reedited under a certain author’s name (Herzog), then become known by the joint name of the author and editor (Herzog-Plitt or Schaff-Herzog), and finally become known under the name of the latest editor (Hauck). In this case it is often described for a time on a title-page as “founded” on its predecessor, but generally the original author’s name is dropped from the title-page altogether when no great portions retain the original verbal form. All editions of a work are recognized in common use in some sense as new works; and in the bookshop or library a man is careful to specify the latest

edition of Smith, or Brown's edition of Smith, to avoid getting the older and outdated original work.

Sometimes the original work and the additions, corrections, explanations, etc., are kept quite separate and distinct — additional matter being given in manuscripts in the margins, or between lines, and in printed books as footnotes or in brackets or parentheses. This is commonly the case with the text-and-comment editions of Biblical books and great writers. Sometimes, as often in ancient manuscripts, it happens in copying that what were marginal and interlinear notes become run in as an undistinguished part of the text and, still more often, what was indicated as quotation in an original work loses its indications and becomes an undistinguished part of the work. In the case of the paraphrase the comment is intentionally run in with the words of the text; and most editors of scientific works likewise make no attempt to distinguish between the original matter and additions by another hand, the whole responsibility being thrown forward on the editor. Sometimes the original work itself to begin with is largely made up of quotation, or is a mere compilation or collection of works in which the "originality" is confined to title-page or preface or even a mere title, as in the case of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Bible, and the order of arrangement of parts.

Almost all books are thus composite. Even in a manuscript copy of a manuscript, or an oral repetition of an oral tale, two human minds have contributed to the net result, and the work of each may perhaps be distinguished from that of the other. In the case of a new edition by the same author, the result is still composite — a new work composed of old and new material. With all new editions by other authors the compositeness increases until, e.g. an edition of the Bible with textual variants and select comments from various writers becomes the combined work of thousands of writers, each distinguished as to his work from all the rest by his name or some symbol.

The work proper or work unchanged, save for involuntary error, includes thus copies, translates, abridgments, selections and quotations; the revised work or work with voluntary changes includes editions and paraphrases (which are simply texts with commentary run into the text), digests, redactions, etc., and perhaps compilations.

These two kinds of variations give rise to the two sciences of text-criticism and higher or historical criticism. The former distinguishes all accidental

errors of transmission, the latter all the voluntary changes; the former aims to reconstruct the original, the latter to separate in any given book between the work of the original and each editor.

In this connection it must not be forgotten that the original itself may be a composite work — containing long quotations, made up wholly of selections or even made up of whole works bound together by a mere title. In these cases textual criticism restores not the original of each, but the original text of the whole, while higher criticism takes up the task of separating out the elements first of later editions and redactions of this original, then of the original itself.

8. TEXTUAL CRITICISM:

The involuntary variations of manuscripts or oral tradition give rise to the science of text-criticism. The point of the science is to reconstruct exactly the original form of words or text. Formerly the method for this was a mere balancing of probabilities, but since Tregelles it has become a rigid logical process which traces copies to their near ancestors, and these in turn farther back, until a genealogical tree has been formed of actual descent. The law of this is in effect that “like variations point to a common ancestor,” the biological law of “homology,” and if the groupings reveal as many as three independent lines of copies from the original, the correct text can be constructed with mathematical precision, since the readings of two lines will always be right against the third — granting a very small margin of error in the psychological tendency of habit in a scribe to repeat the same error. The method proceeds

- (1) to describe all variations of each manuscript (or equally of each oral or printed copy) from the standard text;
- (2) to group the manuscripts which have the most pronounced variations;
- (3) to unite these groups on the principle of homology into larger and larger groups until authors’ utterances have been reached and through these the inward original. The results are expressed in a text and variants — the text being a corrected copy of the original, and the variants showing the exact contribution of each copyist to the manuscripts which he produced.

It is carefully to be remembered that text-criticism proper has only to do with a particular form of words. Every translation or edition is a separate problem complete in itself when the very words used by translator and the editor have been reconstructed. These may in turn be useful in reconstructing the original, but care must be had not to amend, translate or edition from the original, and the original in turn, when it contains quotations from other writers, must not be amended from the originals of these writers. The task of textual criticism is to set forth each man's words — each original author, each copyist, each translator, each editor, just as his words were — no more and no less.

See TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

9. HIGHER CRITICISM:

Higher criticism has to do with voluntary variations or variations in subject-matter. Like text-criticism it has to do with distinguishing the share of each of several cooperators in a composite work; and like it higher criticism traces the contributions of various authors each to its source. It differs, however, in dealing with original matter. While the variations by officious scribes, or intelligent scribes who correct spelling, grammar, wrong dates and the like, come pretty closely into the region of editing, and on the other hand the redactor is sometimes little more than an officious copyist, still the line of involuntary and voluntary change holds good, whether it be the grafting into an original work by the author of many quotations, or the grafting onto the work by others of the work of themselves or of other authors. It is not the business of the textual critic to separate out either of these (it is expressly his business not to), although his work may greatly help and even furnish results which can be used automatically. The whole of this double field of composite authorship belongs to higher criticism.

In the case of most modern works the task of the higher critic is a simple one. Quotation marks, a growing ethical feeling against plagiarism, the mechanical conveniences of typographical display, and the like, all contribute to a careful separation of the work of each contributor. Nevertheless, in many cases as, for example, in the editing of textbooks and newspapers, this is not regarded. While the signed article in the encyclopedia is now nearly universal, the signed review more and more

common, the signed editorial is still rare, and the others by no means universal. It is still a matter of interest to many to pick out by his “style” the author of an unsigned article, review or editorial — which is higher criticism.

In ancient literature, where there were few such mechanical conveniences in discriminating, and little or no conscience had been developed about incorporating anything which suited the purpose of the writer in part or as a whole, the result was often a complete patchwork of verbal forms of many writers. The task of higher criticism is to sort out the original and each of its literary variants, and to trace these variants to their originals. The net result in the case of any work does not differ much from an ordinary modern work with quotation marks and footnotes referring to the sources of the quotations. It restores, so to speak, the punctuation and footnotes which the author omitted or later copyists lost. It includes many nice questions of discrimination through style and the historical connection of the fragments with the works from which they were taken; and after these have been analyzed out, many nice questions also of tracing their authorship or at least the time, place and environment of their composition. It includes thus the questions of superhuman authorship and inspiration.

10. LITERARY CRITICISM:

Literary criticism has to do with originals as originals, or, in composite works, the original parts of originals. An original work may include quotations from others or be mainly quotations, and its “originality” consists in part in the way these quotations are introduced and used. By “original,” however, is meant in the main new verbal forms. The original work must not plagiarize nor even use stereotyped phrases, although it may introduce proverbs or idiomatic phrases. In general, however, originality means that literary food has been digested — reduced to its chemical elements of word or briefest phrase and rebuilt into a wholly new structure in the mind. The building in of old doorways and ornaments may be a part of the literary architect’s originality, but they themselves were not “original” with him.

The literary critic has thus to do with a man’s originality — the contribution that he has made to the subject, the peculiar quality of this in its fitness to influence other minds which is effected by the “reaction of the whole personality,” all his learning and emotional experience, on every part

of his material — what in short we call style. This involves a judgment or comparison with all other works on the same subject as to its contribution of new matter and its readability.

11. ORIGIN OF NEW FORMS:

The chief problems of book science may be described in the words of biological science as

- (1) the origin of new forms,
- (2) survival.

The question of the origin of a new literary work and its survival is so like that of the origin of a new species and its survival that it may be regarded less as analogy than as falling under the same laws of variations, multiplication, heredity and natural selection. The origin of variant forms of the same original through involuntary and voluntary changes has been traced above up to the point where editorial variants overwhelm the original and a new author's name takes the place of the old. After this step has been taken it is a new work, and at bottom the origin of all new works is much the same. The process is most clearly seen in treatises of some branch of science, say physics. A general treatise, say on Heat, is published, giving the state of knowledge on the subject at that time. Then monographs begin to be produced. The monograph may and generally does include, in bibliographical or historical outline, the substance of previous works, and in every event it implies the previous total. The point of the monograph itself is, however, not the summary of common knowledge but the contribution that it makes, or, in the language of natural science, the "useful variant" of the subject which it produces. After some accumulation of these monographs, or useful variants of previous treatises, some author gathers them together and unites them with previous treatises into a new general treatise or textbook, which is in effect the latest previous treatise with all variants developed in the meantime.

In either case a permanent new form has been produced — the old common knowledge with a difference, and the process goes on again: the new work is multiplied by publication into many like individuals; these like individuals develop each its variations; the variations in the same direction unite in some new accepted fact, idea or law, expressed in a monograph;

common knowledge with this new variation forms a new general work which again is multiplied, and so on.

And what is true of scientific monographs is just as true in substance of literature, of oral tradition and of the whole history of ideas. It is the perpetual putting together of variations experienced two or more times by one individual or one or more times each by two or more individuals, with the common body of our ideas, and producing thus a new fixed form. Popular proverbs, for example, and all poetry, fiction and the like, come thus to sum up a long human experience.

And carrying the matter still farther back, what is true of the scientific book and of poetry and of folk-literature, is true also of the inward evolution of every thought, even those phrased for conversation or indeed for self-communion — it is the result of a series of variations and integrations. The workings of the scientist's mind in producing a contribution and the workings of the farmer's mind in evolving a shrewd maxim, are alike the result of a long series of these observations, variations and integrations. Repeated observations and the union of observations which vary in the same direction is the history of the thought process all the way along from the simplest perception of the infant, up through the ordinary thinking of the average man, to the most complex concept of the philosopher.

Through all the processes of inward thought and outward expression thus the same process of evolution in the production of a new form holds good: it is the synthesis of all works on a given subject (i.e. any more or less narrow field of reality), the multiplication of this synthetic work, the development of new variations in it and the reunion again of all these variations in a more comprehensive work.

12. SURVIVAL:

When it comes to the matter of the survival of a new work when it has been produced, the problem is a double one:

- (1) the survival of the individual book, and
- (2) the survival of the work, i.e. any copy of the original whose text does not vary so far that it may not be recognized as the "same" work.

The original book is in a man's mind and survives only so long as its author survives. In the same sense that the author dies, the individual book dies.

No new book, therefore, survives its author. If, however, by survival is meant the existence of any copy, or copy of a copy of this original, containing much (but never quite) the same form of words, then the book survives in this world, in the same sense that the author survives, i.e. in its descendants; it is the difference between personal immortality and race immortality. At the same time, however, the survival of species depends on the individual. A work or a species is no metaphysical reality, but a sum total of individuals with, of course, their relations to one another.

On the average, the chance of long survival for any individual copy of a book is small. Every new book enters into a struggle for existence; wind and weather, wear and tear conspire to destroy it. On the whole they succeed sooner or later. Some books live longer than others, but however durable the material, and however carefully treated they may be, an autograph rarely lasts a thousand years. If survival depended on permanence of the individual, there would be no Bible and no classics.

The average chance of an individual book for long life depends

- (1) on the intrinsic durability of its material, or its ability to resist hostile environment,
- (2) on isolation.

The enemies to which books are exposed are various: wind, fire, moisture, mold, human negligence and vandalism, and human use. Some materials are naturally more durable than others. Stone and metal inscriptions survive better than wood or clay, vellum than papyrus or paper.

On the other hand, however, if isolated or protected from hostile environment, very fragile material may outlast more substantial. Papyrus has survived in the mounds of Egypt, and unbaked clay tablets in the mounds of Babylonia, while millions of stone and metal inscriptions written thousands of years later have already perished. Here the factor of isolation comes in. Fire and pillage, moth and rust and the bookworm destroy for the most part without respect of persons. It is only those books which are out of the way of destructive agencies which survive. An unbaked tablet which has survived 5,000 years under rubbish may crumble to dust in 5 years after it has been dug up and exposed to the air. This isolation may be accidental or "natural," as when tablets and papyri are preserved under ruins, but it may also be artificial and the result of human care. A third factor of survival is therefore the ability of a work to procure for itself

human protection, or artificial isolation. In brief this ability is the “value” of a book to its owner. This value may lie in the material, artistic excellence, association or rarity. Any variation in the direction of value which may be expressed financially tends to preserve. In fire or shipwreck, these are the ones saved, in pillage the ones spared. They are the ones for whom fireproof buildings and special guardians are provided. An exception to this rule is when the material is more valuable for other than book purposes. In times of war the book engraved on gold or lead or paper may be melted down for coin or bullets or torn up for cartridges, while stone and vellum books are spared. The general law is, however, that value tends to preserve, and it has been remarked that all the oldest codices which have survived in free environment are sumptuous copies.

Literary value on the other hand is, on the whole, a factor of destruction for the individual rather than of survival. The better a book is the more it is read, and the more it is read, the faster it wears out. The worthless book on the top shelf outlasts all the rest. In cases of fire or shipwreck an owner will save books which cannot be replaced and the books most easily replaced are those with literary value. A man will sometimes save his favorite books, and does treat them often with a certain reverent care, which tends to preservation but, on the whole, literary value tends to destruction.

When it comes to the survival of the work or race survival, matters are reversed. Literary value is the prime factor. It is the ability of a book to get itself multiplied or re-copied which counts — the quality, whatever it may be, which tends to make a man wish to replace his copy when it is worn out, and to make many men wish to read the work.

This literary interest operates first to produce a large number of copies in order to meet the demand, each of which copies has its chance of survival. It operates also by inducing men to use the very best material, paper, ink, binding, etc., which results in giving each individual book a longer time to produce a new copy.

The modern newspaper published in a million copies is ephemeral, in the first place, because it is printed upon paper which cannot last, save in very favorable conditions of isolation, for more than forty or fifty years. In the second place, it is very rarely reprinted save for an occasional memorial copy. Books like the Bible or Virgil, Dante or Shakespeare, on the other

hand, are reprinted in multitudes of editions and in many instances in the most permanent material that art can devise.

It often happens that a book is popular for a short time, but will not survive a changed environment. The newspaper is popular for a few hours, but the time environment changes and interest is gone. It sometimes happens that a book is very popular in one country and wholly fails to interest in another. Millions of copies of Uncle Tom's Cabin and Ben Hur were required to fill the demand of one generation where a few hundreds may suffice for the next.

All the time popular taste, which is only another name for average human experience, is judging a book. A book survives because it is popular — not necessarily because it is popular with the uneducated majority, but because it appeals continually to the average human experience of some considerable class, good or bad. Survival is, therefore, natural. Skilled critics help popular judgment, and select lists aid, but in the long run the test is simply of its correspondence with human experience; in short, it is because men “like” it that a book survives.

There is thus going on all the time a process of struggle and “natural selection” which in the end is a survival of the fittest in the true evolutionary sense, i.e. books survive because fitted to their environment of human experience or taste. There grows up, therefore, continually in every country a certain class of books which are counted classics. These are those which have survived their tests, and are being still further tested. Some have been tested from remote antiquity, and it is the books which survive the test of many periods of time, many kinds of geographical environment, and many varieties of intellectual environment, i.e. which appeal to many classes of readers, which are the true classics and which, on the other hand, show that they do correspond with the fundamental facts of human experience, simply because they have survived. In general it is the religious books which have survived in all nations, and the only books which have been tested in all lands and ages and appeal to Oriental and Western, ancient and modern alike, are those of the Christian Bible.

13. BOOK COLLECTIONS:

It has been noticed above that the process of forming a new work is the bringing together of all works on the same subject in order to unite all their variations in the new work. It is for this purpose that every student brings

together the working library on his specialty; it is what the librarian does when he brings together all the books on a subject for the use of students. Every man who reads up on a subject is performing the same task for himself, and likewise every man who does general reading.

There are few libraries, however, which attempt to get together all the books on a subject. Most libraries are select libraries containing the best books on the subject: by this is meant all books which have anything new or in short have a useful variation. This is an artificial process of the critical human mind, but in humanity in general it is going on all the time as a natural process. Men are perpetually at work choosing their “five-foot shelves,” the collections of the very “best of best books.” The reason for this lies in the fact that the average human mind can read and hold only a limited number of books; an unconscious process is all the time going on tending to pick out the small number of books which on the whole contain the greatest amount of human experience to the average page. The mass of world’s books, however enormous, is thus boiled down by a natural selection to a few books, which contain the essence of all the rest. The process tends to go on in every country and every language. The most universal example is the Bible, which represents a long process of natural selection through many periods of time and considerable variety of geographical influence. It unites the quintessence of Semitic ideas with the corresponding quintessence of Indo-European ideas, each embodied in a correspondingly perfect language — for language itself is in the last analysis the quintessence of the experience of any people in its likeness and unlikeness to other peoples. It is therefore by the mere fact of “survival” and “natural selection” proved to be the “fittest” to survive, i.e. that which corresponds most nearly to universal human experience. Councils do not form the canon of Scripture: they simply set a seal upon a natural process. The Bible is thus the climax of evolution among books as man is among animals. It is as unique among books as man is unique among all living things.

See LIBRARIES.

14. EARLY HISTORY OF BOOKS IN BIBLE LANDS:

The history of books begins at least with the history of writing. Some of the pictures on the cave walls of the neolithic age (Dechelette, *Man: Archaeol., Prehist.* (1908), 201-37) seem to have the essential

characteristics of books and certainly the earliest clay tablets and inscriptions do. These seem to carry back with certainty to at least 4,200 years BC. By a thousand years later, tablet books and inscriptions were common and papyrus books seem to have been well begun. Another thousand years, or some time before Hammurabi, books of many sorts were numerous. At the time of Abraham, books were common all over Egypt, Babylonia, Palestine, and the eastern Mediterranean as far at least as Crete and Asia Minor. In the time of Moses, whenever that may have been, the alphabet had perhaps been invented, books were common among all priestly and official classes, not only in Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt, but at least in two or three scores of places in Palestine, north Syria and Cyprus. In the time of David not only was historical, official and religious literature common in Egypt and Assyria, but poetry and fiction had been a good deal developed in the countries round about Palestine; and very soon after, if not long before, as the Moabitic, Siloam, Zkr, Zenjirli, Baal-Lebanon, Gezer and Samaritan inscriptions show, Semitic writing was common all over Palestine and its neighborhood.

LITERATURE.

Articles by Dziatzko on "Buch" and "Bibliotheken," in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-encyclopedia d. class. Altertumsw., V, 5, and his Antikes Buchwesen, Leipzig, 1900, are mines of material, and the bibliographical reference thorough. The rapid developments in the history of most ancient books may be followed in Hortschansky's admirable annual volume, Bibliographie des Bibliotheks und Buchwesens, Leipzig, 1904 ff. For a first orientation the little book of O. Wiese, Schrift und Buchwesen in alter u. neuer Zeit (3rd edition, Leipzig, 1910), or in English, the respective articles in the Encyclopedia Britannica, are perhaps best. On the scientific side the best introductions are Vol I of Iwan Muller's Handb. d. klass. Altertumsw. and T. Birt's D. antike Buchwesen (Berlin, 1882). For Biblical aspects of the Book, the best of all, and very adequate indeed, is the long article of E. von Dobschutz on the "Bible in the Church" in the Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion, II, 579-615, and especially on account of the bibliographical apparatus at the end of each section. These little bibliographies give a complete apparatus on many of the above subjects. Paragraphs with bibliographies on others of above topics will be found in the W. Sanday article on "Bible," just preceding.

E. C. Richardson

BOOK OF ABRAHAM

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

BOOK OF ENOCH

See ENOCH, BOOK OF.

BOOK OF JUBILEES

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; APOCRYPHA.

BOOK OF LIFE

(**μυϒ** " **rpse** [cepher chayyim]; [**ἡ βίβλος τῆς ζωῆς**, he biblos tes zoes], "book of life"): The phrase is derived from the custom of the ancients of keeping genealogical records (^{<1015>}Nehemiah 7:5,64; 12:22,23) and of enrolling citizens for various purposes (^{<223>}Jeremiah 22:30; ^{<539>}Ezekiel 13:9). So, God is represented as having a record of all who are under His special care and guardianship. To be blotted out of the Book of Life is to be cut off from God's favor, to suffer an untimely death, as when Moses pleads that he be blotted out of God's book — that he might die, rather than that Israel should be destroyed (^{<1232>}Exodus 32:32; ^{<1608>}Psalms 69:28). In the New Testament it is the record of the righteous who are to inherit eternal life (^{<1018>}Philippians 4:3; ^{<1015>}Revelation 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 21:27). In the apocalyptic writings there is the conception of a book or of books, that are in God's keeping, and upon which the final judgment is to be based (^{<2710>}Daniel 7:10; 12:1; ^{<6112>}Revelation 20:12,15; compare Book Jubilees 39:6; 19:9).

See APOCALYPSE; BLOT; BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE; JUDGMENT, LAST.

L. Kaiser

BOOK OF NOAH

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE

<re-mem'-brans> (^{ˈwɒkzɪrpsə}[cepher zikkdron], “book of record”): Is related in meaning to the “Book of Life.” It refers to a list of the righteous, recorded in a book that lies before God (^{ˈmæləchi}Malachi 3:16; compare ^{ˈdæniəl}Daniel 7:10).

See BOOK OF LIFE.

BOOKS OF ADAM

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; ADAM, BOOKS OF.

BOOT

<boot> (^{ˈboʊt}[ce'on]; the King James Version battle; the American Standard Revised Version “armor”; the American Revised Version, margin “boot”): The word [ce'on], found only in ^{ˈaɪsaɪəh}Isaiah 9:5 (Hebrew 9:4), is probably a loanword from the Assyrian senu, meaning “shoe,” “sandal.” The root has the same meaning in Aramaic and Ethiopic. The passage should be translated “every boot of the booted warrior.”

BOOTH

<booth>, <booth>: The Hebrew word [cukkah] (rendered in the King James Version “booth” or “booths,” eleven times; “tabernacle” or “tabernacles,” ten times; “pavilion” or “pavilions,” five times; “cottage” once) means a hut made of wattled twigs or branches (^{ˈlɛvɪtɪkəs}Leviticus 23:42; ^{ˈnɛhɛmɪəh}Nehemiah 8:15). In countries where trees are abundant such wattled structures are common as temporary buildings as they can be constructed in a very short time. Cattle were probably housed in them (^{ˈdʒɛnɪsɪs}Genesis 33:17). Such hurriedly-made huts were used by soldiers (^{ˈsæməʊəl}2 Samuel 11:11; ^{ˈkɪŋz}1 Kings 20:12) and by harvesters — hence, the name feast of “booths” or “tabernacles” (*see TABERNACLES, FEAST OF*). Job (27:18) uses booth (parallel moth’s house) as a symbol of impermanence. Similar huts were erected in vineyards, etc., to protect them from robbers and beasts of prey. The isolated condition of Jerusalem in the time of the prophet Isaiah is compared to a “booth in a vineyard” (Isaiah 18).

T. Lewis

BOOTHS, FEAST OF

See FEASTS AND FASTS, I, 2.

BOOTY

<boot'-i> (**zB**; [baz] and **zB"** [baz]): “Booty” is the translation of [baz] or [baz], usually rendered “prey” and “spoil” (**<3482>** Jeremiah 49:32); of [malqoach], “prey,” “booty” (**<0612>** Numbers 31:32, “the booty — the rest of the prey,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the prey, over and above the booty,” [baz]); of [meshiccah], “spoil” (**<3117>** Habakkuk 2:7; Zeph 1:13; the Revised Version (British and American) “spoil”); of [opheleia], “gain” (2 Macc 8:20). “Booty respects what is of personal service to the captor; spoils whatever serves to designate his triumph; prey includes whatever gratifies the appetite and is to be consumed” (Crabb, English Synonymes). Persons (for slaves, etc.) might be part of the booty.

See also SPOIL.

W. L. Walker

BOOZ

<bo'-oz> (TR, [**Boóζ**, Booz]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, [**Boές**, Boes]): the King James Version, Greek form of Boaz (thus, the Revised Version (British and American)) (**<4005>** Matthew 1:5; **<0132>** Luke 3:32).

BOR-ASHAN

<bor-ash'-an>: A correction of the Massoretic Text in the American Standard Revised Version in **<0810>** 1 Samuel 30:30 for the King James Version “Chor-ashan” and the English Revised Version “Cor-ashan.” Probably the same as **ASHAN** (**<0652>** Joshua 15:42; **<1042>** 1 Chronicles 4:32; 6:59), which see.

BORDER; BORDERS

<bor'-der>: Indicating in both singular and plural the outlines or territory of a country. In the sense of “limits,” “boundaries” or “territory,” it occurs as a translation of **l WbG"** [gebhul] (and its feminine **hl WbG"** [gebhulah], in **<1947>** Psalm 74:17) in numerous passages in Old Testament,

especially in Josh. **hkrē** [yerekhdh] = “the flank,” “the side,” “the coast,” hence, “the border” occurs in ^{<0493>}Genesis 49:13; **hxq**:[qatseh] = “an extremity” “brim,” “brink,” “edge” (^{<0165>}Exodus 16:35; 19:12; ^{<0049>}Joshua 4:19); **trēsni**[micgereth] = something enclosing, i.e. “a margin” (^{<0272>}Exodus 37:12,14; ^{<1078>}1 Kings 7:28 f,31 f,35 f the King James Version; ^{<0267>}2 Kings 16:17 the King James Version); **tpc**:[saphah] or [sepheth] = “the lip” (as a natural boundary) hence, “a margin” “brim,” “brink,” “edge” (^{<0286>}Exodus 28:26; 39:19 the King James Version); **xqe** [qets] = “an extremity” “end” (^{<0203>}2 Kings 19:23 the King James Version); **haxTō** [totsa’ah] = “exit,” hence, “boundary” (^{<0356>}1 Chronicles 5:16); **rwt** [tor] = “a succession” “a string” “row,” hence, “border” (Song 1:11 the King James Version); **dy**:[yadh] = “hand,” used in a great variety of applications, both literally and figuratively, proximate and remote; but how it should be translated with “border” in ^{<0379>}1 Chronicles 7:29 is not clear; better would be: “in the hands of the children of Manasseh.” Three Greek words occur for the idea: **[κράσπεδον, kraspedon]** = “a margin,” “fringe” (^{<0235>}Matthew 23:5; ^{<0066>}Mark 6:56; ^{<0084>}Luke 8:44); **[οριον, horion]** = “a limit,” “a boundary line” (^{<0043>}Matthew 4:13); **[μεθόριος, methorios]** = “contiguous” (neuter plural as noun, “frontier,” “border” in ^{<0074>}Mark 7:24).

Frank E. Hirsch

BORDERER

<bor’-der-er> ([**παράκειμένους, parakeimenous**]): One who dwells on the borders or confines of a country. Only in 2 Macc 9:25, “The princes that are borderers and neighbors unto my kingdom.”

BORE

<bor>: According to the Book of the Covenant (^{<0200>}Exodus 20:20 through 23:33) a slave whom his master had purchased was to be released after six years. Should he choose to remain in his master’s service a religious ceremony was necessary to ratify his decision. “Then his master shall bring him unto God” (better than “unto the judges” of the King James Version), “and shall bring him to the door, or unto the doorpost; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl” (^{<0206>}Exodus 21:6). It is highly improbable that “unto God” means “to a sanctuary”; for there was no

special reason for performing this ceremony near the door of a sanctuary. On the other hand the entrance to a private house was a sacred spot. According to primitive thinking near the door dwelt the household gods whose function it was to guard the house and its occupants, e.g. against the entry of disease. It was natural that the ceremony of attaching the slave permanently to the master's household should be performed in the presence of the household gods. "The boring of the ear of slaves was a common practice in antiquity, possibly to symbolize the duty of obedience, as the ear was the organ of hearing" (Bennett). The Deuteronomist (^{<1857>}Deuteronomy 15:17) rejects the religious aspect of the ceremony — probably as a relic of Canaanite religion — and looks upon it as a secular and symbolical operation. According to his view, the awl was thrust through the ear of the slave to the door. The slave in question was permanently attached to the household.

T. Lewis

BORITH

<bo'-rith>: Mentioned in the genealogical table which traces the descent of Esdras (Ezra) from Aaron (2 Esdras 1:2). In 1 Esdras 8:2, his name appears as *BOCCAS* (which see), and in ^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 6:5,51; ^{<1804>}Ezra 7:4, *BUKKI* (which see).

BORN

See BEAR, BORN.

BORN AGAIN

See REGENERATION.

BORNE

See BEAR, BORNE.

BORROWING

<bor'-o-ing>:

(1) In the Old Testament period loans were not of a commercial nature, i.e. they were not granted to enable a man to start or run a business. They

were really a form of charity, and were made by the lender only to meet the pressure of poverty. To the borrower they were esteemed a form of misfortune (<B382>Deuteronomy 28:12 f), and by the lender a form of beneficence. Hence, the tone of the Mosaic legislation on the subject.

(2) Laying interest upon the poor of Israel was forbidden in all the codes (see <B225>Exodus 22:25 (JE); <B319>Deuteronomy 23:19; <B336>Leviticus 25:36 H), because it was looked upon as making unwarranted profit out of a brother's distress: "If thou lend money to any of my people with thee that is poor, thou shalt not be to him as a creditor; neither shall ye lay upon him interest and it shall come to pass, when he crieth unto me, that I will hear; for I am gracious."

(3) The Law, however, allowed interest to be taken of a foreigner, or non-Jew (<B331>Deuteronomy 23:20: "Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest"; compare <B318>Deuteronomy 15:3); and even among Jews pledges were allowed under limitations, or taken against the law (<B340>Deuteronomy 24:10; compare <B342>Job 24:2,3 "There are that remove the landmarks they take the widow's ox for a pledge"). In <B351>Deuteronomy 15:1 ff there is a remarkable law providing a "release" by the creditor every "seven years," a "letting drop of loans" (see Driver in the place cited.). In <B372>Exodus 3:22, the King James Version "shall borrow" is rendered "shall ask" in the Revised Version (British and American).

George B. Eager

BOSCATH

<bos'-kath>.

See *BOZKATH*.

BOSOM

<booz'-um>: In the ordinary signification of the anterior upper portion of the trunk of the body, **qwp** [choq] or **qyj** [cheq], "inlet, "lap" (<B346>Exodus 4:6,7; <B4112>Numbers 11:12; <B336>Deuteronomy 13:6; 28:54,56; <B346>Ruth 4:16; <B3741>Psalm 74:11; <B386>Isaiah 65:6,7; <B392>Lamentations 2:12). "A present in the bosom" (<B414>Proverbs 21:14): bribes carried ready for use in the fold of the robe. **xj** [chetsen] = "bosom" (with special reference

to that portion of the body which is between the arms), occurs in ^{<1097>}Psalm 129:7; **bj** [chobh] = “a cherisher,” hence, “the bosom” (^{<1813>}Job 31:33); **tj** “L” **x** [tsalachath] = something advanced or deep, “a bowl”; figurative “the bosom” (^{<1024>}Proverbs 19:24 the King James Version; ^{<1015>}Proverbs 26:15 the King James Version). The Greek employs [κόλπος, kolpos] (^{<1018>}Luke 6:38; ^{<1813>}John 13:23). For Abraham’s bosom, see separate article.

Figurative: In a figurative sense it denotes intimacy and unrestrained intercourse (^{<1045>}Genesis 16:5; ^{<1028>}2 Samuel 12:8); tender care and watchfulness (^{<2401>}Isaiah 40:11); closest intimacy and most perfect knowledge (^{<1018>}John 1:18); “into their bosom” (^{<10912>}Psalm 79:12) indicates the bosom as the seat of thought and reflection.

F. E. Hirsch

BOSOM, ABRAHAM’S

See ABRAHAM’S BOSOM.

BOSOR

^{<bo’-sor>} ([**Boσόρ**, Bosor]):

(1) A city named among those taken by Judas Maccabeus “in the land of Gilead” (1 Macc 5:26,36). From the towns named it is evident that this phrase is elastic, covering territory beyond what is usually called the land of Gilead. Possibly therefore Bosor may be identical with Bucr el-Chariri, in the Luchf, Southeast of el-Leja’.

(2) In ^{<10215>}2 Peter 2:15 the King James Version, the Greek form of **BEOR** (which see).

BOSORA

^{<bos’-o-ra>} ([**Βοσopᾱ**, Bosora]): One of the strong cities of Gilead taken by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:26,28). It is identical with the Roman Bostra, the city whose extensive ruins lie on the Southeast border of the Hauran, on the old Roman road that runs between Der`ah and Calkhad. The modern name is Bosra eski-Sham. It cannot be identified with **BOZRAH** either (1) or (2), as it lies much too far north. It appears for the first time in history in the passage noted above. The ruins show it to have

been a place of great strength and importance. In the time of Herod the Great it was in the hands of the Nabateans. When Aulus Cornelius Palma conquered these regions, Bostra was made capital of the province under the name of Nova Trajana Bostra, in honor of the emperor Trajan. This was in 105 AD, from which year the Bostrian era was reckoned. It was taken by the Moslems under Khalid — "the sword of God." It resisted the attack of Baldwin III. Later it fell on evil days. Now, if it be true, as the proverb says, that "the prosperity of Bocra is the prosperity of the Chauran," the case of the latter is sad indeed.

W. Ewing

BOSS

<boss>: Occurs only in the plural as a translation of **bġ'**[gabh] = "arch," or "protuberance," referring to the curved ornaments of a shield (~~18536~~ Job 15:26), the central knob of the buckler.

BOTANY

<bot'-a-ni>.

1. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PALESTINIAN FLORA:

On account of the great diversity in the climatic and topographical conditions Palestine is peculiarly rich in the variety of its flora — the best authority, Post, distinguishes 3,500 species. The land as a whole belongs to the botanical area known as the "Mediterranean region," a region characterized climatically by very dry, hot summers and fairly mild winters. Plants here grow in spring, rest in the hot, dry season and grow again in autumn; the long-continued, scorching sunlight and the absence of water for five or six months at a time, lead to the destruction of vast quantities of seeds and young plants imported by various natural means and by human agency. Among these xerophile or drought-resisting plants, some of the most characteristic features are a thick, leathery rind admitting of little transpiration, e.g. cactus, stonecrops, etc., and the presence of bulbs, rigid stalks, or fleshy leaves, of which the flora of Palestine abounds with examples. Equally characteristic are dry, much-branched spiny trees or shrubs with scanty foliage and small leaves, such as the acacias and the thorny burnet. In connection with this last, it may be mentioned that, next

to the strong sunlight and drought, the great enemy of vegetation over a great part of the “Mediterranean region” — emphatically so in Palestine — is the goat. He is one of the most destructive of animals, and as he has for long ages been allowed to graze freely all over the hillsides, it is not wonderful that in many spots it is only plants like the thorny burnet with its powerful spines which have survived.

The common plants of Palestine will be referred to in order shortly, but among those especially characteristic of the whole region are the olive and the fig, the ilex oak and the bay laurel, the arbutus and the sumach.

2. PLANTS INTRODUCED SINCE BIBLE TIMES:

A number of trees and shrubs which have been imported into this region within comparatively recent times have become so acclimatized as to be today among the most noticeable plants. Prominent among these is the well-known opuntia or prickly pear, an introduction from the continent of America; so characteristic is this of modern Palestine scenery that it is a common feature in pictures by artists who have painted Scripture scenes in the Holy Land. The common variety, *Opuntia ficus-Indica* with its innumerable sharp prickles makes impenetrable hedges round many of the village gardens, while the *Opuntia cochinillifera*, cultivated specially round Nablus and introduced from tropical America with the cochineal insect, is almost unarmed. The American aloe (*Argave Americana*) — quite a different plant be it noted from either the **ALOES** (which see) of the Bible or the well-known medicinal aloes — has established itself in many parts as a garden ornament and will doubtless in time become thoroughly indigenous. More important and more recent of introduction is the group of eucalypti or gum trees, of which some half-dozen varieties have been imported. As is well known, they all come from Australia, where they flourish in climatic conditions somewhat similar to those of the Mediterranean region. Seeds of eucalypti were first introduced into Europe in 1854, having been sent from Melbourne to Paris, and from that center they have found their way to all parts. The most common variety is the *Eucalyptus globulus* which is now to be found everywhere in the Mediterranean region. It was introduced into Palestine through the late Baron E. de Rothschild of Paris, and great plantations of it have been made specially in the neighborhood of the Jewish colonies. In the marshy plains between Sammarin and Caesarea over a million have been planted, and here, and also on the marshy shores of Lake Huleh, this tree has attained

magnificent proportions. Many specimens will be found with trunks two or three feet in circumference and of a height of upward of 100 feet. This size is nothing for a eucalyptus, many of these trees attaining in their native habitat a height of 300, or even 400 ft., but time is required, and it may be that eventually many of the eucalypti of the Holy Land will also acquire giant proportions. That this group of trees has come to stay is evident. Not only in small forests such as those mentioned, but also in isolated groups all over the land they may be found. Their quick growth, fresh, evergreen foliage and their reputed health-giving properties account for their wide cultivation. Concerning this last it may be said that the virtues of the eucalyptus as a prophylactic against malaria have been much exaggerated. The most malignant cases of malaria may sometimes be found in houses shaded by eucalyptus boughs, and the *Anopheles*, or malarial-bearing mosquito, in such situations will be found swarming among its leaves. Probably the beneficial action of the eucalyptus is simply one of drying up marshy lands by absorbing great quantities of water into its deep-running roots.

Other trees which have been recently introduced but now flourish even better than the indigenous trees are the locust tree (*Robinia pseudo-acacia*), from America, the “Pride of India” (*Melia Azedaracht*) called in Arabic *zinzilukt*, a stranger from India, very extensively grown, the so-called “Spanish pepper tree” (*Schinus molle*), the *Casuarina stricta* from Australia, the very common *ailanthus* (*A. glandulosus*), a native of China, and many others. Of fruit trees the apricot, mulberry, orange, citron, lemon and prickly pear have all been introduced into Syria within historic times; as have almost all the best varieties of the indigenous fruits.

3. FERTILITY AND CLIMATE IN MODERN AND ANCIENT PALESTINE:

A question of great interest to Bible students is, How far has the fertility of the land altered in historic times? Two facts are important in answering this:

(1) The general features of the climate have been the same since the days of the patriarchs, probably since the dawn of history. We may gather this from the many Biblical references to the seasonal rain (¹⁹⁰⁴Leviticus 26:4) — the “early” and the “latter” (e.g. ¹⁵¹⁴Deuteronomy 11:14; ²⁴²⁴Jeremiah 5:24; ²⁴⁶⁵Hosea 6:3); to the frequent droughts (e.g. 1 Kings 17; ³⁰⁰⁶Amos

4:6,7); to the grateful mention of the “dew” (^{<1831>}Deuteronomy 32:2; ^{<1021>}2 Samuel 1:21; 17:12; ^{<3181>}Micah 5:7, etc.); to the repeated mention of the most characteristic products of modern Palestine — the olive and fig, the vine and almond, the oak and the terebinth. It is further confirmed by the presence everywhere of the ruins of ancient terraces on the hillsides and of the “broken cisterns” which are found at every site where once cultivation flourished.

(2) It is undeniable that the destruction of forest and thicket all over the land has been immense during the past fifty years. The increasing demands for fires by resident Europeans and the development of steam mills, the result of European enterprise, are largely responsible. The firewood brought to Jerusalem comes from ever-increasing distances, as the wood in the neighborhood is consumed, and the destruction has been increasingly ruthless. First the branches are cut, then the trunks are leveled, and finally the very roots are dug out of the soil. At a greater distance, as for example in the once extensive forests East of the Jordan, a terrible destruction is being wrought by the charcoal burners. Thousands of sacks of charcoal arrive in Jerusalem during the autumn months, chiefly in the care of Circassian settlers in the East Jordan lands; but a similar work is pursued by other charcoal burners in the northern parts of upper Galilee. All the tree trunks are soon destroyed and then the rising branches are cut as soon as they reach any size, so that miles of country which, within the memory of many now living, were forest are now either entirely treeless or covered with nothing but brushwood. This last consists of dwarf oak, carob, terebinth, arbutus, wild olive and hawthorn — all capable of development into noble trees. The process having been commenced by the hand of man is assisted by the goats who crop the tender leaves and shoots, and thus keep stunted many of the bushes. Older inhabitants can remember that between Bethlehem and Hebron, where today scarcely a twig is visible, there were trees and brushwood all the way, and in the 7th century the pilgrim Arculphus writes of a pine wood as existing South of Bethlehem. This destruction is common all over the land. The only trees which have any chance of surviving are those which from their near proximity to some sacred Wely or grave, or in some case from their own traditional sanctity, have been left uninjured from motives of superstition. Such “holy” trees occur all over the land, sometimes singly, at others in groves; they may be any species of tree. Commonly they are oaks, terebinths, carob, meis (nettle tree), sidr (zizyphus) or hawthorn.

Besides the willful destruction of trees for firewood or charcoal another agent has in places been in operation. It is a common thing for the fellahin to clear a large area for plowing by burning all the vegetation; such fires sometimes extend far beyond the area intended (compare ~~1834~~ Psalm 83:14). There is a large and almost entirely sterile district, chiefly of bare rock, between Cafed and Jebel Jermuk in Galilee which was swept a few years ago by a raging fire which eyewitnesses state blazed for a week. The destruction of all this vegetation has led to the washing away of almost all the soil, so that now great labor would be required to make this area productive. The removal of the natural vegetation produces sterility in two ways. Firstly, whereas the deep roots of trees and shrubs support the soil even on hillsides of considerable slope, and slowly but surely cause the disintegration of the underlying rocks, while their stems and branches by accumulating decaying leaves and twigs ever make more and richer soil, so the destruction of these plants leads to the washing away of the soil by the torrential winter's rain, until the bare rock — never on the hillslopes very far from the surface — is laid open to the sky. Secondly, the rainfall, which was once largely absorbed by this soil, now rapidly rushes off the denuded rocks and flows away to the valleys. The consequent result of this — combined with the destruction of many miles of the artificial soil-surfaces of terraces — is that a large proportion of the rainfall which once found its way slowly through the soil to the sources of the springs — never very deep in Palestine — now rapidly runs down the valley bottoms to the lower grounds. The whole mountain region thus suffers from drought. It is a common saying that “trees bring rain.” Probably the truth is simply that vegetation modifies the climate almost entirely by retaining moisture in the soil, and in the surface air near the soil; by preventing rapid evaporation for the surface through the shade they afford, and by increasing the output of the springs in the way described above. Remove the vegetation, and the soil gradually leaves the hillsides and the rainfall is largely wasted. This is what has happened over large districts in the Holy Land, and the consequent diminution of some of the springs even within half a century has been scientifically noted.

While therefore, from the permanent climatic conditions, Palestine could never have been a land of verdure such, for example, as England, yet we know with certainty that its native vegetation has much diminished within the memory of many now living. But besides this, we have abundant historical evidence that at several periods it was much more productive.

This is shown, for example, abundantly in the writings of Josephus, and, for later periods, in the accounts of many pilgrims. But indeed the mere fact that for many centuries Palestine had a population far greater than today is in itself a proof; for as things are, modern Palestine is not able to support a much greater population than at present. Great expenditure of capital and labor on the restoring of ancient terraces, the construction of dams and systems of irrigation and the planting of trees is one essential preparation for any considerable development of the land. For any of these things to be possible a radical change in the attitude of the Turkish government is an essential preliminary.

With regard to Bible evidence it is clear from very many references in the historical books of the Old Testament that “forest” or “woodland” was very plentiful in those days. In a large proportion where the word [ya’ar] (translated “forest”) occurs it is definitely associated with trees. (For references *see FOREST*.) Whether these references are always to tall trees or also to the brushwood such as is plentiful in parts of Galilee today, is immaterial, as the latter consists of the same elements as the former, only stunted through the interference of man. It would certainly appear probable that at the time of the arrival of the Hebrews there were considerable forests of trees — oaks, terebinths, pines, etc. — over a great part of the higher mountains. In ~~1674~~ Joshua 17:14-18 we have reference to Joshua’s twice-repeated command to the people to cut down the “forest,” as the inhabited areas were too narrow for them. In later ages, e.g. in New Testament times, the cultivation of the land must have been so thorough that, to the West of the Jordan especially, the area left for forest trees must necessarily have been much circumscribed; but the land then with its millions of olive trees and countless vineyards in the mountains and its great palm groves at Jericho and the coast, not to mention all kinds of imported fruit trees, must have presented a very different appearance from its present comparative barrenness. As a single example we may compare the glowing description by Josephus of the extraordinary fertility of Gennesaret with its present condition (Josephus, BJ, III, x, 8). Two periods in history stand out preeminent in the history of Palestine as times of prosperity and fertility: that about and immediately succeeding the rise of Christianity and that of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (see Conder, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 239-41: “The present culture of Palestine does not, perhaps, attain to a tenth of that which enriched the Latins in the 1st century of their rule”). In both these periods the land was highly

cultivated and the population large, in the former more so than the latter. That the blight of the Ottoman Turks is largely responsible for the decay of agriculture and progressive deforestation in recent centuries is undoubted, but it is more than possible that at one if not at both these periods another factor was at work. It is difficult to believe that in the days when Palmyra was a vast city and Petra a great emporium, the home of a highly developed civilization, these sites were not better supplied by springs than at present; at those times great tracts of country East of the Jordan, now swallowed up by the desert, were sites of flourishing cities whose melancholy and lonely ruins are the wonder of all. No afforestation and no increased cultivation will account for the supplies of water which must have sustained such a development; and it is only reasonable to suppose, and there is much to support such a view, that there must have been then a rainfall somewhat greater or more prolonged than today. It must be remembered the increased rainfall of, say, only one inch per annum over a long series of years, or a sustained extension of the rainfall to two or three inches later in the season, or even a few degrees of greater cold producing heavy snow instead of rain, would, any of them, greatly improve the fertility of the soil and the output of the springs. All the evidence seems to confirm theory that there have been cycles of greater and of lesser rainfall extending over centuries, and that the periods we have mentioned, certainly the Roman period, coincided with one of the former cycles. At the present time there is some evidence that the rainfall has, on the whole, been increasing during the last 50 years and the cultivated area of the land, as contrasted with the natural “forest” land, is also slowly extending.

4. PLANT ZONES IN THE HOLY LAND:

In dealing briefly with some of the more characteristic and remarkable of the plants of the Holy Land we must recognize at least four distinct plant zones:

- (1) The coast plains and the western mountains, with a distinctly “Mediterranean flora”;
- (2) The Jordan valley or Ghor, with a very peculiar semi-tropical flora in which a considerable number of African forms occur;
- (3) The steppe or desert zones, specially those East of the Jordan and to the south. The higher western slopes to the East of the Jordan also have a very similar flora;

(4) The Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon above 4,000 ft. in which Alpine forms occur, and in the higher regions of which there is a flora entirely distinct from the three other zones. These divisions are necessarily somewhat artificial. Everywhere the western slopes are more fertile than the eastern, so that the land to the East of the water parting in western Palestine partakes more of the desert flora than that opposite to it on the east. Vegetation in all parts is more abundant on the hill slopes with a northern aspect, as it gets more shade; this is particularly noticeable in the drier areas.

(1) The Coast-Plains and Western Mountains.

(a) In the maritime plain there is a rich red alluvial soil with abundance of water deep under the surface. The annual mean temperature is 70 degrees F.; frost is extremely rare, and the atmosphere is distinctly humid, though the rainfall is less than in the higher hills. Citrons, oranges and lemons here flourish, palms grow in places on the coast, melons and pomegranates reach perfection. Vines have been extensively planted by Jewish colonists in the neighborhood of Jaffa. Cereals — wheat, barley and Egyptian maize (*Sorghum annuum*) — are extensively grown. The wild flora is similar to that of the mountains. The sycamore fig (Arabic jummeiz) flourishes around Jaffa — it is a tree which requires a warm climate; it was in Talmudic writings one of the distinctions between “lower” and “upper” Galilee that the sycamore fig flourished in the former and not in the latter. It is evident it was far more plentiful in olden times (*see SYCAMORE*). A closely allied tree, the mulberry, is common everywhere, though not really indigenous. Two varieties occur, the *Morus nigra* (Arabic tut-shami) a native of central Asia, cultivated for its delicious fruit, and the *M. alba* (Arabic tut beledi) a native of China introduced as food for silk worms. *See SYCAMINE*. Another tree which reaches perfection only in the warmer regions of the plain — and that too in the Jordan valley — is the tamarisk (Arabic athl) of which Post recognizes 9 species. It is characterized by its brittle feathery branches covered by minute scale-like leaves; a bedraggled, wind-torn tamarisk half buried in sea-sand is a characteristic sight all along the Syrian coast. Under favorable conditions some species attain considerable size.

See TAMARISK.

(b) In the higher mountain regions there is an average temperature of 62 degrees F. and extreme variations between a maximum of 100 degrees or 80 degrees in the shade in the summer and a few degrees of frost in the winter. Here the fig, vine and olive do admirably, their late fruiting corresponding with the “dew” — or clouds of fine mist — which settle over the mountains after sunset, particularly in the north. Apricots, mulberries, quince, apples and pears (chiefly from imported grafts), peaches and plums, almonds and walnuts do well in sheltered spots. Wheat and barley are grown on hill slopes or in valley bottoms all over the mountain region.

In the valleys where there is running water the oleander (*Nerium oleander*; Arabic difleh) abounds — a plant beautiful in foliage and flower but poisonous and not uncommonly imparting its poison to the water in which it grows. In similar situations occurs the *Vitex* (*V. Agnus Castris*), a variety of verbenas whose lilac or purple flowers are, wherever they occur, a sure sign of the presence of water on or near the surface.

In similar situations flourishes the oriental plane (*Platanus orientalis*; Arabic dilb), a tree which often attains great size (*see PLANE TREE*), and also the alder (*Alnus orientalis*; Arabic naght), a tree of humbler growth. There are some 8 varieties of willow (Arabic sifsaf), a tree very common along the water courses (*see WILLOW*). Poplars (Arabic chaur) are plentiful in places, especially near water. Three native varieties are known, but the cylindrical Lombardy poplar, an imported variety, is most widely cultivated (*see POPLAR*). The southern hackberry or nettle tree (*Celtis australis*; Arabic mais) a member of the *Urticaceae* closely allied to the elm, is an indigenous tree which is widely planted; it is not uncommonly seen beside Moslem shrines. It grows to a height of 20 to 30 ft., and yields a close-grained timber taking a high polish. The walnut (*Juglans regia*; Arabic jauz) is a valuable timber tree and grows to noble proportions. It flourishes around Damascus, being a water-loving tree: some of the most magnificent specimens occur at Sheba`, a village in the lower slopes of Hermon. The walnut is really an imported tree, its native home being Persia and the Himalayas, but it has been long naturalized.

The carob (*Ceratonia siliqua*; Arabic kharrub) is a handsome evergreen tree whose dense, dark glistening foliage renders it everywhere conspicuous. It is widely distributed, especially in the lower mountain regions. Its pods are the *HUSKS* (which see) of ²⁰¹⁶¹Luke 15:16. Oaks are among the most

important and characteristic of all the trees and shrubs of Pal: the evergreen oak which forms, it is estimated, two-thirds of all the shrubby vegetation of Carmel and attains noble proportions at some of the Moslem shrines, the Valonica oak, plentiful on the hills East of Nazareth, and the ilex or holm oak, commonest near the coast, are among the more important. The recent destruction of timber in the Holy Land has especially fallen upon the oaks, which afford the best of all fuel; as their growth is very slow and there is no attempt to plant young trees this is most regrettable. (For fuller account *see OAK*.) Closely allied to the oak both in the Old Testament and with the modern inhabitant — though botanically very distinct — is the terebinth or turpentine tree (*Pistacia terebinthus*; Arabic butm), one of the finest trees in Palestine, although from a distance superficially like an oak, the foliage is very different. In many spots in Palestine where terebinths are for various reasons regarded as “sacred” they have obtained splendid proportions.

See TEREBINTH.

Pines, although they flourish on the coast and lower mountain slopes, are, together with cypresses, junipers and cedars, reserved to the discussion of the flora of the fourth division of the country — the Alpine regions.

The hawthorn (*Crataegus*; Arabic za` rur), of which there are 4 varieties, occurs as a shrub or small tree everywhere, its sweet-scented white or pink blossom being much in evidence in the spring.

Among the more important shrubs which make up the thickets over the limestone hills the following may be briefly enumerated:

The sumach (*Rhus conaria*), usually a shrub but occasionally a small tree, grows in considerable quantities in fertile spots in the mountains; from its fruit an acid drink is concocted and the fruit, bark and young leaves are used in tanning.

A plant closely allied to this, and also to the terebinth, is the lentesk (*Pistacia lentiscus*; Arabic serres), a common shrub in the lower mountain region, e.g. on Carmel, which yields mastich, a white gum, thought by many to be the *BALM* of the Old Testament (which see).

The bay laurel (*Laurus nobilis*; Arabic el ghar) occurs in clumps in many places. It is the Daphne of the Greeks and was sacred to Apollo. From its large, leathery, shining leaves were made the laurel crowns of victory in

classical times. This, it may be mentioned in passing, is quite a distinct plant from our familiar “cherry laurel,” which is allied to the cherry.

The butchers’ broom (*Ruscus aculeatus*) is very plentiful. It is a plant peculiar in having its leaf petioles flattened out like a leaf (phillodia), so that the flower and berry appear to arise from the middle of the midrib of the leaf.

The myrtle (*Myrtus communis*; Arabic rihan or aas) is exceedingly common, especially in northern Palestine, and when it grows near water it attains a good size.

See MYRTLE.

A showy shrub, which sometimes attains to the dimensions of a tree 20 or 30 ft. high, is the arbutus (Arabic qoTlib) or strawberry tree. Two kinds occur, the less common *Arbutus unedo* or true “strawberry tree” which has a rough, warty fruit of a scarlet color, and *Arbutus andrachne* with a smooth, red bark, which when peeled off leaves a reddish inner surface. It has small orange-colored, non-edible berries. The red stems of this arbutus may be seen conspicuous in thickets all over the land, but very few are allowed to come to full growth.

Among some of the more showy shrubs we may mention the oleaster (*Eleagnus hortensis*; Arabic zaizafan) with its beautiful silvery leaves and white blossom (*see OIL TREE*).; the styrax (*Styrax officinale*; Arabic haz or `abhar), a shrub or small tree, with beautiful white flowers, somewhat resembling orange blossoms, the dried juice from whose bark is the officinal *STORAX* (which see); the Judas tree (*Cercis siliquaestrum*; Arabic zemzariq), a straggling shrub or tree with very showy pink flowers, and the caper (*Capparis spinosa*; Arabic el acaf), which is very common on old walls and about ruins (*see CAPER BERRY*). The beautiful rockrose or *Cistus* (Arabic ghibrah) is found on many shrubby hillsides, even on the bare mountain tops. The *C. villosus* has pink and the *C. salviaefolus* white blossoms, the petals being curiously crumpled. and falling off almost at once when the flower is picked. From the *Cistus* is obtained the gum called *Ladanum* (Arabic ladhanun; Hebrew [loT]) for which *see MYRRH*. Many of the hill tops near the watershed, which should be clothed by forests of oaks and pines, are now almost bare and support upon the dry and scanty soil nothing but low bushes of thorny burnet, mingled with wild thyme and mint, with, in places, small bushes of the *Cistus*. This thorny burner

(*Poterium Spinosum*; Arabic ballan) is almost ubiquitous; its long thorns and tiny leaves enable it to survive the goats. It is of considerable economic importance, as from masses of this plant the fellahin fire almost all the limekilns in the land; and they use it extensively too for their ovens. It is a common sight in the late summer, after the harvest is gathered in, to see companies of peasants gathering this plant into clumps all over the hillsides, and conveying it on the women's heads in huge masses to the kilns. They pile around the kilns enormous heaps, enough to keep the furnace continually burning for several days. They may well be the "thorns under the pot" of ~~2006~~ Ecclesiastes 7:6.

See THORNS.

Of the myriad spring flowers which make such a brilliant annual display it is impossible here to write in any detail. Earliest after the rains appear the crocuses and the cyclamen, then the narcissi, anemones — scarlet, white and purple — the scarlet ranunculi, gladioli, irises, dwarf orchids, pink and yellow flax, mountain lilies, borage and bugloss, the primrose-colored Palestine scabious, and vast numbers of small Composites all appear in quick succession. When these fade many brilliant thistles continue to add some color to the otherwise dry roadsides, and last of all, in the late summer, numbers of tall stalks of squill, shot from the now leafless bulbs, remain scattered in groups over the dry and leafless ground as last survivors of the season's display. The varieties of flowers are enormous, but those mentioned are almost universally present.

Of cultivated vegetables-mention may be made of *CUCUMBERS* (which see), lettuce, onions, *GARLIC* (which see), *MELONS* (which see), cauliflower and cabbage, potatoes (a fairly recent introduction), sweet potatoes, the egg plant (*Melongena badinjan*), artichokes (which also grow wild) and the bamieh (*Hibiscus esculentus*).

(2) The Jordan Valley.

The flora of this region is of a very special kind, and has affinities to Africa. Several trees and shrubs are of great interest. Firstly, mention may be made of the group of true acacias. One variety, the 'anbar (*Acacia Farnesiana*), is by no means peculiar to the Ghor, but is used for making hedges in many parts of the land; its little yellow, fluffy, scented flowers are a great favorite with the natives; it is usually a shrub rather than a tree. The remaining acacias are desert inhabitants and in many places are the only trees. The

seyyal, which includes *A. tortilis* and *A. seyal*, flourishes on the west shores of the Dead Sea, at `Ain Jidy and southward; from it is obtained the gum arabic of commerce; it probably yielded the wood known in the Old Testament as *SHITTIM WOOD* (which see).

The semitropical Ghor is the home of many other thorny trees. Extremely characteristic of the whole region are the jujube trees of which the nabk or sidr tree (*Zizyphus spina-Christi*), is the most common. It has rounded yellowish fruit; under favorable conditions it develops into a tall and handsome tree. Somewhat less common is the `ennabh (*Z. vulgaris*) which bears an edible fruit of the shape and size of an olive. A third kind, the dom (*Z. lotus*), is merely a shrub and has small pea-sized fruit. These various kinds of jujube trees are found in every part of the Jordan depression and of the valleys approaching it. Closely allied botanically to these thorny shrubs is the samur (*Paliurus aculeatus*) or “Christ thorn,” widely used for the making of hedges (*see BRIERS*). Another common shrub, or small tree, in the hotter parts of the Ghor near Jericho and the Dead Sea, is the zaqqum (*Balanites Aegyptiaca*) from whose oval berries the monks of Jericho extract a resinous substance which they term “Balm of Gilead.”

The dibk (*Cordia myxa*), a giant borage, which grows to a tree of 7 or 8 ft. high is widely cultivated but grows in the Ghor spontaneously. The fruit, which is edible, is used principally for making bird lime.

A very striking tree near Jericho and the Dead Sea is the `oshr (*Calotropis procera*), a member of the Natural Order Asclepiadeae. It has large obovate leaves, cabbage-like in consistence — a great contrast to the small, dry, dull-colored leaves of most of its neighbors. The trunk has a cork-like bark and white, milky juice and the fruit consists of queer apple-like follicles which, though solid looking, are only inflated with air and contain but silk threads and seeds. These have been supposed to be the apples of Sodom of Josephus, which he describes as looking like tempting fruit but which on examination prove to contain but dust. A much more likely theory is that he refers to the equally common colocynth (*Citrullus colocynthus*).

See WILD GOURD.

Another abundant herb is the *Solanum coagulans* (Arabic khadak), whose apple-like fruit has also received (without serious claim) the name of “apple of Sodom.”

Then there are in the immediate neighborhood of the Dead Sea a whole group of salt-loving plants which grow in the saline marshes such, for example, as the samphire or glasswort (*Salicornia fructosa* and *S. herbacea*). The latter of these is called the kali plant, because it is burnt in order to obtain potash (el kali). Another group is included under the name of sea blite or *sueda* (Arabic *suweid*) of which there are several varieties.

Along the banks of the Jordan willows (*Silex safsaf*) and tamarisks (especially *Tamarix Jordanis*) abound.

At various parts of the Jordan valley, but particularly to the north of Lake Huleh, flourishes the papyrus reed (*Cyperus papyrus*), known in Arabic as *babir*, the source of the earliest paper.

Of cultivated plants, palms, as we know from history, grow here well, though their cultivation has been neglected; sterile wild palms still occur in some of the warmer valleys, especially to the East of the Dead Sea. Many dead palm-tree trunks lie scattered along the shores of the Dead Sea.

In situations well supplied with water, bananas flourish — they are cultivated both near Jericho and near the Lake of Galilee. Oranges, lemons and citrons also grow well. All kinds of ordinary vegetables are grown in various parts of this region. Wheat and barley yield an early and an abundant crop in irrigated regions on both sides of the Jordan; rice and Indian maize are cultivated in irrigated fields North of Lake Huleh, and cotton at several spots. With scientific irrigation this region might be one of the most productive upon earth.

(3) *The Steppe or “Desert” Zones:*

The Steppe or “Desert” Zones are chiefly noticeable for the absence of trees and the stunted condition of the small shrubs and herbs which grow there. Thorny plants like *Poterium*, *Astragalus* (the most characteristic order) and *Cousinea* thistles flourish. With the early rains a rapid growth of dwarf flowers appears which dries up soon after the rainy season ends. Botanically the region stands somewhat distinct by the occurrence of Persian and Indian plant-forms. This region includes the great corn land of the Hauran and Nukra — some of the richest of their kind.

(4) *The Flora of the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon:*

The flora of the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon consists, in the lower slopes, of similar plants to those mentioned under (1). The Conifera are specially characteristic of this northern region, the destruction of these trees in Palestine proper being in many parts complete. Of the indigenous cypress (Arabic Saru) we have one species, the *Cypressus sempervirens*, a handsomer tree than the cylindrical kind — a cultivated variety — planted so frequently in Turkish cemeteries (*see CYPRESS*). There are 6 varieties of juniper known, and one species of yew. Of pines the two important kinds are — the Aleppo pine (*Pinus Halepensis*), which grows with considerable rapidity and is widely planted, and the handsomer stone pine (*Pinus pinia* the true snobar of the Arabs), probably more truly the native tree (*see PINE TREE*). The most important and characteristic member of this order of trees is the cedar which still flourishes in a very few spots (*see CEDAR*). On the Lebanon occurs a single species of rhododendron (*R. Ponticum*) and one of heather (*Erica verticillata*). Above the height of 7,000 ft. trees and shrubs disappear and vegetation is chiefly represented by low, rounded, thorny bushes, chiefly varieties of *Astragalus*; by clumps of *Acantholimon Lebanonicum*; by small procumbent bushes of *Cerasus prostata* — a member of the cherry family — and the *Coloneaster nummularia* with scarlet berries. Even on the summit of Hermon it is astonishing how many tiny flowers are in bloom in the late summer after the snow has melted. The most curious feature of this region is the almost complete absence of Arctic forms such as are found in the Alps and even in the Himalayas.

LITERATURE.

Prof. Ellsworth Huntington, *Palestine and Its Transformation*; J. Glaisher (PEF); *Meteorological Observations at Jerusalem*; G. E. Post, M.D., *Flora of Syria, Palestine and Sinai*; Mrs. Hannah Zeller, *Wild Flowers of the Holy Land*; Augusta A. Temple, *Flowers and Trees of Palestine*; Tristram, *The Fauna and Flora of Palestine* (PEF Memoirs); also articles in recent Bible Dictionaries, particularly those by Dr. Post in HDB, and by Sir W. T. Thiselton Dyer, director of Kew Gardens, in EB.

E. W. G. Masterman

BOTCH

See BOIL.

BOTRYS

<bot'-ris> ([Bότρυς, Botrus]; modern Batrun): A town of Phoenicia on the coast some miles North of Gebal (Byblus) on the southern side of the bold promontory called in classic times Theoprosopon. It is said to have been founded by Ithobal (Ethbaal), king of Tyre, whose daughter married Ahab (Josephus, Ant, VIII, xiii, 2). The town is not mentioned in Scripture.

BOTTLE

<bot'-i> (tmj [echemeth], dan [ho'-dh], l bnf [nebhel], qBqB" [baqbuq], bwθ [’obh]; [ἄσκός, askos]): The most literal rendering of all the words for bottle in English Versions of the Bible is “skin,” or “wine-skin,” the Revised Version (British and American). The primitive bottle among eastern peoples was really a bag made from skins, tanned or untanned, of kid, goat, cow, camel or buffalo — in most cases drawn off of the animal entire, after the legs and head were cut off, and, when filled, grotesquely retaining the shape of the animal. The skins in common use today, as in ancient times no doubt, for holding water milk, butter and cheese, have the hair left on and are far from cleanly-looking. Those used for wine and oil are tanned by means of oak bark and seasoning in smoke, a process that gives a peculiar astringency of flavor to the wine kept in them, and gave rise to the parable of Jesus about putting new wine into old wine-skins (<1917> Matthew 9:17; <1922> Mark 2:22; <1957> Luke 5:37). The fact that the leather underwent distension once and only once under fermentation, and the further fact that the wine-skins became dried and liable to crack from the smoke and dry heat of the tents and houses, gave point to the parable: “No man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins: but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins.” All such “bottles” today are liable to crack and become worthless.

Pliny Fisk used fresh goat-skins to carry water, but he says this gave the water a reddish color and an exceedingly loathsome taste. Harmer tells of carrying liquids in smoked skin-bottles, which when rent “were mended by

putting in a new piece, or by gathering up the piece, or by inserting a flat bit of wood.” Burckhardt says he saw Arabs keeping water for their horses on journeys in “large bags made of tanned camel-skin.” They would sew the skins up well on four sides, but would leave two openings, one to admit the air, one to let out the water. Two such bags made a good load for a camel. Edwin Wilbur Rice says the leather or skin-bottles are of different sizes and kinds, usually made from the skin of the goat, rarely ever from that of the sheep, as it is not considered strong enough. But sometimes they are made from the skin of the camel, or the ox, which is then prepared by tanning. When leather bags are sewed up the joinings are smeared with grease, as the skin-bottles of all sorts are, as they grow older, lest the water, or other liquid, ooze through.

Such bottles, being more portable and less breakable than earthenware, were peculiarly well suited to the use of primitive and nomad peoples, as they are to the roving Bedouin of today. The mention of them, however, in such various accounts and connections as those for instance of the story of Hagar (^{<0219>}Genesis 21:19), of the Gibeonites (^{<0890>}Joshua 9:4), and of David (^{<0258>}1 Samuel 25:18) shows that they were in common use among ancient Orientals, pastoral and peasant alike. Tourists still find that they are admirably suited to travelers in waterless districts, or districts where the water is brackish and bad. One of the characteristic figures even in oriental centers like Damascus today is the waterman who sells from his dripping goat-skin water cooled with the snow of Hermon, flavored with lemon, rose, or licorice, temptingly offered up and down the streets by his clapping his brass cups and crying in the most pleading but pleasing tones, “Drink, drink, thirsty. one” (compare ^{<0280>}Isaiah 55:1). But, as Dr. Mackie, of Beirut, says, “While the bottle is thus highly prized, and the water thus kept in it is a grateful necessity, the luxury of the East belongs to the spring itself, to the draught from the fountain of living waters. Hence, the comparison Jesus made at Jacob’s well (^{<0844>}John 4:14), and the one blessed terminus of all, the Shepherd’s leading (^{<0077>}Revelation 7:17). See HDB, under the word

Of course in the settled life of the Orient water, milk, wine and other liquids are often kept in earthen jars or other receptacles. For such “bottles” *see* **PITCHER**; **VESSEL**. Glass bottles are not mentioned in the Bible; but those now found in tombs, for keeping perfume in, may have been known in Old Testament times.

Figurative:

(1) For the clouds (~~<1887>~~ Job 38:37).

(2) For intoxication, through which, because of their headstrong continuance in sin, Israel shall be helpless to resist the enemy's attack (~~<2432>~~ Jeremiah 13:12).

(3) For sorrow: "Put thou my tears into thy bottle" (~~<1918>~~ Psalm 56:8). "The Psalmist's sorrows were so many that they would need a great wine-skin to hold them all. There is no allusion to the little lachrymatories of fashionable and fanciful Romans: it is a robust metaphor by far; such floods of tears had the Psalmist wept that a leathern bottle would scarce hold them" (Treasury of David, III, 39). "God treasures His servants' tears as if they were water or wine." Bernard says, "The tears of penitents are the wine of angels" (Dummelow's Comm., 351).

George B. Eager

BOTTOM

~~<bot'-um>~~: Rendered by several Hebrew words:

(1) ~~vrw~~_l [sheres], "root"; Chaldaic, ~~vrw~~_q [shoresh] (~~<1870>~~ Job 36:30, "the bottom of the sea").

(2) [q" r" q"] [qarqa'], "soil," "pavement of tesserae" (~~<3008>~~ Amos 9:3).

(3) ~~bxq~~_l [qetsebh], "cutting," "chop," "extremity" (Jon 2:6, "the bottoms of the mountains").

(4) ~~hdypir~~" [rephidhah], "railing," "couch" (Song 3:10, "the bottom thereof of gold").

(5) ~~qyj~~ ~~e~~ [cheq], "bosom," "lap" (~~<2683>~~ Ezekiel 43:13,14,17, the Revised Version, margin "hollow").

(6) ~~hLxm~~ [metsullah], "to be dark," "shadowy place," from primitive root tsalal, "to tumble down," i.e. "settle"; hence, the idea of a valley ("the myrtle-trees that were in the bottom," ~~<3008>~~ Zechariah 1:8 the Revised Version, margin "shady place"). The prophet may have been

wont to frequent the myrtle grove in the glen or bottoms, in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, for meditation and prayer (BTP, II, 283).

M. O. Evans

BOTTOMLESS, PIT

<bot'-um-les>, ([τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου, to phrear tes abussou], “the pit of the abyss,” ^{<691>}Revelation 9:1,2 the King James Version): In the Revised Version (British and American), he abussos (always an adjective in classical authors = “bottomless”) is uniformly rendered “the abyss” (which see) (^{<138>}Luke 8:31; ^{<507>}Romans 10:7; ^{<691>}Revelation 9:11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1,3).

BOUGH

<bou>.

See *BRANCH*.

BOUGHT (1)

<bout> (𐤁𐤓𐤕[tawekh], “bisection,” “middle”): The best part of a sling that contains the stone, “in the midst of the bought of a sling” (^{<1259>}1 Samuel 25:29 King James Version, margin, the King James Version “out of the middle,” the Revised Version (British and American) “from the hollow”).

BOUGHT (2)

<bot> (adj. and vb.).

See *BUYING*.

BOUND

See *BIND*.

BOUNDS

<boundz>: 𐤁𐤓𐤕 G:[gabhal] = “to twist” (as a rope), “to make an enclosure” (as by a line) occurs in ^{<1292>}Exodus 19:12,23; ^{<1341>}Psalms 104:9; 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕 [gebhul] = “a cord,” hence, “a boundary,” “territory” (^{<1233>}Exodus

23:31 the King James Version), with its feminine form **hl wbg** [gebhulah] (^{<6318>}Deuteronomy 32:8; ^{<23013>}Isaiah 10:13); **qj qchoq** = “enactment,” “appointment” (of time, space, quantity, labor, or usage), hence, “commandment,” “decree,” “ordinance” (^{<18415>}Job 14:5; 26:10 the King James Version); in the Greek, [ὄροθεσία, horothesia], in the sense of “a limit,” “boundary line,” occurs in ^{<41726>}Acts 17:26.

BOUNTIFULNESS; BOUNTY

<boun'-ti-fool-nes>, **<boun'-ti>** ([ἀπλότης, haplotes], “singleness,” “benevolence,” ^{<40911>}2 Corinthians 9:11 the King James Version; **bwθ** [Tobh], “to be good” (^{<1219>}Proverbs 22:9); [εὐλογία, eulogia], “good speech,” “blessing” (2 Cor 9:6); **l m" G**: [gamal], “to treat well” (^{<13917>}Psalms 119:17); [**wθ**] [shoa`], “to be liberal” (^{<23115>}Isaiah 32:5); **dy**: [yadh], “hand,” “power”): Paul speaks of the church at Corinth “being enriched in everything unto all liberality” (the King James Version “bountifulness,” ^{<40911>}2 Corinthians 9:11). The offering of the church at Corinth for the Christians of Judea is termed a “bounty,” a blessing, liberally given: “and not of extortion” (the King James Version “of covetousness,” ^{<40915>}2 Corinthians 9:5,6). The word occurs also in ^{<11013>}1 Kings 10:13: “Besides that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty,” literally “according to the hand of King Solomon.”

L. Kaiser

BOW

<bo>.

See ARCHERY.

BOW; BOWING

<bou>, **<bou'-ing>**.

See ADORATION; ATTITUDES.

BOW, IN THE CLOUD

<bo>: Reference to the promise made to Noah (^{<00913>}Genesis 9:13) preserved in the Constellation figures.

See *ASTRONOMY, II, 4.*

BOWELS

<bow'-elz> (h[me`ah], plural **μy**[me`im], **μj r**[rechem], plural **μymj r'**[rachamim]; [**σπλάγχνον**, splagchnion]):

(1) Literal: The literal meaning of these words is intestines, then the abdomen, the womb (matrix and uterus). As will be seen there is not much definiteness in the use of these expressions from the standpoint of physiology; but not less so than in modern oriental languages and even in many occidental languages, as popularly used. The remarkable phrases used in <218>2 Chronicles 21:18,19, “Yahweh smote him in his bowels” and “His bowels fell out by reason of his sickness,” refer to a severe and fatal case of hemorrhoids.

(2) Figurative: In figurative language these words denote deep emotions of various kinds. As in physiology we speak of the “nervus sympathicus,” the ancients expressed by these terms “affection,” “sympathy” and “mercy,” feelings of distress and sorrow, as in <897>Job 30:27 the King James Version; <202>Lamentations 1:20 the King James Version; <212>Lamentations 2:11 the King James Version. In one passage we have to translate [me`im] by “heart,” being the seat of affection and devotion (<9706>Psalm 71:6): “Thy law is within my heart” (<9018>Psalm 40:8). In the New Testament (Revised Version) the word is only given in <4018>Acts 1:18.

H. L. E. Luering

BOWING

<bow'-ing> (**htn**:[naTah], “to incline,” “bulge”): The Psalmist’s assailants expected that he would be “like a leaning (the King James Version “bowing”) wall” (<9518>Psalm 62:3) before their united attack, as when an ill-built, bulging wall gives way under a sudden and heavy fall of rain (compare <2331>Ezekiel 13:11; 38:22).

BOWL

<bol>:

(1) The primitive Hebrews, like the wandering Bedouin of today, probably used bowls of wood, as less breakable than earthenware. Some hollow dish of the sort would be indispensable, even in the lowest stage of nomad life, to receive the milk of the flock, and as the common dish in which to serve the family meal. We have abundant proof, however, that vessels of earthenware of various sorts were in use by the settled peoples of Canaan in the earliest times. Many interesting specimens, characteristic of different peoples and ages, have been found by excavators of the PEF, especially recently by Flinders Petrie and Fred. Bliss at Tell el-Hesi (see Tell el-Hesi (Lachish), by Petrie, and A Mound of Many Cities, by Bliss) and by Macalister and others at Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo, etc. (see PEFS).

It was probably in some such dish — ”a bowl fit for lords” (English Versions, “a lordly dish”) — that Jael offered. Sisera a draught of sour milk (^{Q065}Judges 5:25; compare Arabic leben), and the bowl into which Gideon wrung the water from his fleece (^{Q068}Judges 6:38) is denoted by the same word ([**psē**cephel]; Septuagint lekane), though this may have been of earthenware instead of wood. Certainly the [cephel] was a dish of goodly size.

(2) Another word rendered sometimes “bowl” and sometimes “basin” is **qrz**” **mi**[mizraq]. It is used of the large silver bowls presented by “the princes of the congregation” (^{Q073}Numbers 7:13 f). *See BASIN*. It is also applied by Amos (6:6) to the costly bowls used by the nobles of Samaria in their debaucheries.

(3) A still larger bowl is mentioned by Jeremiah (35:5), the King James Version “pot” ([**ybf**:[gabhia`]). This same word is used of Joseph’s cup (^{Q042}Genesis 44:2 f): “Put my cup, the silver cup, in the sack’s mouth.” As used at banquets it corresponds to the crater, from which the drinking cups (**twōkō**[kocoth]) were replenished. The material seems to have been uniformly silver. But see (4).

(4) Bowl is used in the King James Version to translation [**ybf**:[gabhia`], “the bowls made like almonds” (^{Q253}Exodus 25:33 the King James Version), as applied to the “cups” (Revised Version), or calyxes, used to ornament the golden candlestick (*see TABERNACLE*). It seems to have been an elastic term.

(5) The bowl of ^{<304B>}Zechariah 4:3 (^{hL}gullah], found also in 5:2 correct text), is represented as the receptacle for oil in the candlestick of the prophet's vision. It is likewise used of "the lamp of life" (^{<212B>}Ecclesiastes 12:6) and to designate the bowl-shaped capitals of Jachin and Boaz (^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:41,42; ^{<4442>}2 Chronicles 4:12,13).

(6) Bowl is found in ^{<2517>}Isaiah 51:17,22 the Revised Version (British and American), "bowl of the cup" (the King James Version "dregs of the cup"). Some think the second word here (^{sw} t [B" qu] qubba`ath koc]) is a gloss to explain the unusual preceding word.

(7) In Revelation where the King James Version has "vial" (phiale) the Revised Version (British and American) has "bowl."

See *BASIN*.

George B. Eager

BOWMAN

^{<bo'-man>}: Israel seems not to have been equal to the surrounding peoples in the use of the bow. The battle of Gilboa was clearly lost through the superior skill of the Philistine bowmen. This seems to have moved David to encourage archery practice in Judah (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 1:18; compare Driver in the place cited.). It is thought probable that the revival of Israel's military power under Jeroboam, son of Joash, was due to improvement in archery. Hosea, a contemporary, speaks of the bow as the national weapon of Israel (1:5,7) . The most skilled bowmen of antiquity were the Assyrians (compare ^{<3158>}Isaiah 5:28; 37:33). From Assyrian reliefs it seems that it was their practice to overwhelm their enemies with the bow, and to use sword and spear only when the foe had been demoralized and put to flight.

See *ARCHERY*.

George B. Eager

BOWSHOT

^{<bo'-shot>}: Found only in ^{<0216>}Genesis 21:16 in the account of Hagar and her child: "And she went, and sat her down over against him a good way

off, as it were a bowshot,” literally “stretchings of a bow,” a typical oriental way of indicating distance.

BOX

The passages in which this word occurs are ^{<1916>}2 Kings 9:1,3 (Hebrew [pakḥ], “cruet,” “flask,” the Revised Version (British and American) vial) and the synoptic passages ^{<1817>}Matthew 26:7 the King James Version; ^{<1148>}Mark 14:3 the King James Version; ^{<1757>}Luke 7:37 the King James Version (Greek [alabastron]). “Perfume-boxes” are mentioned in ^{<1817>}Isaiah 3:20; in the New Testament passages the Revised Version (British and American) renders “alabaster cruse.” “Alabaster” was a white stone much used in ornamentation; and out of it small vessels were made for holding precious ointment. “She brake the cruse” (^{<1148>}Mark 14:3), i.e. the seal, not the vessel.

In ^{<2419>}Isaiah 41:19 and 60:13, “box” is found in connection with “tree,” as “box-tree” (which see).

BOXING

See *GAMES*.

BOX-TREE

^{<box'-tre>} (rWVa" T)[te'ashshur]; ^{<2419>}Isaiah 41:19; 60:13, “boxwood” ^{<2716>}Ezekiel 27:6): A tree of uncertain identity, which must once have been common in the forests of Lebanon. According to Post (HDB, I, 313), “The only species of box found in Bible lands is *Buxus longifolia*, which is a shrub from 2 to 3 ft. high. It does not grow South of Mt. Cassius and it is unlikely that it did in historical times.”

As an alternative to the box the cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens* — known in Arabic as Sherbin — has been suggested. It is a fine tree and was probably once plentiful, but as it seems to answer to the berosh (see *FIR*), it cannot well be the [te'ashshur]. There is nothing certain to go upon. — *E. W. G. Masterman*

BOY

(dl y[eyeledh], “child,” r[ʔ][na`ar], “lad,” “youth”; [ὁ παῖς, ho pais]

and [ἡ παῖς, he pais]): Refers to a child of any age, and is sometimes used of either sex: ^{<208>}Joel 3:3; ^{<385>}Zechariah 8:5; ^{<478>}Matthew 17:18; ^{<128>}Luke 2:43; 8:51, 54 fem.; 9:42. In the East the word applies also to an adult who is a servant (^{<1086>}Matthew 8:6 the Revised Version, margin). The boy occupied a place of special importance in the family life of all ancient people. In Syria the father even was called by the name of his son. He was known as the father of Joseph, or whatever the name might be. As is true among all oriental people, while the father had absolute control in his case as well as in the case of the rest of the household, yet the boy received a consideration and advantages not accorded to the daughter. In the Jewish family his religious life began at the fourth year. He was expected to learn the Scriptures at five, the Mishna at ten, and to fulfill the whole law at thirteen. At twelve years he was expected to learn a trade, and attained to something of independence at that age, though he did not come into full rights as a citizen until he was twenty. Among many nations there was special rejoicing at the birth of the boy, and sometimes a feast. One of the most ancient customs was the planting of a cedar tree on this occasion.

See CHILD; FAMILY; SON.

Jacob W. Kapp

BOZCATH

^{<boz'-kath>} (ṭq" xḂ;[botsqath]).

See BOZKATH.

BOZEZ

^{<bo'-zez>} (ḂxṭḂ [botsets]; [Baζές, Bazes], probably from an obsolete root batsats, corresponding to the Arabic batstsa, "to shine" or "to ooze"): The name of the northern of the two cliffs that stand one on each side of the gorge of Michmash (^{<940>}1 Samuel 14:4). It catches the sun during most of the day, while the southern cliff is in the shade. To this circumstance it may owe its name, "shining." "The contrast is surprising and picturesque between the dark coal color of the south side, and the ruddy or tawny tints of the northern cliff, crowned with the gleaming white of the upper chalky strata. The picture is unchanged since the day when Jonathan looked over to the white camping ground of the Philistines, and Bozez must have then

shone as brightly as it does now, in the full light of an eastern sun” (Conder, Tent Work, 256).

W. Ewing

BOZKATH

<boz'-kath> (**tq" xB**;¹[botsqath], “stony”; Septuagint [**Βασηδῶθ**,

Basedoth]): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named between Lachish and Eglon (¹⁶⁵⁹Joshua 15:39). It was the birthplace of Adaiah the mother of King Josiah (¹²²¹2 Kings 22:1; the King James Version “Boscath”). The site is not identified.

BOZRAH

<boz'-ra> (**hrxB**;¹[botsrah], “sheepfold”; [**Βοσόρρα**, Bosorrha], [**Βοσόρ**, Bosor]):

(1) The capital of Edom, a city of great antiquity (¹⁶⁵³Genesis 36:33; ¹⁷⁰⁴1 Chronicles 1:44; ²³⁴⁶Isaiah 34:6; 63:1; ²⁴⁹³Jeremiah 49:13; ³⁰⁰⁰Amos 1:12). It may be identical with Buceirah, which lies about 7 miles Southwest of Tufileh, on the main road to Petra.

(2) A city in Moab mentioned in ²⁴⁸²Jeremiah 48:24. It is probably identical with Bezer, the city of refuge. It may be represented today by Qusur Bashair, which towers lie some 15 miles Southeast of Dibon. In this case Beth-gamul would be identical with Jemail, 8 miles East of Dibon, and Beth-meon with Ma'in, Southwest of Medebah.

W. Ewing

BRACELET

<bras'-let> (**hd[xa]**,¹[’ets`adhah], **j h**;¹[chach], **dymx**;¹[tsamidh],

lytP;¹[pathil], **twOve**;¹[sheroth]): Used to translate a number of Hebrew words, only one of which means a band for the arm ([’ets`adhah]), as in ³⁰⁰⁰2 Samuel 1:10, “the bracelet that was on his arm.” In ¹²⁵²Exodus 35:22, where both men and women are said to have brought as offerings among other “jewels of gold” “bracelets” (the Revised Version (British and American) “brooches”), another word ([chach]) is used, meaning most

likely nose-rings (*see RINGS*). The bracelet asked of Judah by Tamar as a pledge (“Thy signet, and thy b, and thy staff that is in thy hand,”

^{<0388>}Genesis 38:18,25 the King James Version) was probably the cord of softly-twisted wool for the shepherd’s headdress (pathil; the Revised Version (British and American) “cord”). The bracelets (“two bracelets for her hands of ten shekels weight of gold”) which Abraham’s servant gave to Rebekah stand for still another word ([tsamidh]). These “bracelets” are always spoken of as “bracelets for the hands,” or as “put upon the hands” (^{<0247>}Genesis 24:47, compare ^{<0611>}Ezekiel 16:11; 23:42). Isaiah, predicting the day when Yahweh will smite the haughty daughters of Zion, who “walk with outstretched necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet,” says, “In that day the Lord will take away the beauty of their anklets the bracelets” (3:19, [sheroth]) etc., where some translate “twisted ornaments,” leaving it uncertain as to just what is specifically meant. In ^{<0010>}2 Samuel 1:10 the bracelet appears with the crown as one of the royal insignia. In ^{<0112>}2 Kings 11:12, according to Wellhausen, W. R. Smith (OTJC2, 311n.) and others, we should read, “Then he brought out the king’s son, and put the crown upon him and gave him bracelets” **twd[xh]** [...] for “testimony” **twd[j]** [...] See DB.

Today, as of old, the bracelet is multiform and a favorite ornament in the East. It is made of gold, silver, copper, brass, glass and even enameled earthenware, and in many designs: flat band, plain ring, interlinked rings, as well as of twisted wires, connected squares, solid or perforated, with or without pendants (Mackie).

When owned by women, bracelets had the special commendation, along with other jewelry, of being inalienable — not to be taken by the husband in case of divorce, nor seized and sold for his debts. “Even now,” says Rice (Orientalisms, etc., 41), “in Moslem lands a woman may be divorced without legal process, at the freak of her husband, but she can carry away undisputed any amount of gold, silver, jewels, precious stones, or apparel that she has loaded on her person; so she usually wears all her treasures on her person, not knowing when the fateful word may be spoken.”

George B. Eager

BRAG

([μεγαλαυχέω, megalaucheo], “proud brags”): Occurs only in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 15:32), not being sufficiently dignified to be given a place in the canonical Scriptures by the King James translators (compare Judith 16:5).

BRAIDED; BRAIDING

<brad’-ed>, <brad’-ing> ([τὸ πλέγμα, to plegama], “that which is plaited,” ^{<408>}1 Timothy 2:9; [ἡ ἐμπλοκή, he emplode], “a plaiting,” ^{<408>}1 Peter 3:3): Used with reference to Christian women in two passages where the apostles emphasized the superiority of good works and spiritual grace over outward adornment.

See *EMBROIDERY*.

BRAMBLE

<bram’-b’-l>.

See *THORNS*.

BRAN

([τὰ πίτυρα, ta pitura]): The women of Babylon are described as burning “bran for incense” in their unchaste idolatrous worship (Baruch 6:43).

BRANCH AND BOUGH

<bransh>: Represented by very many words in the Hebrew.

(1) **hrwʾz** [zemorah] used especially of a vine branch. The spies “cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes” (^{<413>}Numbers 13:23). See also ^{<365>}Ezekiel 15:2; Nah 2:2. “They put the branch to their nose” (^{<387>}Ezekiel 8:17), refers to some unknown idolatrous practice, as does also ^{<370>}Isaiah 17:10, “thou plantest pleasant plants, and settest it with strange slips,” or “vine slips of a strange (god)” the Revised Version, margin.

(2) **tqnwʾ** [yoneqeth], literally “a sucker.” “The tender branch thereof will not cease” (^{<347>}Job 14:7). Used figuratively of Israel, ^{<301>}Psalms 80:11

(the Revised Version (British and American) “shoots”); ^{<2672>}Ezekiel 17:22 the King James Version; ^{<2846>}Hosea 14:6, and of the wicked, ^{<1886>}Job 8:16 (the Revised Version (British and American) “shoots”), 15:30.

(3) **hPKi**[kippah], ^{<1852>}Job 15:32. ^{<2094>}Isaiah 9:14; 19:15, the Revised Version (British and American) has “palm-branch,” “Therefore Yahweh will cut off from Israel head and tail, palm-branch and rush, in one day” (9:14).

(4) **rxne**[netser] (of the same Hebrew root, according to many commentators, as Nazareth), literally “a little shoot springing from the root” (“out of a shoot from her roots,” ^{<2710>}Daniel 11:7), which may be planted out to grow (^{<2800>}Isaiah 11:1; 60:21), or may be rooted out and thrown away (^{<2349>}Isaiah 14:19).

(5) **j m" x**,[tsemach]. The “branch” of Messianic prophecy. *See PROPHECY*. “In that day shall the branch (m “shoot” or “sprout”) of Yahweh be beautiful and glorious” (^{<2942>}Isaiah 4:2); “a shoot out of the stock of Jesse” (^{<2800>}Isaiah 11:1); “a righteous branch” (^{<2435>}Jeremiah 23:5; 33:15); “my servant the Branch” (^{<3888>}Zechariah 3:8); “the man whose name is the Branch” (^{<3622>}Zechariah 6:12).

(6) **hnq**:[qanah], is used for the “branches” of the golden candlesticks (^{<1252>}Exodus 25:32; 37:18 ff). Literally, [qanah] means a “reed.”

There are a number of words, less frequently used, meaning “branch”:

(7) **pyDB** [baddim] (plural only used; ^{<2676>}Ezekiel 17:6; 19:14).

(8) **tyl D**:[dalith] (plural only used; ^{<2416>}Jeremiah 11:16).

(9) **hFm** [maTTeh] (^{<2691>}Ezekiel 19:11).

(10) **'y[is]**:[ca`iph] (^{<2885>}Isaiah 18:5; **hP[is]**:[ce`appah] (plural) (^{<2605>}Ezekiel 31:6); **hP[r" s"** [car`appah] (^{<2605>}Ezekiel 31:5).

(11) **n[anaph]** (^{<3900>}Malachi 4:1; ^{<3901>}Psalms 80:11); **'n[anaph]** (^{<2044>}Daniel 4:14,21); **'n[eneph]** (^{<2608>}Ezekiel 36:8).

(12) **hrapu** [pu'rah], “a bough” (^{<2303>}Isaiah 10:33); **twθapo** [po'roth] (pl. only) (^{<2705>}Ezekiel 31:5,8).

(13) **trmx** [tsammereth], “foliage” or “boughs of trees,” literally “locks” or “fleece” of trees (^{<2705>}Ezekiel 17:3; 31:3).

(14) **ryxq** [qatsir] (collective) (^{<840>}Job 14:9), “boughs” (^{<801>}Psalms 80:11), “branches.”

(15) **tl Bvi** [shibbeleth], the two olive branches of ^{<8012>}Zechariah 4:12.

(16) **ʃθ** [soqch], root meaning “to interweave” (^{<094>}Judges 9:49); **hkwθ** [sokhah] (^{<094>}Judges 9:48), “boughs.”

(17) **gyrč** [sarigh] (pl. only, **mygyrč** [sarighim]), “branches” (of the vine) (^{<040>}Genesis 40:10; ^{<3007>}Joel 1:7).

Represented in Greek in the New Testament:

(1) **[βαῖον, baion]** (^{<8213>}John 12:13), “a palm branch.”

(2) **[κλάδος, klados]** (^{<032>}Matthew 13:32; 21:8; 24:32; ^{<002>}Mark 4:32; 13:28; ^{<039>}Luke 13:19; ^{<5116>}Romans 11:16,17,18,19,21).

(3) **[κλήμα, klema]**, a slip or cutting of the vine, especially one cut off to be grafted into another plant (^{<815>}John 15:2,4,5,6).

(4) **[στιβάς, stibos]** (= **[στοιβάς, stoibas]**), a “twig” or “bough” (^{<4108>}Mark 11:8).

E. W. G. Masterman

BRAND

In the double signification of an object on fire and of objects used to feed a fire. The first meaning is expressed by **dwa** [’udh], “a bent stick” for stirring fire (^{<3041>}Amos 4:11; ^{<3032>}Zechariah 3:2; compare ^{<2004>}Isaiah 7:4); the second by **dyPi** [lappidh], in ^{<0750>}Judges 15:4,5. A third meaning is found in **hqyzi** [ziqah], indicating the brand as a spreader of fire (^{<1238>}Proverbs 26:18).

BRANDING

See PUNISHMENTS.

BRASEN

<bra'-z'-n>.

See BRASS.

BRASS; BRAZEN

<bras> (tvj w' [nechosheth]): The use of the word brass has always been more or less indefinite in its application. At the present time the term brass is applied to an alloy of copper and zinc or of copper, zinc and tin. The word translated "brass" in the King James Version would be more correctly rendered bronze, since the alloy used was copper and tin (<1270>Exodus 27:4). In some passages however copper is meant (<1889>Deuteronomy 8:9), as bronze is an artificial product. This alloy was known in Egypt in at least 1600 BC. It was probably known in Europe still earlier (2000 BC), which helps to answer the question as to the source of the tin. Bronze was probably of European origin and was carried to Egypt. At a later period the Egyptians made the alloy themselves, bringing their copper from Sinai, Cyprus or northern Syria (*see COPPER*), and their tin from the Balkan regions or from Spain or the British Isles (*see TIN*). When the Children of Israel came into the promised land, they found the Canaanites already skilled in the making and use of bronze instruments. This period marked the transition from the bronze age to the iron age in Palestine. Museums possessing antiquities from Bible lands have among their collections many and varied bronze objects. Among the most common are nails, lamps, hand mirrors, locks, cutting instruments, etc. Within comparatively recent times brass, meaning an alloy of copper and zinc, has been introduced into Syria. The alloy is made by the native workmen (*see CRAFTS*). Sheet brass is now being extensively imported for the making of bowls, vases, etc. Bronze is practically unknown in the modern native articles.

Figurative: "Brass," naturally, is used in Scripture as the symbol of what is firm, strong, lasting; hence, "gates of brass" (<1976>Psalm 107:16), "hoofs of brass" (<3013>Micah 4:13), "walls of brass" (Jeremiah is made as a "brazen

wall,” 1:18; 15:20), “mountains of brass” (^{<2125>}Daniel 2:35, the Macedonian empire; the arms of ancient times were mostly of bronze). It becomes a symbol, therefore, of hardness, obstinacy, insensibility, in sin, as “brow of brass” (^{<2384>}Isaiah 48:4); “they are brass and iron” (^{<2468>}Jeremiah 6:28, of the wicked); “all of them are brass” (^{<2528>}Ezekiel 22:18, of Israel).

James A. Patch

BRAVERY

<brav'-er-i>: **hrapTi**[tiph'arah] or **trapTi**[ˈtiph'ereth] = “beauty,” “glory,” “honor” and “majesty,” hence, “splendor of bravery.” “The bravery of their tinkling ornaments” (^{<2318>}Isaiah 3:18 the King James Version), “the beauty of their anklets” (American Standard Revised Version). Compare bravado, bravura.

BRAWLER

<brol'-er> (Qere **μυνῃδ" mi**[midhyanim]; Kethibh **μυνῃδ" mi**[midhwanim], “quarrelsomeness”; [**ἄμαχος**, amachos], “not fighting”): Spoken of the quarrelsome woman; “a contentious (the King James Version “brawling”) woman” (^{<2190>}Proverbs 21:9). He who seeks the office of a bishop should be “no brawler” ([**παροινος**, paroinos] the King James Version “given to wine,” ^{<2607>}Titus 1:7); “not contentious” (the King James Version “not a brawler,” ^{<2408>}1 Timothy 3:3; ^{<2607>}Titus 3:2).

BRAY

<bra> (**qh" n**:[nahaq], “to bray,” of the ass; **vt" K**:[kathash], “to pound in a mortar”): This word occurs with two distinct meanings:

(a) The harsh cry of the ass (^{<2805>}Job 6:5). Job argued that as the sounds instinctively uttered by animals denote their wants, even so his Words were but the natural expression of his longing for some adequate explanation of his sufferings, or, failing this, for death itself. Used figuratively of Job’s mockers (^{<2807>}Job 30:7).

(b) “To beat small in a mortar,” “to chastise.” ^{<2722>}Proverbs 27:22 refers to a more elaborate process than threshing for separating grain (the English Revised Version “corn”) from its husk and impurities; used

figuratively of a thorough but useless course of discipline; or still more probably with reference to the Syrian custom of braying meat and bruised corn together in a mortar with a pestle, “till the meat and grain become a uniform indistinguishable pulp” (see *The Expositor Times*, VIII, 521).

M. O. Evans

BRAZEN

<bra'-z'-n>.

See *BRASS*.

BRAZEN SEA

See *SEA, THE MOLTEN*.

BRAZEN SERPENT

See *NEHUSHTAN*.

BREACH

<brech>: Represented by

(1) **ÄrḔ**, [perets] = “a tear,” “a rending asunder,” “a break,” hence, figuratively “enmity,” “disruption,” “strife” (^{<0329>}Genesis 38:29; ^{<0215>}Judges 21:15; ^{<0150>}2 Samuel 5:20; ^{<0353>}1 Chronicles 15:13; ^{<0601>}Nehemiah 6:1; ^{<0164>}Job 16:14; ^{<0463>}Psalms 106:23; ^{<0303>}Isaiah 30:13; 58:12);

(2) **rby**, [shebher] = “fracture,” “affliction,” “bruise,” “destruction” (^{<0320>}Leviticus 24:20; ^{<0447>}Jeremiah 14:17; ^{<0313>}Lamentations 2:13; ^{<0602>}Psalms 60:2);

(3) **qdB**, [bedheq] = “a gap” or “leak” (in a building or ship) occurring in ^{<0215>}2 Kings 12:5-8, 12; 22:5;

(4) **haWnT**, [tenu'ah] = “alienation,” “breach of promise” (^{<0443>}Numbers 14:34 the King James Version);

(5) Ἄρπηι[miphrats] = “a break” (in the shore), and hence, “a haven” (~~QUBT~~ Judges 5:17, the Revised Version (British and American) “creeks”).

Frank E. Hirsch

BREACH, OF COVENANT

<brech>, <kuv'-e-nant>, <kuv'-e-nant>.

See *CRIMES*.

BREACH OF RITUAL

<rit'-u-al>.

See *CRIMES*.

BREACH OF TRUST

See *CRIMES*.

BREAD

<bred> (μῆ | ,[lechem]; [ἄρτος, artos]):

The art of bread-making is very ancient. It was even known to the Egyptians at a very early day (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians), to the Hebrews of the Exodus (Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebr. Archäologie) and, of course, to the Greeks and Romans of a later day. Bread played a large part in the vocabulary and in the life of the ancient Hebrews.

1. DIETARY PREEMINENCE.

(1) In the East bread is primary, other articles of food merely accessory; while in the West meat and other things chiefly constitute the meal, and bread is merely secondary. Accordingly “bread” in the Old Testament, from ~~QUBT~~ Genesis 3:19 onward, stands for food in general.

(2) Moreover in ancient times, as now, most probably, when the peasant, carpenter, blacksmith or mason left home for the day’s work, or when the muleteer or messenger set out on a journey, he wrapped

other articles of food, if there were any, in the thin loaves of bread, and thus kept them ready for his use as needed.

(3) Often the thin, glutinous loaf, puffed out with air, is seen today, opened on one side and used so as to form a natural pouch, in which meat, cheese, raisins and olives are enclosed to be eaten with the bread (see Mackie in DCG, article “Bread”). The loaf of bread is thus made to include everything and, for this reason also, it may fitly be spoken of as synonymous with food in general. To the disciples of Jesus, no doubt, “Give us this day our daily bread” would naturally be a petition for all needed food, and in the case of the miraculous feeding of the multitude it was enough to provide them with “bread” (~~Q145~~ Matthew 14:15 ff).

2. MATERIALS.

1. Barley:

Barley was in early times, as it is today, the main bread-stuff of the Palestine peasantry (see ~~Q113~~ Judges 7:13; where “the cake of barley bread” is said to be “the sword of Gideon”), and of the poorer classes of the East in general (see ~~Q113~~ John 6:13, where the multitude were fed on the miraculous increase of the “five barley loaves,” and compare Josephus, BJ, V, x, 2).

2. Wheat:

But wheat, also, was widely used as a breadstuff then, as it is now, the wheat of the Syrian plains and uplands being remarkable for its nutritious and keeping qualities.

3. Three Kinds of Flour:

Three kinds, or qualities, of flour, are distinguished, according to the way of making:

- (1)** a coarser sort, rudely made by the use of pestle and mortar, the “beaten corn” of ~~Q114~~ Leviticus 2:14,16 (the Revised Version (British and American) “bruised”);
- (2)** the “flour” or “meal” of ordinary use (~~Q121D~~ Exodus 29:2; ~~Q111D~~ Leviticus 2:2; 6:15), and

(3) the “fine meal” for honored guests (see ^{<0186>}Genesis 18:6, where Abraham commands Sarah to “make ready three measures of fine meal”) with which we may compare the “fine flour” for the king’s kitchen (^{<1022>}1 Kings 4:22) and the “fine flour” required for the ritual meal offering, as in ^{<0111>}Leviticus 2:1; 5:11; 7:12; 14:10; 23:13; 24:5; etc.

3. BREAD-MAKING.

1. Grinding:

After thoroughly sifting and cleaning the grain, the first step in the process was to reduce it to “meal” or “flour” by rubbing, pounding, or grinding. (In ^{<0418>}Numbers 11:8 it is said of the manna “The people went about, and gathered it, and ground it in mills, or beat it in mortars.”) It has been shown that by a process, which is not yet extinct in Egypt, it was customary to rub the grain between two the “corn-rubbers” or “corn grinders,” of which many specimens have been found by Petrie, Bliss, Macalister and others, at Lachish, Gezer and elsewhere (PEFS, 1902, 326; 1903, 118; compare Erman, Egypt, 180, for illustrations of actual use). For detailed descriptions of the other processes, *see* **MORTAR**; **MILL**.

2. Kneading:

The “flour” was then ordinarily mixed simply with water, kneaded in a wooden basin or kneading-trough (^{<0188>}Exodus 8:3) and, in case of urgency, at once made into “cakes” and baked. (See ^{<0124>}Exodus 12:34, “And the people took their dough before it was leavened.”) The Hebrews called such cakes [matstsoth], and they were the only kind allowed for use on the altar during Passover, and immediately following the Feast of Unleavened Bread (also called [Matstsoth]). Commonly however the process was as follows: a lump of leavened dough of yesterday’s baking, preserved for the purpose, was broken up and mixed with the day’s “batch,” and the whole was then set aside and left standing until it was thoroughly leavened (*see* **LEAVEN**).

3. Baking:

We find in the Old Testament, as in the practice of the East today, three modes of firing or baking bread:

(1) Hot Stones:

That represented by Elijah's cake baked on the hot stones (~~1196~~ 1 Kings 19:6 the Revised Version, margin; compare "the cakes upon the hearth," ~~1196~~ Genesis 18:6 the King James Version, and see Robinson, *Researches*, II, 406). The stones were laid together and a fire was lighted upon them. When the stones were well heated the cinders were raked off, and the cakes laid on the stones and covered with ashes. After a while the ashes were again removed and the cake was turned (see ~~2008~~ Hosea 7:8) and once more covered with the glowing ashes. It was thus cooked on both sides evenly and made ready for eating (compare the Vulgate, *Panis subcineraris*, and DeLagarde, *Symmicta*, II, 188, where [~~1196~~ *ἐγκουθία*, *egkouthia*], is referred to as "the hiding" of the cakes under the ashes). Out of these primitive usages of the pastoral tribes and peasants grew other improved forms of baking.

(2) Baking Pans:

An ancient method of baking, prevalent still among the Bedouin of Syria and Arabia, is to employ a heated convex iron plate, or griddle, what we would call a frying pan, in lieu of the heated sand or stones. The Hebrew "baking-pan" (~~1196~~ *ṭḇ j ṭḇ* [machabhath], ~~1196~~ Leviticus 2:5; 7:9; compare ~~2008~~ Ezekiel 4:3) must have been of this species of "griddle." The reference in ~~1196~~ 1 Chronicles 9:31 is probably to bread baked in this way. There it is said that one of the sons of the priests "had the office of trust over the things that were baked in pans."

4. Ovens:

~~1196~~ *ṭḇṭṭ* [tannur] (compare Arabic), no doubt were used by the Hebrews, when they settled in Palestine, as they were used by the settled populations of the Orient in general, more and more as they approached civilized conditions. These "ovens" were of various kinds:

(1) The Bowl-Oven:

The simplest used by the ancients were hardly more primitive than the kind quite commonly used in Palestine today. It may be called the "bowl-oven." It consists of a large clay-bowl, which is provided with a movable lid. This bowl is placed inverted upon small stones and then heated with a fuel distinctly oriental, consisting of dried dung heaped over and around it. The

bread is baked on the stones, then covered by the inverted oven, which is heated by the firing of the fuel of dung on the outside of the cover.

(2) The Jar-Oven:

The jar-oven is another form of oven found in use there today. This is a large earthen-ware jar that is heated by fuel of grass (^{<1063>}Matthew 6:30), stubble (^{<3008>}Malachi 4:1), dry twigs or thorns (^{<1172>}1 Kings 17:12) and the like, which are placed within the jar for firing. When the jar is thus heated the cakes are stuck upon the hot inside walls.

(3) The Pit-Oven:

The pit-oven was doubtless a development from this type. It was formed partly in the ground and partly built up of clay and plastered throughout, narrowing toward the top. The ancient Egyptians, as the monuments and mural paintings show, laid the cakes upon the outside of the oven (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians); but in Palestine, in general, if the customs of today are conclusive, the fire was kindled in the inside of the pit-oven. Great numbers of such ovens have been unearthed in recent excavations, and we may well believe them to be exact counterparts of the oven of the professional bakers in the street named after them in Jerusalem “the bakers’ street” (^{<3572>}Jeremiah 37:21). The largest and most developed form of oven is still the public oven of the town or city of this sort; but the primitive rural types still survive, and the fuel of thorns, and of the grass, “which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven,” are still in evidence.

5. Forms of Baked Bread:

(1) The large pome or thick, light loaf of the West is unknown in the East. The common oriental cake or loaf is proverbially thin. The thin home-made bread is really named both in Hebrew and Arabic from its thinness as is reflected in the translation “wafer” in ^{<1263>}Exodus 16:31; 29:23; ^{<1885>}Leviticus 8:26; ^{<1069>}Numbers 6:19; ^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 23:29. Such bread was called in Hebrew [raqiq] (**qyqr**:[raqiq]; compare modern Arabic warkuk, from warak = “foliage,” “paper”).

(2) It is still significantly customary at a Syrian meal to take a piece of such bread and, with the ease and skill of long habit, to fold it over at the end held in the hand so as to make a sort of spoon of it, which then is eaten along with whatever is lifted by it out of the common dish (compare

^{<1023>}Matthew 26:23). But this “dipping in the common dish” is so accomplished as not to allow the contents of the dish to be touched by the fingers, or by anything that has been in contact with the lips of those who sit at meat (compare Mackie, DCG, article “Bread”).

(3) Such “loaves” are generally today about 7 inches in diameter and from half an inch to an inch thick. Such, probably, were the lad’s “barley loaves” brought to Christ at the time of the feeding of the 5,000 (^{<1019>}John 6:9,13). Even thinner cakes, of both leavened and unleavened bread, are sometimes made now, as of old, especially at times of religious festivals. Often they are coated on the upper surface with olive oil and take on a glossy brown color in cooking; and sometimes they are sprinkled over with aromatic seeds, which adhere and impart a spicy flavor. They may well recall to us the “oiled bread” of ^{<1025>}Leviticus 8:26 and “the wafers anointed with oil” of ^{<1020>}Exodus 29:2 and ^{<1018>}Leviticus 2:4.

(4) Sometimes large discs of dough about 1 inch thick and 8 inches in diameter are prepared and laid in rows on long, thin boards like canoe paddles, and thus inserted into the oven; then, by a quick, deft jerk of the hand, they are slipped off upon the hot pavement and baked. These are so made and baked that when done they are soft and flexible, and for this reason are preferred by many to the thinner cakes which are cooked stiff and brown.

(5) The precise nature of the cracknels of ^{<1014>}1 Kings 14:3 (the American Standard Revised Version “cakes”) is not known. A variety of bakemeats (^{<1017>}Genesis 40:17, literally “food, the work of the baker”) are met with in the Old Testament, but only in a few cases is it possible or important to identify their nature or forms (see Encyclopedia Bibl, coll. 460 f). A cake used for ritual purposes (^{<1020>}Exodus 29:2 and often) seems, from its name, to have been pierced with holes, like the modern Passover cakes (compare Kennedy, 1-vol HDB, article “Bread”).

6. Work for Women:

(a) Every oriental household of importance seems to have had its own oven, and bread-making for the most part was in the hands of the women. Even when and where baking, as under advancing civilization, became a recognized public industry, and men were the professional bakers, a large part of the baker’s work, as is true today, was to fire the bread prepared and in a sense pre-baked by the women at home.

(b) The women of the East are often now seen taking a hand in sowing, harvesting and winnowing the grain, as well as in the processes of “grinding” (^{<2113>}Ecclesiastes 12:3; ^{<244>}Matthew 24:41; ^{<275>}Luke 17:35), “kneading” (^{<186>}Genesis 18:6; ^{<284>}1 Samuel 28:24; ^{<138>}2 Samuel 13:8; ^{<478>}Jeremiah 7:18) and “baking” (^{<983>}1 Samuel 8:13), and doubtless it was so in ancient times to an equal extent.

6. SANCTITY AND SYMBOLISM OF BREAD.

1. Sanctity:

It would seem that the sanctity of bread remains as unchanged in the Orient as the sanctity of shrines and graves (compare Mackie, DCG, article “Bread,” and Robinson’s Researches). As in Egypt everything depended for life on the Nile, and as the Nile was considered “sacred,” so in Palestine, as everything depended upon the wheat and barley harvest, “bread” was in a peculiar sense “sacred.” The psychology of the matter seems to be about this: all life was seen to be dependent upon the grain harvest, this in turn depended upon rain in its season, and so bread, the product at bottom of these Divine processes, was regarded as peculiarly “a gift of God,” a daily reminder of his continual and often undeserved care (^{<155>}Matthew 5:45 ff; consider in this connection the Lord’s Prayer, “Give us this day our daily bread,” ^{<151>}Matthew 6:11; compare ^{<111>}Luke 11:11). Travelers generally note as a special characteristic of the Oriental of today that, seeing a scrap of bread on the roadside, he will pick it up and throw it to a street dog, or place it in a crevice of the wall, or on a tree-branch where the birds may get it. One thing is settled with him, it must not be trodden under foot in the common dust, for, in the estimation of all, it has in it an element of mystery and sacredness as coming from the Giver of all good.

2. Symbolism:

(a) In partaking of the hospitality of the primitive peasants of Palestine today, east and west of the Jordan, one sees what a sign and symbol of hospitality and friendship the giving and receiving of bread is. Among the Arabs, indeed, it has become a proverb, which may be put into English thus: “Eat salt together, be friends forever.” Once let the Arab break bread with you and you are safe. You may find the bread the poorest barley loaf, still marked by the indentations of the pebbles, with small patches of the gray ash of the hearth, and here and there an inlaid bit of singed grass or charred thorn, the result of their primitive process

of baking; but it is bread, the best that the poor man can give you, “a gift of God,” indeed, and it is offered by the wildest Arab, with some sense of its sacredness and with somewhat of the gladness and dignity of the high duty of hospitality. No wonder, therefore, that it is considered the height of discourtesy, yea, a violation of the sacred law of hospitality, to decline it or to set it aside as unfit for use.

(b) Christ must have been influenced by His knowledge of some such feeling and law as this when, on sending forth His disciples, He charged them to “take no bread with them” (~~<bredh>~~ Mark 6:8). Not to have expected such hospitality, and not to have used what would thus be freely offered to them by the people, would have been a rudeness, not to say an offense, on the part of the disciples, which would have hindered the reception of the good tidings of the Kingdom.

(c) It has well been pointed out that God’s gift of natural food to His people enters in for the praises of the Magnificat (~~<bredh>~~ Luke 1:53), and that when Christ called Himself “the bread of life” (~~<bredh>~~ John 6:35) He really appealed to all these endeared and indissoluble associations connected in the eastern mind with the meaning and use of bread. Most naturally and appropriately in the inauguration of the New Covenant Christ adopted as His memorial, not a monument of stone or brass, but this humble yet sacred article of food, familiar and accessible to all, to become, with the “wine” of common use, in the Lord’s Supper, the perpetual symbol among His disciples of the communion of saints.

LITERATURE.

Wilkinson. Ancient Egypt, 1878, II, 34; Erman, Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben, 1885, 191 ff; Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebr. Archäologie, 1894; Maimonides, Yadh, Temidhin U-Mucaphin, v, 6-8; Bacher, Monats-schrift, 1901, 299; Mishna B.M., II, 1, 2; Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine, II, 416; Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta, I, 131; Josephus, BJ; and Bible Dicts. on “Bread,” “Dietary Laws”: “Matstsoth,” “Challah,” etc.

George B. Eager

BREADTH

~~<bredth>~~ (**bj** " **ro** [rochabh], the root idea being to make wide,

spacious): A term of expanse or measurement used of the ark (^{<0065>}Genesis 6:15); of the tabernacle (^{<0273>}Exodus 27:13); of Solomon's temple (^{<1042>}1 Kings 6:2). [^{<0216>}πλάτος, platos], "breadth," as of the celestial city (^{<0216>}Revelation 21:16). Figuratively, of the comprehensiveness of God's law (^{<0896>}Psalms 119:96); of the heart (^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:29, rendered "largeness of heart" English Versions); of God's immeasurable love (^{<0888>}Ephesians 3:18).

BREAK

<brak>: **rb"** **v**:[shabhar] = "break" (down, off, in pieces, up), "destroy," "quench" (^{<2425>}Isaiah 14:25; ^{<2490>}Jeremiah 19:10,11; ^{<2446>}Ezekiel 4:16; Amos 1:5); **qrP**:[paraq] = "to break off" or "craunch"; figuratively "to deliver" (^{<0274>}Genesis 27:40 the King James Version); **1r[**:[araph] = "to break the neck," hence, "to destroy" (^{<0213>}Exodus 13:13); **srh**:[harac] = "to break through" (^{<0291>}Exodus 19:21,24); **ÅrP**:[parats] = "to break" (forth, away), occurs in ^{<0292>}Exodus 19:22,24; ^{<0250>}1 Samuel 25:10; "breaking faith," ^{<2402>}Hosea 4:2; **j rP**:[parach] = "to break forth as a bud" (^{<0832>}Leviticus 13:12); **Åt" n**:[nathats] or **qq" n**:[nathaq] = "destroy" (^{<2234>}Ezekiel 23:34 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "gnaw"; *see* **BREAST**); **l l j**:[chalal] = "profane," "defile," "stain" (^{<0812>}Numbers 30:2; ^{<1981>}Psalms 89:31,34); **[q" B**:[baqa] = "rip open" (^{<1201>}2 Kings 3:26; ^{<2508>}Isaiah 58:8); **[[r**:[ra`a] = "to spoil by breaking to pieces," "to make good for nothing" (^{<1924>}Job 34:24; ^{<1119>}Psalms 2:9; ^{<2452>}Jeremiah 15:12, the King James Version "Shall iron break northern iron?"); **j x" P**:[patsach] = "to break out" (in joyful sound), "break forth," "make a noise" (^{<2447>}Isaiah 14:7, the nations rejoice in the peace which follows the fall of the oppressor); **rynl**[nir] = "to glisten," "gleam" (as of a fresh furrow) (^{<2443>}Jeremiah 4:3; ^{<2402>}Hosea 10:12); **j t" P**:[pathach] = "to open wide," "loosen," "have vent" (^{<2414>}Jeremiah 1:14); **Åp" n**:[naphats] = "to dash to pieces or scatter," "overspread," "scatter" (^{<2482>}Jeremiah 48:12, the work usually done carefully shall be done roughly; 51:20-23, descriptive of the terrible fate appointed for Babylon); **1a" n**:[na'aph] = "to break wedlock" (^{<2468>}Ezekiel 16:38); **j l " x**:[tsalach] or

j " l 𐤎; [tsaleach] = “break out,” “come mightily” (^{<3056>}Amos 5:6). The New Testament employs [**λύω**, *luo*] = “to loosen,” “dissolve” (^{<4159>}Matthew 5:19); [**διορύσσω**, *diorusso*] = “to penetrate burglariously,” “break through” (^{<1059>}Matthew 6:19,20, Greek “dig through”); [**ῥήγνυμι**, *rhegnumi*] or [**ῥήσσω**, *rhesso*] = “to disrupt,” “burst,” “to utter with a loud voice” (^{<4007>}Galatians 4:27); [**κλαο**] = “to break” (^{<4007>}Acts 20:7, “to break bread,” i.e. to celebrate the Lord’s Supper; ^{<4016>}1 Corinthians 10:16).

See also BREACH.

Frank E. Hirsch

BREAK OF DAY

𐤕𐤎𐤀 [’or], “to be light,” “the light breaks” (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 2:32); [**αὐγή**, *auge*], “bright light,” “radiance” (^{<4011>}Acts 20:11).

See DAWN.

BREAST

<brest>: Signifying the front view of the bust in humans and the corresponding portion of the body in animals. **H𐤆𐤌**; [chazeh], occurs in ^{<1026>}Exodus 29:26,27; ^{<1071>}Leviticus 7:30,31,34; 8:29; 10:14,15; ^{<1010>}Numbers 6:20; 18:18; and **𐤎𐤕𐤍** [chadhi], in ^{<1072>}Daniel 2:32. **D𐤎** [shadh] or **d𐤎𐤐** [shodh] = “breast” in the sense of pap of a woman or animal (^{<1341>}Job 24:9; Song 8:1,8,10; ^{<2116>}Isaiah 60:16; ^{<2143>}Lamentations 4:3). Only one word occurs with this signification in the New Testament: [**στῆθος**, *stethos*] = “bosom,” “chest” (^{<2183>}Luke 18:13; 23:48; ^{<4135>}John 13:25; 21:20).

See WAVE-OFFERING.

Figurative: “The breasts of virginity,” pressed and bruised (^{<4318>}Ezekiel 23:3,8 the King James Version), indicative of Ezekiel’s belief that Israel practiced idolatry in Egypt (compare ^{<3108>}Ezekiel 20:8). “To tear (pluck off) thy breasts” (^{<2734>}Ezekiel 23:34) denotes the anguish of the people in parting with their beloved sin (compare ^{<3112>}Hosea 2:2). “Its breast of silver” (^{<1072>}Daniel 2:32) is possibly expressive of the humanity and wealth of the Medo-Persian empire.

Frank E. Hirsch

BREASTPLATE

<breſt'-plat>.

See *ARMOR*.

BREASTPLATE OF THE HIGH PRIEST

<preſt>: The Hebrew word [^]vj [choshen], rendered in the King James Version “breastplate,” means really a “pouch” or “bag.” The references to it are found exclusively in the Priestly Code (^{<1230>}Exodus 25:7; 28; 29:5; 35:9,27; 39; ^{<1888>}Leviticus 8:8). The descriptions of its composition and particularly the directions with regard to wearing it are exceedingly obscure. According to ^{<1916>}Ezra 2:63 and ^{<1976>}Nehemiah 7:65 the Urim and Thummim, which were called in the priestly pouch, were lost during the Babylonian exile. The actual pouch was a “span in length and a span in breadth,” i.e. about 9 inch square. It was made, like the ephod, of “gold, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen” (^{<1235>}Exodus 28:15 f). In it were twelve precious stones, in rows of four, representing the twelve tribes of Israel. Apparently the pouch had two rings (perhaps four) through which passed two gold chains by which it was fastened to the ephod supplied for the purpose with ouches or clasps. The pouch was worn by the high priest over his heart when he entered the “holy place” “for a memorial before Yahweh.” The presence of the high priest, the representative of the people, with the names of the separate tribes on his person, brought each tribe before the notice of Yahweh and thereby directed His attention to them. The full designation was [choshen mishpaT], “pouch of judgment” or “decision.” It was the distinctive symbol of the priest in his capacity as the giver of oracles. As already suggested the priestly pouch contained the Urim and Thummim which were probably precious stones used as lots in giving decisions. In all probability the restored text of ^{<1941>}1 Samuel 14:41 preserves the true custom. On one side stood Saul and Jonathan, and the people on the other side. If the result was Urim, Saul and Jonathan would be the guilty parties. If the result was Thummim, the guilt would fasten on the people. — *T. Lewis*

BREATH; BREATHE; BREATHING

<breth>, <breth>, <breath'-ing>: In the English Versions of the Bible of the Old Testament “breath” is the rendering of ^{hmyv} [neshamah], and

of **j " Wr** [ruach]. These words differ but slightly in meaning, both signifying primarily “wind,” then “breath,” though the former suggests a gentler blowing, the latter often a blast. As applied to persons there is no very clear distinction between the words. Yet in general one may say that of the two [neshamah] is employed preferably of breath regarded physiologically: “vital breath,” hence, the vital principle, “Soul (animal) life” (compare ^{<1007>}Genesis 2:7; 7:22; ^{<1878>}Job 27:3, where both words occur; ^{<346>}Isaiah 42:52; ^{<2723>}Daniel 5:23); while [ruach] (though it, too, sometimes signifies “vital breath”) is the word generally employed where the breath is regarded physically — breath or blast as an act or force — and so is related to the will or the emotions, whence the meaning “spirit,” also sometimes “thought,” “purpose” (compare ^{<1849>}Job 4:9; 9:18; ^{<19185>}Psalms 18:15; 146:4; ^{<3716>}Ezekiel 37:5,6,8,9,10). The examples cited, however, and other passages reveal a lack of uniformity of usage. Yet generally [ruach] is the expression, [neshamah], the principle, of life. Yet when employed of God they of course signify the principle, not of His own life, but of that imparted to His creatures. “Breathe” in English Versions of the Bible of the Old Testament requires no remark except at ^{<1972>}Psalms 27:12 (“such as breathe out cruelty”), from [yaphach], “to breathe hard,” “to snort” (compare ^{<490>}Acts 9:1). In the New Testament “breath” ([**πνοή**, pnee]) occurs once ^{<4175>}Acts 17:25 in the plain sense of vital principle, the gift of God. “Breathed” is employed in ^{<1312>}John 20:22 of our Lord’s concrete symbolism of the giving of the Spirit. In ^{<490>}Acts 9:1 Saul’s “breathing threatening and slaughter” is literally “snorting,” etc., and the nouns are partitive genitives, being the element of which he breathed.

See also SPIRIT.

J. R. Van Pelt

BREECHES

^{<brich’-iz>}, ^{<brech’-iz>}: A garment, extending from the waist to or just below the knee or to the ankle, and covering each leg separately. Breeches are not listed among the garments of an ordinary wardrobe, but the priests in later times (^{<1216>}Exodus 20:26) wore a garment resembling modern trousers. These priestly linen breeches, **db" yse" k̄ni** [mikhnece bhadh], were worn along with the linen coat, the linen girdle and the linen turban by Aaron on the Day of Atonement, when he entered the “holy place.” (The word **ysēk̄ni** [mikhnece] is derived from a root, **snk**

[kanac] = **znq** [ganaz], “to cover up,” “hide.”) Ordinary priests also wore them on sacrificial occasions (~~Q89~~ Exodus 28:42; 39:28; ~~R60~~ Leviticus 6:10; ~~Q418~~ Ezekiel 44:18). Apart from the breeches just referred to, the only reference to a similar garment among the Israelites is found in ~~Q821~~ Daniel 3:21, where the **l Br" s"** [carbal], the Revised Version (British and American) “hosen,” is mentioned. (The King James Version translates “coats.”) The rendering of the King James Version is the more likely, though the meaning of the Aramaic [sarbal] is obscure (compare the thorough discussion in Ges., Thesaurus). In Targum and Talmud (compare Levy, NHWB, under the word), and is so taken by the rabbinical commentators. Still, Aquila and Theodotion ([**σαράβαρα**, sarabara]), Septuagint in ~~Q87~~ Daniel 3:27, Symmachus (anaxurides), Peshitta, express the meaning “trousers” (of a looser kind than those worn by us), a garment known (from Herodotus and other sources) to have been worn by the ancient Scythians and Persians, and to have been called by them sarabara. The word, with the same connotation, was brought into the Arabic in the form sirwal. In both these senses the word may be originally Persian: in that of mantle, meaning properly (according to Andreas) a “head-covering” (sarabara), for which in Persia the peasants often use their mantle; in that of “trousers,” corresponding to the modern Persian shalwar, “under-breeches.” Cook has pointed out that “mantles, long-flowing robes, and therefore extremely liable to catch the flames,” are more likely to be especially mentioned in this chapter than trousers, or (Revised Version) “hosen.”

The word **vyfP"** [paTish] (~~Q821~~ Daniel 3:21), is also uncertain. The Septuagint and Theodotion render tiarai, “turbans”; Peshitta has the same word, which is variously taken by Syrian lexicographers as “tunic,” “trousers,” or a kind of “gaiter” (Payne Smith, Thes. Syriac., col. 3098). (For further discussion of these words, compare commentaries on Daniel of Jour. Phil., XXVI, 307 if.)

In general, we must remember that a thorough discussion of Israelite “dress” is impossible, because of the limitations of our sources. — **H. J. Wolf**

BREED

<bred>: Found in the past tense in ^{<D163>}Exodus 16:20 as a translation of **רָמַר** [rum] = “to bring up,” “to rise.” In this verse, the manna is said to have arisen, i.e. “become alive” (with worms), to indicate that God’s gifts are spoiled by selfish and miserly hoarding. The pres. act. occurs in ^{<D1637>}Genesis 8:17 for **רָרַרְוּ** [sharats] = “to wriggle,” “swarm,” “abound,” hence, “breed abundantly”; and in ^{<D5214>}Deuteronomy 32:14 for **רָבַעַבְנָה** [ben] = “son,” “descendant,” “child,” “colt,” “calf,” “breed.” The present participle is found in Zeph 2:9 the King James Version for **רָמַרְמִי** [mimshaq], a derivative of **רָמַרְמִי** [mesheq] = “possession,” “territory,” “field.” The passage in question should therefore be translated “field of nettles” (the Revised Version (British and American) “possession of nettles”).

Frank E. Hirsch

BRETHREN

<breth'-ren>.

See *BROTHER*.

BRETHREN OF THE LORD

In ^{<D1246>}Matthew 12:46 ff; ^{<D1191>}Mark 3:31 ff; ^{<D1819>}Luke 8:19 ff, while Jesus was in the midst of an earnest argument with scribes and Pharisees, His mother and brothers sent a message evidently intended to end the discussion. In order to indicate that no ties of the flesh should interfere with the discharge of the duties of His Messianic office, He stretched His hands toward His disciples, and said: “Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother.” In ^{<D1354>}Matthew 13:54 ff; ^{<D1012>}Mark 6:2 ff, while He was teaching in His own town, Nazareth, His neighbors, who, since they had watched His natural growth among them, could not comprehend the extraordinary claims that He was making, declare in an interrogative form, that they know all about the entire family, mother, brothers and sisters. They name the brothers. Bengel suggests that there is a tone of contempt in the omission of the names of the sisters, as though not worth mentioning. In ^{<D1212>}John 2:12, they are said to have accompanied Jesus and His mother and disciples from the wedding at

Cana. In ~~400B~~ John 7:3 ff, they are described as unbelieving, and ridiculing His claims with bitter sarcasm. This attitude of hostility has disappeared, when, at Jerusalem, after the resurrection and ascension (~~400B~~ Acts 1:14), in the company of Mary and the Eleven, and the faithful group of women, they “continued steadfastly in prayer,” awaiting the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Their subsequent participation in the missionary activity of the apostolic church appears in ~~400B~~ 1 Corinthians 9:5: “Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?” In ~~400B~~ Galatians 1:19, James, bishop of the church at Jerusalem, is designated “the Lord’s brother,” thus harmonizing with ~~400B~~ Matthew 13:55, where their names are recorded as James, Joseph, Simon and Judas. When, then, “Jude, brother of James” is mentioned (~~400B~~ Jude 1:1), the immediate inference is that Jude is another brother of the Lord. In reading these passages, the natural inference is that these “brethren” were the sons of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus, living with Mary and her daughters, in the home at Nazareth, accompanying the mother on her journeys, and called the “brethren” of the Lord in a sense similar to that in which Joseph was called His father. They were brethren because of their common relationship to Mary. This impression is strengthened by the fact that Jesus is called her prototokos, “first-born son” (~~400B~~ Luke 2:7), as well as by the very decided implication of ~~400B~~ Matthew 1:25. Even though each particular, taken separately, might, with some difficulty, be explained otherwise, the force of the argument is cumulative. There are too many items to be explained away, in order to establish any other inference. This view is not the most ancient. It has been traced to Tertullian, and has been more fully developed by Belvidius, an obscure writer of the 4th century

Two other views have been advocated with much learning and earnestness. The earlier, which seems to have been prevalent in the first three centuries and is supported by Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrose, Epiphanius being its chief advocate, regards these “brethren” as the children of Joseph by a former marriage, and Mary as his second wife. Joseph disappears from sight when Jesus is twelve years old. We know nothing of him after the narrative of the child Jesus in the temple. That there is no allusion to him in the account of the family in ~~400B~~ Mark 6:3 indicates that Mary had been a widow long before she stood by the Cross without the support of any member of her immediate family. In the Apocryphal Gospels, the attempt is made to supply what the canonical Gospels omit. They report that Joseph was over eighty years of age at his

second marriage, and the names of both sons and daughters by his first marriage are given. As Lightfoot (commentary on Galatians) has remarked, "they are pure fabrications." Theophylact even advanced theory that they were the children of Joseph by a levirate marriage, with the widow of his brother, Clopas. Others regard them as the nephews of Joseph whom, after the death of his brother Clopas, he had taken into his own home, and who thus became members of his family, and were accounted as though they were the children of Joseph and Mary. According to this view, Mary excepted, the whole family at Nazareth were no blood relatives of Jesus. It is a Docetic conception in the interest of the dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary. All its details, even that of the advanced age and decrepitude of Joseph, start from that premise.

Another view, first propounded by Jerome when a very young man, in antagonizing Belvidius, but afterward qualified by its author, was followed by Augustine, the Roman Catholic writers generally, and carried over into Protestantism at the Reformation, and accepted, even though not urged, by Luther, Chemnitz, Bengel, etc., understands the word "brother" in the general sense of "kinsman," and interprets it here as equivalent to "cousin." According to this, these brethren were actually blood-relatives of Jesus, and not of Joseph. They were the children of Alpheus, otherwise known as Clopas (^{<6025>}John 19:25), and the sister of Mary. This Mary, in ^{<4256>}Matthew 27:56, is described as "the mother of James and Joses," and in ^{<4150>}Mark 15:40, "the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome." This theory as completely developed points to the three names, James, Judas and Simon found both in the list of the apostles and of the "brethren," and argues that it would be a remarkable coincidence if they referred to different persons, and the two sisters, both named Mary, had found the very same names for their sons. The advocates of this theory argue also that the expression "James the less" shows that there were only two persons of the name James in the circle of those who were most closely connected with Jesus. They say, further, that, after the death of Joseph, Mary became an inmate of the home of her sister, and the families being combined, the presence and attendance of her nephews and nieces upon her can be explained without much difficulty, and the words of the people at Nazareth be understood. But this complicated theory labors under many difficulties. The identity of Clopas and Alpheus cannot be established, resting, as it does, upon obscure philological resemblances of the Aramaic form of the two names (*see ALPHAEUS*). The most that such argument

affords is a mere possibility. Nor is the identity of “Mary the wife of Clopas” with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, established beyond a doubt. ^{<4025>}John 19:25, upon which it rests, can with equal correctness be interpreted as teaching that four women stood by the cross, of whom “Mary of Clopas” was one, and His mother’s sister was another. The decision depends upon the question as to whether “Mary” be in apposition to “sister.” If the verse be read so as to present two pairs, it would not be a construction without precedent in the New Testament, and would avoid the difficulty of finding two sisters with the same name — a difficulty greater yet than that of three cousins with the same name. Nor is the identity of “James the less” with the son of Alpheus beyond a doubt. Any argument concerning the comparative “less,” as above explained, fails when it is found that in the Greek there is no comparative, but only “James the little,” the implication being probably that of his stature as considerably below the average, so as to occasion remark. Nor is the difficulty less when it is proposed to identify three of these brethren of Jesus with apostles of the same name. For the “brethren” and the apostles are repeatedly distinguished. In ^{<4029>}Matthew 12:49, while the former stood without, the latter are gathered around Jesus. In ^{<4012>}John 2:12, we read: “his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples.” In ^{<4013>}Acts 1:13 the Eleven, including James the son of Alpheus, and Simon, and Judas of James, and then it is said that they were accompanied by “his brethren.” But the crowning difficulty of this hypothesis of Jerome is the record of the unbelief of the brethren and of their derision of His claims in ^{<4008>}John 7:3-5.

On the other hand, the arguments against regarding them as sons of Mary and Joseph are not formidable. When it is urged that their attempts to interfere with Jesus indicate a superiority which, according to Jewish custom, is inconsistent with the position of younger brothers, it may be answered that those who pursue an unjustifiable course are not models of consistency. When an argument is sought from the fact that Jesus on the cross commended His mother to John, the implication is immediate that she had no sons of her own to whom to turn in her grief and desolation; the answer need not be restricted to the consideration that unknown domestic circumstances may explain the omission of her sons. A more patent explanation is that as they did not understand their brother, they could not understand their mother, whose whole life and interests were bound up in her firstborn. But, on the other hand, no one of the disciples understood Jesus and appreciated His work and treasured up His words as did John. A bond of fellowship had thus been established between John and Mary that

was closer than her nearer blood relationship with her own sons, who, up to this time, had regarded the course of Jesus with disapproval, and had no sympathy with His mission. In the home of John she would find consolation for her loss, as the memories of the wonderful life of her son would be recalled, and she would converse with him who had rested on the bosom of Jesus and whom Jesus loved. Even with the conversion of these brethren within a few days into faithful confessors, before the view of Jesus, provision was made for her deeper spiritual communion with her risen and ascended Son through the testimony of Jesus which John treasured in his deeply contemplative spirit. There was much that was alike in the characters of Mary and John. This may have had its ground in relationship, as many regard Salome his mother, the sister of the mother of Jesus mentioned in ~~4:25~~ John 19:25.

Underneath both the stepbrother (Epiphanian) and the cousin (Hieronymian) theories, which coincide in denying that Mary was the actual mother of these brethren, lies the idea of the perpetual virginity of Mary. This theory which has as its watchword the stereotyped expression in liturgy and hymn, "Maria semper Virgo," although without any support from Holy Scripture, pervades theology and the worship of the ancient and the medieval churches. From the Greek and Roman churches it has passed into Protestantism in a modified form. Its plea is that it is repugnant to Christian feeling to think of the womb of Mary, in which the Word, made flesh, had dwelt in a peculiar way, as the habitation of other babes. In this idea there lies the further thought, most prominent in medieval theology, of a sinfulness of the act in itself whereby new human lives come into existence, and of the inclination implanted from the creation, upon which all family ties depend. ~~5:18~~ 1 Timothy 4:3,4; ~~8:14~~ Hebrews 13:4 are sufficient answer. The taint of sin lies not in marriage, and the use of that which is included in its institution, and which God has blessed (compare ~~4:15~~ Acts 10:15), but in its perversion and abuse. It is by an inconsistency that Protestants have conceded this much to theory of Rome, that celibacy is a holier estate than matrimony, and that virginity in marriage is better than marriage itself. The theory also is connected with the removal of Mary from the sphere of ordinary life and duties as too commonplace for one who is to be surrounded with the halo of a demi-god, and to be idealized in order to be worshipped. The interpretation that they are the Lord's real brethren ennobles and glorifies family life in all its relations and duties, and sanctifies motherhood with all its cares and trials as holier than a selfish isolation from the world, in order to evade the annoyances and humiliations

inseparable from fidelity to our callings. Not only Mary, but Jesus with her, knew what it was to grieve over a house divided concerning religion (~~4005~~ Matthew 10:35 ff). But that this unbelief and indifference gave way before the clearer light of the resurrection of Jesus is shown by the presence of these brethren in the company of the disciples in Jerusalem (~~4004~~ Acts 1:14). The reference to His post-resurrection appearance to James (1 Cor 15:7) is probably connected with this change in their attitude. ~~4005~~ 1 Corinthians 9:5 shows that at least two of these brothers were active as missionaries, undoubtedly within the Holy Land, and to Jews, according to the agreement into which James entered in Galatians 2, and his well-known attitude on questions pertaining to the Gentiles. Zahn regards James as an ascetic and celibate not included in ~~4005~~ 1 Corinthians 9:5, which is limited then to Jude and Simon. Their marriage indicates “the absence in the Holy Family of that pseudo-asceticism which has so much confused the tradition concerning them” (Alford).

See also JAMES; JUDE.

For fuller discussions, see the extensive arguments of Eadie and Lightfoot, in their commentaries on Gal, the former in favor of the Helvidian, and the latter, with his exhaustive scholarship, of the Epiphonian views; also, on the side of the former, Mayor, The Epistle of James; Alford, Greek Test.; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity; Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament.

H. E. Jacobs

BRIBERY

<*brib'-er-i*> (*dj " vq* shochadh], “a gift,” in a corrupt sense, “a bribe”):

The Hebrew law condemns everything that would tend to impair the impartial administration of justice, particularly the giving and receiving of gifts or bribes, in order to pervert judgment (~~0238~~ Exodus 23:8). Allusions are frequent to the prevailing corruption of oriental judges and rulers. “And fire shall consume the tents of bribery” (~~0154~~ Job 15:34; ~~0008~~ 1 Samuel 8:3; ~~0010~~ Psalm 26:10; ~~2012~~ Isaiah 1:23; 33:15; ~~2520~~ Ezekiel 22:12). Samuel speaks of a “ransom” in the sense of a bribe: “Of whose hand have I taken a ransom (*rpko* kopher], “covering,” the King James Version “bribe”) to blind mine eyes therewith?” (~~0018~~ 1 Samuel 12:3; ~~0052~~ Amos 5:12; compare ~~0016~~ Amos 2:6).

BRICK

(**hnbē**][lebhenah]): The ancient Egyptian word appears in the modern Egyptian Arabic *toob*. In Syria the sun-baked bricks are commonly called *libn* or *lebin*, from the same Semitic root as the Hebrew word.

Bricks are mentioned only a few times in the Bible. The story of how the Children of Israel, while in bondage in Egypt, had their task of brick-making made more irksome by being required to collect their own straw is one of the most familiar of Bible narratives (^{<0014>}Exodus 1:14; 5:7,10-19).

Modern excavations at Pithom in Egypt (^{<0011>}Exodus 1:11) show that most of the bricks of which that store-city was built were made of mud and straw baked in the sun. These ruins are chosen as an example from among the many ancient brick structures because they probably represent the work of the very Hebrew slaves who complained so bitterly of their royal taskmaster. In some of the upper courses rushes had been substituted for straw, and still other bricks had no fibrous material. These variations could be explained by a scarcity of straw at that time, since, when there was a shortage in the crops, all the straw (Arabic, *tibn*) was needed for feeding the animals. It may be that when the order came for the workmen to provide their own straw they found it impossible to gather sufficient and still furnish the required number of bricks (^{<0018>}Exodus 5:8). However, the quality of clay of which some of the bricks were made was such that no straw was needed.

Brickmaking in early Egyptian history was a government monopoly. The fact that the government pressed into service her Asiatic captives, among whom were the Children of Israel, made it impossible for independent makers to compete. The early bricks usually bore the government, stamp or the stamp of some temple authorized to use the captives for brick manufacture. The methods employed by the ancient Egyptians differ in no respect from the modern procedure in that country. The Nile mud is thoroughly slipped or mixed and then rendered more cohesive by the addition of chopped straw or stubble. The pasty mass is next worked into a mould made in the shape of a box without a bottom. If the sides of the mould have been dusted with dry earth it will easily slip off and the brick is

allowed to dry in the sun until it becomes so hard that the blow of a hammer is often necessary to break it.

When the children of Israel emigrated to their new country they found the same methods of brickmaking employed by the inhabitants, methods which are still in vogue throughout the greater part of Palestine and Syria. In the interior of the country, especially where the building stone is scarce or of poor quality, the houses are made of sun-baked brick (*libn*). Frequently the west and south walls, which are exposed most to the winter storms, are made of hewn stone and the rest of the structure of bricks. When the brick-laying is finished the house is plastered inside and outside with the same material of which the bricks are made and finally whitewashed or painted with grey- or yellow-colored earth. The outer coating of plaster must be renewed from year to year. In some of the villages of northern Syria the brick houses are dome-shaped, looking much like beehives. In the defiant assertion of ~~2390~~ Isaiah 9:10 the superiority of hewn stone over bricks implied a greater difference in cost and stability than exists between a frame house and a stone house in western lands today.

In the buildings of ancient Babylonia burnt bricks were used. These have been found by modern excavators, which confirms the description of ~~4118~~ Genesis 11:3. Burnt bricks were rarely used in Egypt before the Roman period and in Palestine their use for building purposes was unknown. Specimens of partially burnt, glazed bricks have been found in Babylonia and recently in one of the Hittite mounds of northern Syria. These were probably used for decorative purposes only. If burnt bricks had been generally used in Palestine, traces of them would have been found with the pottery which is so abundant in the ruins (*see POTTERY*).

The fact that unburnt bricks were so commonly used explains how the sites of such cities as ancient Jericho could have become lost for so many centuries. When the houses and walls fell they formed a heap of earth not distinguishable from the surrounding soil. The wood rotted and the iron rusted away, leaving for the excavator a few bronze and stone implements and the fragments of pottery which are so precious as a means of identification. The "tels" or mounds of Palestine and Syria often represent the ruins of several such cities one above the other.

LITERATURE.

H. A. Harper, *The Bible and Modern Discoveries*; Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*; Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*; Hilprecht, *Recent Research in Bible Lands*.

James A. Patch

BRICK-KILN

<bruk'-kil>, *<-kiln>* (*Ḳēḳēlān* [malben]): The Hebrew word is better translated by "brickmould." In Syria the brickmould is still called milben. In *Jeremiah* 43:9 the American Standard Revised Version rendering is "brickwork" and the American Revised Version, margin "pavement." *2 Samuel* 12:31 becomes much clearer if the American Revised Version, margin is incorporated. Being put to work at the brickmould was considered the task of those taken as slaves. The ancestors of the new taskmasters had themselves been put to similar toil.

BRIDE

<brid>.

See MARRIAGE.

BRIDE-CHAMBER

<brid'-cham-ber> ([*νυμφών*, numphon]): The room in which the marriage ceremonies were held (*Matthew* 9:15; *Mark* 2:19; *Luke* 5:34; compare *Matthew* 22:10).

See CHAMBER; MARRIAGE.

BRIDE-CHAMBER, SONS (CHILDREN) OF THE

([*οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*, hoi huioi tou numphonos]): These were friends or companions of the bridegroom and were usually very numerous (*Matthew* 9:15; *Mark* 2:19; *Luke* 5:34). Any wedding guest might be included in the expression, or anyone who took part in the bridal procession and remained for the wedding-feast (*see MARRIAGE*). In the above passages "the sons of the bride-chamber" are the disciples of Christ.

BRIDEGROOM; BRIDEGROOM, FRIEND OF

<*brid'-groom*>;

See *MARRIAGE*.

BRIDGE

<*brij*> ([*γέφυρα*, *gephura*], 2 Macc 12:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) *GEPHYRUN*): Does not occur in the canonical Scriptures, unless it be indirectly in the proper name Geshur (*רֶשֶׁשׁׁוּר* [*geshur*], ~~1088~~ 2 Samuel 3:3; 13:37; 15:8; ~~1023~~ 1 Chronicles 2:23, and others). The so-called Jacob's bridge is said to mark the site where Jacob crossed the upper Jordan on his return from Paddan-aram, but, of course, does not date from the time of the patriarch. There are traces of ancient bridges across the Jordan in the vicinity of the Lake of Gennesaret, over the Arnon and over other rivers which enter the Jordan from the east; but none of them seem to date farther back than the Roman period. Nah 2:6, in which the Chaldaic paraphrase renders "bridges," evidently refers to dikes or weirs. Judas Maccabeus is said to have planted a bridge in order to besiege the town of Casphor (2 Macc 12:13). Josephus (*Ant.*, V, i, 3) tells us that the Jordan, before the passage of the Israelites, had never been bridged, evidently implying that in his own time bridges had been constructed over it, which was the case, under the Romans. The bridge connecting the temple with the upper part of the city of which Josephus speaks (*War*, VI, vi, 2; *Ant*, XV, xi, 5) probably was a viaduct.

Frank E. Hirsch

BRIDLE

<*bri'-d'-l*>.

See *BIT*.

BRIER

<*bri'-er*>.

See *THORNS*.

BRIGANDINE

<brig'-an-den>.

See *ARMS (Defensive, 5)*; *COAT OF MAIL*.

BRIGHTNESS

<brit'-nes>: Used by the King James Version in ^{<800B>}Hebrews 1:3 for “effulgence of his glory,” as in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version. The Greek [apaugasma] may mean either “reflection” or “radiation.” Patristic usage favors the latter; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 7:26; also the Nicene Creed: “Light of Light,” i.e. the Son not only manifests the Father, but is of the same substance. “What emanates from light, must have the nature of light” (Delitzsch).

BRIM

hxq;₁[qatseh] or **hxqe**;₁[qatseh] = “an extremity” (in a variety of applications and idioms), “border,” “edge,” “side,” “shore” (^{<0085>}Joshua 3:15 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “brink”); also **hpc**;₁[saphah] or **tpc**;₁[sepheth] = “edge,” “lip” (^{<1023>}1 Kings 7:23,24,26; ^{<1402>}2 Chronicles 4:2,5). In ^{<0117>}John 2:7, the adverb [ἄνω, ano], is used to emphasize the verb [ἐγέμισαν, egemisan] = “to fill,” thus giving the idea of “filling to the top.”

BRIMSTONE

<brim'-ston>, <brim'-stun> (**tyrb**;₁[gophrith]; [τὸ θεῖον, to theion]):

The word translated “brimstone” probably referred originally to the pitch of trees, like the cypress. By analogy it has been rendered “brimstone” because of the inflammability of both substances. Sulphur existed in Palestine in early times and was known by most of the ancient nations as a combustible substance. In the vicinity of the Dead Sea, even at the present time, deposits of sulphur are being formed. Blanckenhorn (ZDPV, 1896) believes that this formation is due to the action of bituminous matter upon gypsum, as these two substances are found associated with each other in this district. Travelers going from Jericho to the Dead Sea may pick up lumps of sulphur, which are usually encrusted with crystals of gypsum.

^{<6223>}Deuteronomy 29:23 well describes the present aspect of this region. That the inhabitants of the land had experienced the terrors of burning sulphur is very probable. Once one of these deposits took fire it would melt and run in burning streams down the ravines spreading everywhere suffocating fumes such as come from the ordinary brimstone match. No more realistic figure could be chosen to depict terrible suffering and destruction. It is not at all unlikely that during some of the disastrous earthquakes which took place in this part of the world, the hot lava sent forth ignited not only the sulphur, but also the bitumen, and added to the horrors of the earthquake the destruction caused by burning pitch and brimstone.

The figurative use of the word brimstone to denote punishment and destruction is illustrated by such passages as ^{<6223>}Deuteronomy 29:23; ^{<8885>}Job 18:15; ^{<9106>}Psalms 11:6; ^{<2383>}Isaiah 30:33; ^{<5822>}Ezekiel 38:22; ^{<2729>}Luke 17:29; ^{<6972>}Revelation 9:17.

James A. Patch

BRING

av_i[dasha'] = "to sprout," "spring" (^{<0011>}Genesis 1:11 the King James Version); **Árvi**[sharats] = "to wriggle," "swarm" (^{<0023>}Genesis 1:20 f; 9:7; ^{<0888>}Exodus 8:3); **dl " y**_i[yaladh] = "to bear," "beget" (^{<0086>}Genesis 3:16; ^{<298>}2 Kings 19:3; ^{<8555>}Job 15:35; 39:1,2; "what a day may bring forth," ^{<2701>}Proverbs 27:1; "before the decree bring forth," Zeph 2:2); **ṇ**_i[ṇanan] = "to cloud over," "to darken" (^{<0094>}Genesis 9:14); **j l " v**_i[shalach] = "to send on," "to escort" (^{<0896>}Genesis 18:16); **bWv** [shubh] = "to turn back," "bring" (again, back, home again), "fetch," "establish" (^{<0245>}Genesis 24:5,6,8; ^{<8009>}Job 10:9; ^{<9822>}Psalms 68:22; "bring him back to see," ^{<2022>}Ecclesiastes 3:22; ^{<3806>}Zechariah 10:6,10); **vGh**_i[naghash] = "present," "adduce" (an argument) (^{<9309>}1 Samuel 13:9; 15:32; 23:9; 30:7; "bring forth your strong reasons," ^{<2421>}Isaiah 41:21,22); **hc**_i[ṇasah] = "to do," "cause to be," "accomplish" (^{<9505>}Psalms 37:5); **hl**_i[ṇalah] = "to carry up," "exalt," "restore" (^{<0404>}Genesis 46:4; ^{<0888>}Exodus 3:8,17; 33:12; ^{<9720>}Psalms 71:20; ^{<2823>}Hosea 12:13); **[gh]**_i[nagha`] = "to touch," "lay hand upon," "reach to" (^{<0887>}Leviticus 5:7); **db" K**_i[kabhadh], or **dbK**_i[kabhedh] =

“to be heavy” (causative “to make weighty”), “to be glorious” (^{<1048>}Proverbs 4:8); **[nK]**:[kana`] = “to bend the knee,” hence “humiliate,” “bring” (down, into subjection, under), “subdue” (^{<898>}Deuteronomy 9:3; ^{<2375>}Isaiah 25:5); **rk** **z**:[zakhar] = “to mark,” “call to, put (put in) remembrance” (Psalm 38 title; Psalm 70 title); **l b** **y**:[yabhal] = “to flow,” “bring” (especially with pomp) (^{<889>}Psalm 60:9; 68:29; 76:11; Zeph 3:10); **l Wj** [chul], or **l yj i**[chil] = “to writhe in pain,” “to be in travail” (^{<2768>}Isaiah 66:8); **d [ʔ]**:[tsa`adh] = “to step regularly,” “march,” “hurl” (^{<1884>}Job 18:14); **] "** **h**:[halakh] = “to walk,” “get” (^{<3024>}Hosea 2:14); **l dg**:[gadhal] = “bring up,” “increase” (^{<3912>}Hosea 9:12).

The New Testament employs **[τελεσφορέω, telesphoreo]** = “to bring to maturity,” “to ripen” (^{<1844>}Luke 8:14); **[ὑπομιμνήσκω, hupomimnesko]** = “to bring to mind,” “suggest,” “bring to remembrance” (^{<846>}John 14:26); **[δουλόω, doulōō]** = “to enslave” (^{<406>}Acts 7:6); **[σύντροφος, suntrophos]** = “brought up with” (^{<410>}Acts 13:1 the Revised Version (British and American), “the foster-brother of”); **[διασώζω, diasozo]** = “to save,” “to care,” “rescue” (^{<4234>}Acts 23:24); **[ᾠθετέω, atheteo]** = “to set aside” “cast off,” “bring to naught” (1 Cor 1:19); **[καταργέω, katargeo]** = “to abolish,” “destroy,” “do away,” “put away,” “make void” (1 Cor 1:28); **[προπέμπω, propempo]** = “to send forward,” “bring forward” (1 Cor 16:6 the King James Version; ^{<683>}Titus 3:13 the King James Version; ^{<6006>}3 John 1:6 the King James Version); **[ἐκτρέφω, ektrepho]** = “to rear up to maturity,” “to cherish,” “nourish” (^{<4064>}Ephesians 6:4 the King James Version).

Frank E. Hirsch

BRINK

<brink>: **hpc**:[saphah], or **tpc**:[sepheth] = “the lip,” “margin,” “bank,” “edge” (^{<1048>}Genesis 41:3; ^{<1078>}Exodus 2:3; 7:15); **hxq**:[qatseh], or **hxqf**:[qetseh] = “an extremity,” “border,” “brim” (^{<888>}Joshua 3:8,15; ^{<2397>}Isaiah 19:7; ^{<2715>}Daniel 12:5).

See BRIM.

BROAD

<brod> (**bj " rō** [brochabh], “width”; **bj σ** [rechobh], “a broadway,” “street,” “court”; [**εὐρύχωρος**, eurchoros], “spacious”): Occurs frequently as a term of dimension (^{<270>}Exodus 27:1; ^{<1086>}1 Kings 6:6; ^{<2606>}Ezekiel 40:6,43 the Revised Version (British and American), “handbreadth long”) and as indicative of strength (^{<4088>}Nehemiah 3:8; ^{<2658>}Jeremiah 51:58). The centers of communal life are called the “broad places,” often rendered “streets” (^{<4181>}Jeremiah 5:1; Song 3:2; Nah 2:4). A court before the temple: “the broad place on the east” (the King James Version “the east street,” ^{<4204>}2 Chronicles 29:4); “broad plates” (^{<0468>}Numbers 16:38,39, the Revised Version (British and American) “beaten”).

Figurative: Relief from distress: “Yea, he would have allured thee out of (Hebrew “the mouth of”) distress into a broad place” (^{<8366>}Job 36:16); the liberty of obedience or liberty within the law (^{<4896>}Psalms 119:96, “broad,” “roomy,” “at liberty”); the all-sufficiency of God for His people (^{<2321>}Isaiah 33:21). Jerusalem could not boast of a river or navy — Yahweh’s presence with and within her would more than supply these deficiencies; the road to destruction: “Broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction” (^{<4073>}Matthew 7:13); the ostentatious piety of the Pharisees: “They make broad ([**πλατύνο**, platuno], “widen”) their phylacteries” (^{<4235>}Matthew 23:5).

See *CITY; GATE*.

L. Kaiser

BROAD PLACE

See *CITY*.

BROIDERED

<broid'-erd>:

(1) **hmqr̥l** [riqmah], “variegation of color” (^{<2660>}Ezekiel 16:10,13,18; 26:16; 27:7,16,24);

(2) **ĀBəṭ̥** [tashbets], “checkered stuff” (as reticulated). The high priest’s garments consisted of “a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat” (^{<02804>}Exodus 28:4 the King James Version; the

Revised Version (British and American) “a coat of checker work”), a miter, and a girdle”;

(3) [πλέγμα, plegma], “twined or plaited work” (1 Tim 2:9 the King James Version).

See *BRAIDED; EMBROIDERY*.

BROKEN

<bro'-k'-n>: Occurs both as past participle of the verb translated “to break” and as an adjective, the former use will be dealt with here only so far as verbs occur which are thus translated but do not present the non-participial forms. Such are: **j " wOm**[meroach] = “bruised,” “emasculated” (^{<822>}Leviticus 21:20); **tt" j**:[chathath] = “to frustrate,” hence, “to break down” either by violence or by confusion and fear (^{<1020>}1 Samuel 2:10; ^{<2480>}Jeremiah 48:20,39); **hkD**:[dakhah] = “to collapse” (^{<3449>}Psalms 44:19; 51:8); **Åx" r**:[ratsats] = “to crack in pieces” “crush” (^{<2126>}Ecclesiastes 12:6); **tt" K**:[kathath] = “to bruise or violently strike,” “break in pieces” (^{<2304>}Isaiah 30:14); ^{<2426>}Jeremiah 2:16 should evidently be rendered: “have grazed on the crown of thy head,” instead of the King James Version “have broken,” etc., for **h[r**:[ra`ah] = “to tend a flock,” “pasture,” “graze,” but gives no hint of the meaning “to break”; **hl ;** [alah] = “to arise,” “depart” (^{<2671>}Jeremiah 37:11); [**συνθλάω**, sunthlao] = “to dash together,” “shatter” (^{<1244>}Matthew 21:44); [**ἐξορύσσω**, exorusso] = “to dig through,” “to extract,” “remove” (^{<1004>}Mark 2:4).

See *BREAK*.

Frank E. Hirsch

BROKENFOOTED

<bro'-k'-n-foot-ed> (**l gk rby**,[shebher reghel]): In ^{<8219>}Leviticus 21:19, one of the blemishes which prevented a man of priestly descent from the execution of the priestly office.

BROKENHANDED

<bro'-k'-n-hand-ed> (dy:rbv₁[shebher yadh]): In ^{<1219>}Leviticus 21:19 one of the blemishes which prevented a man of priestly descent from the execution of the priestly office.

BROKENHEARTED

<bro'-k'-n-har-ted> (bl ɛrb" v; [shabhar lebh]; [συντετριμμένοι τὴν καρδίαν, suntetrimmenoi ten kardian]; ^{<1360>}Psalms 69:20,21; ^{<2300>}Isaiah 61:1; ^{<1048>}Luke 4:18 the King James Version; "of a broken heart," ^{<1348>}Psalms 34:18; "broken in heart," 147:3): People who feel their spiritual bankruptcy and helplessness, and who long for the help and salvation of God. Such people are in the right condition to be met and blessed by God. Compare "of contrite spirit" (^{<1318>}Psalms 31:18; ^{<2360>}Isaiah 66:2).

BROOCH

<broch> (j j ;[chach]): Used in plural by the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "bracelets") for a class of "jewels of gold" brought as offerings by both men and women of Israel (^{<1252>}Exodus 35:22). "Brooches," as Mackie says, is unoriental. The Hebrew word means most likely nose-rings.

See BRACELET; RING.

BROOK

<brook> (l j " n'[nachal], qypā;[ʾaphiq], rwaʾy" [ye'or], l kymi [mikhal]; [χεῖμαρρος, cheimarrhos]): In Palestine there are few large streams. Of the smaller ones many flow only during the winter, or after a heavy rain. The commonest Hebrew word for brook is [nachal], which is also used for river and for valley, and it is not always clear whether the valley or the stream in the valley is meant (^{<1113>}Numbers 13:23; ^{<1013>}Deuteronomy 2:13; ^{<1053>}2 Samuel 15:23). The Arabic wady, which is sometimes referred to in this connection, is not an exact parallel, for while it may be used of a dry valley or of a valley containing a stream, it means the valley and not the stream. [ʾAphiq] and [ye'or] are translated both "brook" and "river," [ye'or] being generally used of the Nile (^{<1012>}Exodus 1:22, etc.), though in ^{<2715>}Daniel 12:5-7, of the Tigris. Cheimarrhos,

“winter-flowing,” is applied in ^{<480>}John 18:1 to the Kidron. Many of the streams of Palestine which are commonly called rivers would in other countries be called brooks, but in such a dry country any perennial stream assumes a peculiar importance.

Alfred Ely Day

BROOK OF EGYPT, THE

(**l j " n'**[nachal] = “a flowing stream,” “a valley”; best translated by the oriental word wady, which means, as the Hebrew word does, both a stream and its valley).

1. NAME:

The Brook of Egypt is mentioned six times in the Old Testament (^{<0345>}Numbers 34:5; ^{<0304>}Joshua 15:4,47; ^{<1035>}1 Kings 8:65; ^{<2372>}Isaiah 27:12); once, ^{<0158>}Genesis 15:18, by another word, **r hn**[nahar]. The Brook of Egypt was not an Egyptian stream at all, but a little desert stream near the borderland of Egypt a wady of the desert, and, perhaps, the dividing line between Canaan and Egypt. It is usually identified with the Wady el 'Arish of modern geography.

2. DESCRIPTION:

The Brook of Egypt comes down from the plateau et Tih in the Sinai peninsula and falls into the Mediterranean Sea at latitude 31 5 North, longitude 33 42 East. Its source is at the foot of the central mountain group of the peninsula. The upper portion of the wady is some 400 ft. above the sea. Its course, with one sharp bend to the West in the upper part, runs nearly due North along the western slope of the plateau. Its whole course of 140 miles lies through the desert. These streams in the Sinai peninsula are usually dry water-courses, which at times become raging rivers, but are very seldom babbling “brooks.” The floods are apt to come with little or no warning when cloudbursts occur in the mountain region drained.

3. ARCHAEOLOGY:

The use of the Hebrew word **naḥal** [nachal] for this wady points to a curious and most interesting and important piece of archaeological evidence on the critical question of the origin of the Pentateuch. In the Pentateuch, the streams of Egypt are designated by an Egyptian word ([ye'or]) which belongs to Egypt, as the word bayou does to the lower Mississippi valley, while every other stream mentioned, not except this desert stream, "the Brook of Egypt," is designated by one or other of two Hebrew words, [na chal] and [nahar]. Each of these words occurs 13 times in the Pentateuch, but never of the streams of Egypt. The use of [nahar] in ⁽¹¹⁷⁹⁾Exodus 7:19 in the account of the plagues is not really an exception for the word is then used generically in contrast with [ye'or] to distinguish between the "flowing streams," [neharoth], and the sluggish irrigation branches of the Nile, [ye'orim], "canals" (compare CANALS) (⁽²⁸¹⁶⁾Isaiah 19:6; 33:21), while [ye'or] occurs 30 times but never of any other than the streams of Egypt. There is thus a most exact discrimination in the use of these various words, a discrimination which is found alike in the Priestly Code (P), Jahwist (Jahwist), and Elohim (E) of the documentary theory, and also where the editor is supposed to have altered the documents. Such discrimination is scarcely credible on the hypothesis that the Pentateuch is by more than one author, in later than Mosaic times, or that it is by any author without Egyptian training. The documentary theory which requires these instances of the use of these various words for "river" to have been recorded by several different authors or redactors, in different ages and all several centuries after the Exodus, far away from Egypt and opportunities for accurate knowledge of its language, seems utterly incompatible with such discriminating use of these words. And even if the elimination of all mistakes be attributed to one person, a final editor, the difficulty is scarcely lessened. For as no purpose is served by this discriminating use of words, it is evidently a natural phenomenon. In every instance of the use of [ye'or], one or other of the usual Hebrew words, [nachal] or [nahar] would have served the purpose of the author, just as any foreign religious writer might with propriety speak of the "streams of Louisiana," though a Louisianian would certainly call them "bayous." How does the author come to use [ye'or] even where his native Hebrew words might have been used appropriately? Why never, where its appropriateness is even doubtful, not even saying [ye'or] for [nachal] of the "Brook of Egypt"? It is not art, but experience, in the use of a language which gives such skill as to attend to

so small a thing in so extensive use without a single mistake. The only time and place at which such experience in the use of Egyptian words is to be expected in Israel is among the people of the Exodus not long subsequent to that event.

M. G. Kyle

BROOM

<broom>: Occurs in ^{<1190>}1 Kings 19:4 m (“broomtree”); ^{<8300>}Job 30:4, and ^{<9000>}Psalms 120:4 m as the translation of the Hebrew **μtr** [rothem], where the King James Version employed “juniper” which is retained in the Revised Version (British and American) text in ^{<1190>}1 Kings 19:4 and ^{<8300>}Job 30:4. Juniper is certainly incorrect and broom is not a particularly happy rendering. The [rothem] was doubtless the shrub called by the Arabs ratam, a shrub which casts so little shadow that it would be used for shade only when there was no other refuge from the desert sun, and would be eaten only in case of the direst necessity, but which could be burned and used for the making of charcoal.

See JUNIPER.

David Foster Estes

BROTH

<broth> (**qrm**;[maraq]): Equivalent to our “soup.” When Gideon (^{<0000>}Judges 6:19) made ready a kid, “the flesh he put in a basket,” but, it is added, “he put the broth in a pot”; and he is told by the angel to “pour out the broth” (^{<0000>}Judges 6:20). Isaiah (65:4) makes Yahweh speak of rebellious Israel as “a people that provoke me to my face continually sacrificing in gardens,” and adds in description “that eat swine’s flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels” ([maraq, paraq]).

See FOOD.

BROTHER

<bruth’-er> (**j a**;[’ach]; [**ᾱδελφός**, adelphos] = kin by birth, from the same parents or parent): Used extensively in both Old Testament and New Testament of other relations and relationships, and expanding under

Christ's teaching to include the universal brotherhood of man. Chiefly employed in the natural sense, as of Cain and Abel (^{<0048>}Genesis 4:8); of Joseph and his brethren (^{<0048>}Genesis 42:3); of Peter and Andrew, of James and John (^{<0002>}Matthew 10:2). Of other relationships:

- (1) Abram's nephew, Lot, is termed "brother" (^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14);
- (2) Moses' fellow-countrymen are "brethren" (^{<0001>}Exodus 2:11; ^{<4022>}Acts 3:22; compare ^{<8005>}Hebrews 7:5);
- (3) a member of the same tribe (^{<0092>}2 Samuel 19:12);
- (4) an ally (Amos 1:9), or an allied or cognate people (^{<0014>}Numbers 20:14);
- (5) used of common discipleship or the kinship of humanity (^{<4218>}Matthew 23:8);
- (6) of moral likeness or kinship (^{<0089>}Proverbs 18:9);
- (7) of friends (^{<8065>}Job 6:15);
- (8) an equal in rank or office (^{<1093>}1 Kings 9:13);
- (9) one of the same faith (^{<4129>}Acts 11:29; ^{<4051>}1 Corinthians 5:11);
- (10) a favorite oriental metaphor used to express likeness or similarity (^{<8029>}Job 30:29, "I am a brother to jackals");
- (11) a fellow-priest or office-bearer (^{<8082>}Ezra 3:2); Paul called Sosthenes "brother" (1 Cor 1:1) and Timothy his spiritual son and associate (2 Cor 1:1);
- (12) a brother-man, any member of the human family (^{<0078>}Matthew 7:3-5; ^{<8027>}Hebrews 2:17; 8:11; ^{<6109>}1 John 2:9; 4:20);
- (13) signifies spiritual kinship (Matt 12:50);
- (14) a term adopted by the early disciples and Christians to express their fraternal love for each other in Christ, and universally adopted as the language of love and brotherhood in His kingdom in all subsequent time (2 Pet 3:15; ^{<5007>}Colossians 4:7,9,15). The growing conception of mankind as a brotherhood is the outcome of this Christian view of believers as a household, a family (^{<4029>}Ephesians 2:19; 3:15; compare ^{<4126>}Acts 17:26). Jesus has made "neighbor" equivalent to "brother," and the sense of fraternal affection and obligation essential to vital Christianity, and

coextensive with the world. The rabbis distinguished between “brother” and “neighbor,” applying “brother” to Israelites by blood, “neighbor” to proselytes, but allowing neither title to the Gentiles. Christ and the apostles gave the name “brother” to all Christians, and “neighbor” to all the world (1 Cor 5:11; ^{<2129>}Luke 10:29 ff). The missionary passion and aggressiveness of the Christian church is the natural product of this Christian conception of man’s true relation to man.

See also FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS.

Dwight M. Pratt

BROTHERHOOD

^{<bruth’-er-hood>}: The rare occurrence of the term (only ^{<38114>}Zechariah 11:14 and ^{<1127>}1 Peter 2:17) in contrast with the abundant use of “brother,” “brethren,” seems to indicate that the sense of the vital relation naturally called for the most concrete expression: “the brethren.” But in ^{<1127>}1 Peter 2:17 the abstract is used for the concrete. In the Old Testament the brotherhood of all Israelites was emphasized; but in the New Testament the brotherhood in Christ is a relation so much deeper and stronger as to eclipse the other.

See also BROTHER; BRETHREN.

BROTHER-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

BROTHERLY

^{<bruth’-er-li>} (j a;[’ach], “brother”; [φιλαδελφία, philadelphia], “brotherly love”): Like a brother in all the large human relationships indicated above; e.g. the early friendly and fraternal alliance between Tyre and Israel as illustrated by “brotherly covenant” between David and Solomon, and Hiram, king of Tyre (^{<1051>}2 Samuel 5:11; ^{<1052>}1 Kings 5:12), and repudiated in a later generation by the treachery of Tyre (Amos 1:9).

See BROTHERLY KINDNESS (LOVE).

BROTHERLY KINDNESS

^{<kind’-nes>} (the King James Version ^{<6107>}2 Peter 1:7), or LOVE (the King

James Version ~~<6120>~~ Romans 12:10; ~~<3040>~~ 1 Thessalonians 4:9; ~~<8201>~~ Hebrews 13:1; [~~<154>~~φιλαδελφία, philadelphia]):

1. AS MORAL IDEAL:

In the Revised Version (British and American), “love of the brethren” in all places, and so in the King James Version of ~~<1012>~~ 1 Peter 1:22, thus defining the disposition as love, and its objects as brethren. Since God is Father and men are His sons, they are therefore brethren of one another. As sonship is the most essential factor in man’s right relation to God, so is brotherhood in his relation to his fellow-man. Brotherhood is first known as the relation between sons of the same parent, a relation of tender affection and benevolence. It becomes gradually extended to kindred, and to members of the same tribe or nation. And the Christian ideal of society is that a similar relation should exist between all men without limit or distinction. Agape, “love” (*see CHARITY*), is the word in the New Testament that generally denotes this ideal. “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” is the whole law of conduct as between man and man (~~<1023>~~ Matthew 22:39,40); and neighbor includes every man within one’s reach (~~<1019>~~ Luke 10:29 ff), even enemies (~~<1054>~~ Matthew 5:44; ~~<1075>~~ Luke 6:35). Without the love of man, the love of God is impossible, but “he that abideth in love abideth in God” (~~<1046>~~ 1 John 4:16,20).

2. AS ACTUAL BETWEEN CHRISTIANS:

But man’s sonship to God may be potential or actual. He may not respond to God’s love or know His Fatherhood. Likewise love to man may not be reciprocated, and therefore may be incomplete. Yet it is the Christian’s duty, like God, to maintain his disposition of love and benevolence to those that hate and curse him (~~<107>~~ Luke 6:27,28). But within the Christian community, love should respond to love, and find its fulfillment, for there all men are, or should be, God’s sons actually, “because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts, through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us” (~~<885>~~ Romans 5:5). And this mutual love within the Christian brotherhood (1 Pet 5:9) is called [philadelphia].

3. STOIC TEACHING:

This twofold ideal of social morality as universal benevolence and mutual affection had been foreshadowed by the *STOICS* (which see). Men as citizens of the world should adopt an attitude of justice and mercy toward

all men, even slaves; but within the community of the “wise” there should be the mutual affection of friendship.

4. CHRISTIAN ADVANCE ON HEATHEN THOUGHT:

Christianity succeeded in organizing and realizing in intense and practical fellowship the ideal that remained vague and abstract in the Greek schools: “See how these Christians love one another.” It was their Master’s example followed, and His commandment and promise fulfilled: “Love one another as I have loved you; by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples” (~~13:14~~ John 13:14,34,35). Paul in his earliest epistle bears witness that the Thessalonians practice love “toward all the brethren that are in all Macedonia,” even as they had been taught of God, but urges them to “abound more and more” (1 Thess 4:9,10). For the healing of differences, and to build up the church in order and unity, he urges the Romans “in love of the brethren (to) be tenderly affectioned one to another” (~~12:10~~ Romans 12:10). Christians must even “forbear one another in love” (~~4:2~~ Ephesians 4:2) and “walk in love, even as Christ also loved you” (~~5:2~~ Ephesians 5:2; ~~2:1,2~~ Philippians 2:1,2). It involves some suffering and sacrifice. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews recognizes the presence of “love of the brethren” and urges that it may continue (~~13:1~~ Hebrews 13:1). It is the direct result of regeneration, of purity and obedience to the truth (1 Pet 1:22,23). It proceeds from godliness and issues in love (2 Pet 1:7). “Love of the brethren” (agape) is the one practical topic of John’s epistles. It is the message heard from the beginning, “that we should love one another” ~~3:11,23~~ 1 John 3:11,23. It is the test of light and darkness (2:10); life and death (3:14); children of God or children of the devil (3:10; 4:7-12). Without it there can be no knowledge or love of God (4:20), but when men love God and obey Him, they necessarily love His children (5:2). No man can be of God’s family, unless his love extends to all its members.

T. Rees

BROTHER'S WIFE

(**tmbe**) [yebhemeth] = “a sister-in-law,” “brother’s wife”

(~~DEUT~~ Deuteronomy 25:7,9); **hVai**[’ishshah] = “a woman,” “wife”; **j a**; **tvae**[esheth ‘ach] = “brother’s wife” (~~GEN~~ Genesis 38:8,9; ~~LEV~~ Leviticus 18:16;20:21); [**ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ**, he gunē tou adelphou] = “the brother’s wife” (~~MARK~~ Mark 6:18)); A brother’s wife occupies a unique

position in Hebrew custom and law, by virtue of the institution of the Levirate. The widow had no hereditary rights in her husband's property, but was considered a part of the estate, and the surviving brother of the deceased was considered the natural heir. The right to inherit the widow soon became a duty to marry her if the deceased had left no sons, and in case there was no brother-in-law, the duty of marriage devolved on the father-in-law or the agnate who inherited, whoever this might be. The first son of the Levirate marriage was regarded as the son of the deceased. This institution is found chiefly among people who hold to ancestral worship (Indians, Persians, Afghans, etc.), from which circumstances Benzinger (New Sch-Herz, IV, 276) derives the explanation of this institution in Israel. The Levirate marriage undoubtedly existed as a custom before the Israelite settlement in Canaan, but after this received special significance because of the succession to the property of the first son of the marriage, since he was reckoned to the deceased, inherited from his putative, not from his real father, thus preventing the disintegration of property and its acquirement by strangers, at the same time perpetuating the family to which it belonged. While the law limited the matrimonial duty to the brother and permitted him to decline to marry the widow, such a course was attended by public disgrace (^{<2380>}Deuteronomy 25:5 ff). By the law of ^{<2708>}Numbers 27:8, daughters were given the right to inherit, in order that the family estate might be preserved, and the Levirate became limited to cases where the deceased had left no children at all.

Frank E. Hirsch

BROW

^{<brou>}: Is found in ^{<2380>}Isaiah 48:4, "thy brow brass" as the translation of ^{j x" me} [metsch], meaning "to be clear," i.e. conspicuous. In ^{<2709>}Luke 4:29 "led him unto the brow of the hill" is the rendering of [ὄφρυς, ophras], literally "the eyebrow," but used throughout Greek literature as any prominent point or projection of land (compare use of supercilium in Verg. Georg. i.108).

BROWN

See COLORS.

BRUISE; BRUISED

<brooz>, <broozd>: The noun occurs in ^{<2906>}Isaiah 1:6 the King James Version, “bruises and putrifying sores,” as the translation of **hrWbj** “ [chabbarah]. The verb translations a number of Hebrew words, the principal ones being

(1) **Wv** [shuph] (^{<0085>}Genesis 3:15 (twice));

(2) **qq” D:**[daqaq] (^{<2388>}Isaiah 28:28 (twice) (the American Standard Revised Version “ground,” “and though the wheel of his cart and his horses scatter it, he doth not grind it” for the King James Version “nor break it with the wheels of his cart, nor bruise it with his horsemen”));

(3) **akD:**[dakha’], in the classical passage, ^{<2515>}Isaiah 53:5, “He was bruised for our iniquities,” 53:10, “Yet it pleased Yahweh to bruise him”;

(4) **Åxr:**[ratsats], “A bruised reed shall he not break,” ^{<2493>}Isaiah 42:3 (quoted in ^{<4120>}Matthew 12:20).

In the New Testament bruise is the translation of [**σπαράσσω**, sparasso], “to rend” (the American Standard Revised Version “bruising him sorely”) ^{<4989>}Luke 9:39; of [**συντρίβω**, suntribo], “to break to pieces” (^{<4020>}Matthew 12:20); “shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly” (^{<5150>}Romans 16:20); of [**θραύω**, thrauo] in ^{<4048>}Luke 4:18 in the quotation from ^{<2886>}Isaiah 58:6, “to set at liberty them that are bruised” (WH omits the verse).

Arthur J. Kinsella

BRUIT

<broot> (**[m” v**shema`]): A word no longer in common use (marked “archaic” and “obsolete” by Murray), signifying a rumor or report. The word occurs in the King James Version ^{<2402>}Jeremiah 10:22 (the Revised Version (British and American) “rumour”; the American Standard Revised Version “tidings”) and the King James Version Nah 3:19 (the Revised Version (British and American) “bruit,” appendix. “report”; the American Standard Revised Version “report”).

BRUTE; BRUTISH

<broot>, <brootish> (ר [B" [ba`ar], “stupid”; [ἄλογος, alogos], “without speech,” hence, irrational, unreasonable (^{<4257>}Acts 25:27; ^{<612>}2 Peter 2:12; ^{<6110>}Jude 1:10 the King James Version)): The man who denies God acts in an irrational way. Such persons are described as brutish (^{<1990>}Psalms 49:10; 92:6; 94:8; ^{<2404>}Jeremiah 10:14,21; 51:17). These are stupid, unteachable. This is a graphic description of the atheist. The proverb, “No fool like the learned fool,” is especially true of the ignorance of the unbelievers of the Scriptures. Their objections to the Bible, as a rule, are utterly ridiculous. The word is occasionally used in the sense of thoughtless ignorance. Brutish counsel is counsel that is foolish, unreasonable (^{<2391>}Isaiah 19:11). The term is used by Agur (^{<2802>}Proverbs 30:2) to express the low estimate he has of himself and his conscious lack of knowledge.

Jacob W. Kapp

BUBASTIS

<bu-bas’-tis>.

See PI-BESETH.

BUCKET

<buk’-et> (י [D][deli]): The word is found only in ^{<2305>}Isaiah 40:15; ^{<1247>}Numbers 24:7, in the latter passage in a figurative use. The bucket was doubtless a waterskin with two cross-pieces at the top to fit it for use in drawing water, like those now in use in Palestine. The ordinary word for water-skin is a different one ([no`dh]).

BUCKLE

<buk’-’-l> ([πόρπη, porpe]): As a mark of favor Jonathan Maccabeus was presented by Alexander Balas with a buckle of gold (1 Macc 10:89), the wearing of which was restricted to the blood royal. The buckle was used for fastening the mantle or outer robe on the shoulder or chest.

BUCKLER

<buk'-ler>: God is called a “buckler” (the Revised Version (British and American) “shield”) to them that trust Him (~~<1912>~~ Psalm 18:2,30; ~~<1928>~~ 2 Samuel 22:31; ~~<1917>~~ Proverbs 2:7).

See ARMOR.

BUD

See FLOWER.

BUFFALO

<buf'-a-lo>.

See CATTLE.

BUFFET

<buf'-et> ([**κολαφίζω**, kolaphizo], “to beat with the fist”): Refers to bodily maltreatment and violence: “Then did they spit in his face and buffet him” (~~<1867>~~ Matthew 26:67; ~~<1145>~~ Mark 14:65; ~~<4041>~~ 1 Corinthians 4:11; ~~<1021>~~ 1 Peter 2:20). Paul speaks of “a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me” (2 Cor 12:7). Used figuratively of self-control: “I buffet (the King James Version keep under, the Revised Version, margin “bruise”) my body, and bring it into bondage” (1 Cor 9:27). The Greek in this passage reads [**ὑποπιάζω**, hupopiazō], literally “to give a blow beneath the eye.” In ~~<2195>~~ Luke 18:5 the same word is rendered “wear out”: “Lest she wear out by her continual coming” (the King James Version “weary me” the Revised Version, margin “bruise me”) (see Pape’s Lexicon, under the word).

L. Kaiser

BUGEAN

<bu-je'-an>, <ba'-je-an> ([**Βουγαίος**, Bougaios]): An epithet given to Haman in Apocrypha, Additions to Esther (12:6, the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version has “Agagite”).

BUILD; BUILDING

<*bild*>, <*bild'-ing*> (*hnB*:[banah], *hynBi*:[binyah], once (^{<24113>}Ezekiel 41:13); [*οἰκοδομέω*, oikodomeo]).

1. BUILDING CONDITIONS:

The building conditions existing at the time of the Hebrew conquest were rude and untutored, and, with the exception of the work of the Solomonic period, there was still little or no effort made to introduce a higher state, until the time when Greek influence began to be felt (circa 3rd century BC). In localities where stone was not available, mud bricks were used, and their perishable nature being realized, stone slab facing came into use. These slabs were a protection against the weather and had no constructive value. Probably the hand of the “jerry” builder can be seen in an attempt to make such bad construction appear to be solid stone.

2. MASONRY:

In stone localities buildings were of stone, but the class of building was only that of the rude stone waller. Random rubble masonry, unskillfully laid, was the prevailing characteristic. Occasionally a piece of carefully dressed masonry is found, but it is the exception and is often a re-use of an earlier type akin to “sawed stone” (^{<1009>}1 Kings 7:9). The remains of Jewish walls of the period of the early kings in Jerusalem show skill which does not appear to have existed elsewhere. The boss and margin stones, with wide mud joint, were, in part, the actual masonry of the early fortifications, and were re-used and imitated over and over again. The type crops up in feeble imitation at different sites throughout the country, but hammer-picked and rough hammer-dressed stones are also common. The fine comb pick and marginal dressing of the walls of the Temple area belong to the Herodian period (see Bliss and Dickie, “Excavations at Jerusalem,” 273 ff, PEFS, 1898). The absence of lime is a striking characteristic. There is no distinctive type which can be named exclusively Jewish, although there is good reason for believing that the boss and margin type has a Jewish origin. Wilson (Golgotha, 124) points out that the projecting bosses had a defensive value, in breaking the force of the battering-ram, and here again the necessity of defense shows its vitality in the existence of such a well-engineered detail. The absence of the finer qualities of building craft can be traced to the same source.

3. FOUNDATIONS:

Foundations of fortifications were usually on rock which was sometimes squared for a bed, but more often leveled up with small stones. A portion of the South wall of Jerusalem, certainly late (5th century AD), was laid on a foundation of small rubble resting on debris, accumulated over an earlier wall. (See Plate IV, Excavations at Jerusalem, p. 29.) In smaller buildings, the foundations were usually laid on the debris of earlier structures. At Lachish mud brick walls were laid on a foundation of stone. A peculiar method of spreading a layer of sand under the foundations was also noted (see A Mound of Many Cities, 125-26).

4. MODERN METHODS:

The native wall of today is less rudely built and is bedded in lime mortar. It is a broad wall usually about 3 ft. thick, with inner and outer faces of large stones, filled in between with small rubble without proper bond, somewhat in the manner of ancient building. To make up for the want of bond, it is a common habit to insert a piece of steel joint across the return angle (*see BEAM*). The building and hewing methods, in all probability, are the same as they were in early Jewish times. Hewers sit at their work, with the plane of the stone on which they operate, lying obliquely from them. Stones are conveyed from the quarry, if at a distance from the building site, on donkeys, thence on men's backs to the top of the wall, by rude gangways. Every man digs his "own cistern" (^{<23616>}Isaiah 36:16), which is sunk in the rock under the site of the house, and used as a quarry from which stones for the building are supplied. If water is scarce, the cistern is sunk first, and the winter rains are allowed to collect and provide the necessary water for the building.

5. FIGURATIVE:

To build up is often used in the sense of giving increase and prosperity, or of establishing and strengthening. Thus in ^{<18223>}Job 22:23; ^{<19625>}Psalms 69:35; ^{<24189>}Jeremiah 18:9. A kindred sense is to restore what was decayed, as in ^{<25812>}Isaiah 58:12. To "build an house" for a person is to grant him children or a numerous posterity (^{<18011>}Ruth 4:11; of David, ^{<10172>}2 Samuel 7:27; ^{<13710>}1 Chronicles 17:10). Spiritually, the word is used of one's work in life, or of the formation of character and habits. The main thing here is the foundation. Those who build on Christ's word build on rock; those who reject this word build on sand (^{<10724>}Matthew 7:24-27). Christ is the sole true

foundation; the work which a man builds on this will be tried by fire (1 Cor 3:9-15). The church is compared to a building (1 Cor 3:9; ~~6104~~ 1 Peter 2:4-6) reared on the foundation of apostles and prophets (their truths or teaching), Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone (~~4021~~ Ephesians 2:20-22). Believers are “builded up” in Christ (~~5007~~ Colossians 2:7), and are exhorted to build themselves up on their most holy faith (~~6102~~ Jude 1:20).

See ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE; FORTIFICATION.

A. C. Dickie

BUILDER

~~6104~~ *<build’-er>* (~~hnb~~;¹[banah]; [~~οἰκοδομέω~~, oikodomeo], [~~τεχνίτης~~, technites]): “To build,” “builder,” etc, are in the Old Testament commonly the translation of banah, “to build,” occurring very frequently; *see BUILD, BUILDING*. The literal significance leads also to several figurative applications, especially to God as Divine Builder

- (1) as establishing, e.g. the nation (~~4985~~ Psalm 69:35; 102:16; ~~2426~~ Jeremiah 12:16), the throne of David (~~4804~~ Psalm 89:4), Jerusalem (~~4970~~ Psalm 147:2);
 - (2) in restoration — rebuilding (~~2882~~ Isaiah 58:12; 61:4; 65:21; ~~2604~~ Jeremiah 31:4,28; 42:10; ~~3376~~ Ezekiel 36:36; ~~3091~~ Amos 9:11; compare ~~4156~~ Acts 15:16);
 - (3) as establishing in prosperity (~~4823~~ Job 22:23; ~~4025~~ 1 Samuel 2:35; ~~2416~~ Jeremiah 24:6; compare ~~4142~~ Genesis 16:2 the Revised Version, margin, Hebrew, “be builded by her”);
 - (4) the firm establishment of the Divine attributes (~~4802~~ Psalm 89:2);
 - (5) Divine opposition (~~2505~~ Lamentations 3:5, “He hath builded against me”); compare ~~4808~~ Job 19:8;
 - (6) the choosing of a corner-stone which the builders rejected (~~4882~~ Psalm 118:22,23; quoted by Christ (~~4142~~ Matthew 21:42; ~~4120~~ Mark 12:10; ~~4207~~ Luke 20:17); by Peter (~~4041~~ Acts 4:11; ~~6107~~ 1 Peter 2:7)).
- In the New Testament Christians are represented as being
- (1) built by God (1 Cor 3:9,16) on Christ as the one foundation (~~4168~~ Matthew 16:18, on Jesus as the Christ; ~~4115~~ 1 Peter 2:5 f; ~~4193~~ Acts 9:31 the Revised Version, margin; ~~5150~~ Romans 15:20; ~~4180~~ 1 Corinthians 3:10,12,14 ([epoikodomo]); ~~4021~~ Ephesians 2:20);

- (2) as being continuously and progressively built up in their faith and life (~~482~~ Acts 20:32; ~~481~~ 1 Corinthians 8:1 the Revised Version, margin, “buildeth up”; 10:23 margin, Greek “build up”; 14:4,17 m; ~~511~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:11; compare ~~481~~ Jude 1:20);
- (3) they are “builded together” ([sunoikodomeo]) in Christ (~~422~~ Ephesians 2:22; ~~507~~ Colossians 2:7 ([epoikodomeo])); compare ~~481~~ 1 Corinthians 3:9);
- (4) “builded up” is used in a bad sense (1 Cor 8:10 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American),
- (5) “emboldened,” the Revised Version, margin “be builded up”);
- (6) in ~~584~~ Hebrews 3:4 God is represented as the Builder (establisher) of all things, the Revised Version, margin “established,” and in 11:10 as the Builder ([technites]), of the New Jerusalem; in 9:11 for “building” the Revised Version (British and American) has “creation” ([ktisis]);
- (7) in ~~480~~ 1 Corinthians 3:10-14; ~~428~~ Galatians 2:18, building represents constructing a system of teaching; Paul speaks of himself as “a wise master-builder” ([sophos architekton]).

W. L. Walker

BUKKI

<buk'-i> (yQB~~u~~buqqi], “mouth of Jah”):

- (1) A Danite, son of the tribal prince Jogli (~~482~~ Numbers 34:22); he was one of the representative chiefs who assisted in the division of the land.
- (2) Son of Abishua and father of Izzi, a priest, fourth in descent from Aaron, in the line of Eleazar (~~1365~~ 1 Chronicles 6:5,51), and ancestor of Ezra (~~1374~~ Ezra 7:4). In 2 Esdras 1:2 the name appears as Borith, and in 1 Esdras 8:2 as Boccas.

BUKKIAH

<buk-i'-a> (W~~h~~yQB~~u~~buqqiyahu], “proved of God”): A Levite, son of Heman (~~1374~~ 1 Chronicles 25:4,13).

See BAKBUKIAH.

BUL

<bul> (𐤁 𐤁𐤅 [bul]): Name of the 8th month of the Jewish year (^{<1068>}1 Kings 6:38). It is of Phoenician origin and signifies the month of rain, the beginning of the rainy season.

See CALENDAR.

BULL; BULLOCK

<bool>, <bool'-ok>.

See CATTLE.

BULL, WILD

See ANTELOPE; CATTLE.

BULLS, JEROBOAM'S

See CALF (GOLDEN).

BULRUSH

<bool'-rush>.

See REED.

BULRUSHES, ARK OF

See ARK OF BULRUSHES.

BULWARK

<bool'-wark>: The word represents several Hebrew terms (𐤁 𐤁𐤅 𐤁𐤅𐤋 [chel], ^{<2301>}Isaiah 26:1; 𐤁𐤁 𐤁𐤅𐤋 [chelah], ^{<0813>}Psalms 48:13; 𐤁𐤁𐤅𐤋 [matsodh], ^{<2094>}Ecclesiastes 9:14; 𐤁𐤁𐤅𐤋 [matsor], ^{<0301>}Deuteronomy 20:20). In ^{<1065>}2 Chronicles 26:15 the word is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "battlements."

See FORTIFICATION.

BUNAH

<bu'-na> (h**nWB** [bunah]); A son of Jerahmeel (<1925> 1 Chronicles 2:25).

BUNCH

<bunsh>: Is used of

- (1) a “bunch of hyssop” (<1922> Exodus 12:22, h**Dgḏ**) [‘aghuddah]);
- (2) a “cluster of raisins” (<1040> 2 Samuel 16:1 the King James Version; <3120> 1 Chronicles 12:40 the King James Version q**WMXi** [tsimmuq] = “something dried or shriveled”);
- (3) a “camel’s hump” (<2306> Isaiah 30:6 the King James Version t**vBD**’ [dabbesheth]): of obscure etymology.

BUNDLE

<bun’-d’-l>: Represents in English Versions of the Bible the words tseror, from a verb meaning “cramp” “bind,” etc. (<1425> Genesis 42:35; <1929> 1 Samuel 25:29; Song 1:13); tsebheth, from a verb probably meaning “to grasp” (<8206> Ruth 2:16); and [δέσμη, desme], from [δέω, deo], “to tie up,” “bind,” hence, literally “bundle,” just as the English word is derived from “bind” (<4130> Matthew 13:30); and [πλῆθος, plethos], properly “multitude.” The custom of binding up precious things in bundles (compare Song 1:13) is the basis of the very interesting metaphor in <1929> 1 Samuel 25:29: “The soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with Yahweh thy God,” or perhaps better, “in the bundle of the living in the care of Yahweh” — an assurance of perfect safety. — *J. R. Van Pelt*

BUNNI

<bun’-i> (y**nBḡ** [bunni], y**nWB** [buni], y**nWB** [bunni]; compare *BANI*):

(1) A Levite (<4090> Nehemiah 9:4). The repetition of Bani’s name in this passage is probably a scribal error. The Syriac version for the second “Bani” reads “Binnui”; but as, in <4009> Nehemiah 10:9 and 12:8, Binnui’s name comes, as here, between those of Jeshua and Kadmiel, we should substitute Binnui here for the first Bani. The Septuagint renders all three

names as if the Hebrew in each case had been **ynB** [bene], “sons of,” reducing the proper names in the verse to five. The names probably stand for chief Levitical houses rather than individuals.

(2) Another Levite, one of the overseers of the temple, father of Hashabiah, according to ^{<1115>}Nehemiah 11:15; but, according to ^{<1394>}1 Chronicles 9:14, Hashabiah is “of the sons of Merari” The reading in Nehemiah is a corruption of the one in Ch.

H. J. Wolf

BURDEN

<bur'-dn>.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the Old Testament more than one word is rendered “burden.”

(1) **aCm** [massa’], from a root **acn** [nasa’] “he lifted up.” Thus literally any load is called [massa’] (^{<1236>}Exodus 23:5; ^{<1045>}Numbers 4:15,24,27 ff; ^{<1317>}2 Kings 5:17; 8:9). Figuratively, people are a burden (^{<1111>}Numbers 11:11,17; ^{<1012>}Deuteronomy 1:12; ^{<1053>}2 Samuel 15:33; 19:35). A man may be a burden to himself (^{<1070>}Job 7:20). Iniquities are a burden (^{<1380>}Psalms 38:4). Taxes may be a burden (^{<1080>}Hosea 8:10).

(2) In both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) [massa’] is translated “burden,” as applied to certain prophetic utterances; but both the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin have “oracle.” Examples are ^{<1371>}Isaiah 13:1; 14:28, and often; ^{<1233>}Jeremiah 23:33,36,38, no marginal reading; ^{<1320>}Ezekiel 12:10; Nah 1:1; ^{<1001>}Habakkuk 1:1; ^{<1301>}Zechariah 9:1; 12:1; ^{<1001>}Malachi 1:1. As was natural under the circumstances, such oracles usually denounced judgment upon place or people. Hence, probably the translation “burden.” But some of these prophetic utterances do not contain denunciation or threat (Zechariah 12). The passage in Jer, moreover, implies that the prophet used the term in the sense of “orale,” for scoffers are reproved for perverting the word and giving it the meaning “burden.” [Massa’], therefore, means something taken up with solemnity upon the lips, whether threatening or not, and the rendering, “burden,” ought most likely to be given up.

The word **taeḥ** [mas'-eth], of the same derivation as [massa'], is applied to foolish oracles (^{<1014>}Lamentations 2:14 the King James Version, oracles the American Standard Revised Version, burdens the American Revised Version, margin, burdens the Revised Version (British and American), oracles the Revised Version, margin; ^{<1051>}Amos 5:11, burdens the King James Version, exactions the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American)).

[Massa'] is used also in ^{<1010>}Proverbs 30:1 and 31:1, and is variously rendered prophecy (the King James Version), oracle (American Revised Version), burden, or the name of the speaker's country (Revised Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin), oracle (Revised Version). The reading is doubtful, but probably the reference is to the speaker's country — "Jakeh, of Massa" (compare ^{<10214>}Genesis 25:14), "Lemuel king of Massa."

Other words translated "burden" are from the root **l b** **s**; [cabhal], "to bear a load" (^{<10417>}Nehemiah 4:17; ^{<10806>}Psalms 81:6; ^{<11128>}1 Kings 11:28; King James Version margin, charge the King James Version, labor the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American), burden the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin, ^{<10104>}Exodus 5:4,5; 6:6,7; ^{<10207>}Isaiah 10:27; ^{<10345>}Isaiah 14:25).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In the New Testament several Greek words mean "burden."

(1) [**βάρος**, baros], "something heavy." Burdens of the day (^{<10102>}Matthew 20:12), the burden of duty to be borne, a difficult requirement (^{<10458>}Acts 15:28; ^{<10124>}Revelation 2:24). The burden of one's moral infirmities (^{<10102>}Galatians 6:2).

(2) [**φορτίον**, phortion], "something to be borne." The obligation which Christ imposes (^{<10113>}Matthew 11:30); the legal ordinances of the Pharisees (^{<10146>}Luke 11:46); a man's individual responsibility (^{<10105>}Galatians 6:5). Whether any clear and consistent distinction can be made between these two words is doubtful. Probably, however, [phortion] refers to the load as something to be borne, whether heavy or light, whilst [baros] may be an oppressive load. According to Lightfoot [baros] may suggest a load of which a man may rightly rid himself should occasion serve, but [phortion] a burden which he is expected to bear, as every soldier carries his own pack.

But most likely too much weight should not be given to these distinctions.

(3) There is also the word [γόμος, gomos], “the freight” of a ship (^{<421B>}Acts 21:3); compare [ὄγκος, ogkos], weight or encumbrance which impedes the runner’s progress to the goal (^{<3821>}Hebrews 12:1), with particular reference to the superfluous flesh which an athlete seeks to get rid of in training (compare ^{<412>}1 Corinthians 9:24-27), and figuratively whatever hinders the full development of Christian manhood.

George Henry Trever

BURGLARY

<bur'-gla-ri>.

See *CRIMES*.

BURIAL

<ber'-i-al> (hrWbq)[qebhurah]; compare New Testament [τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι, to entaphidsai]:

It is well to recall at the outset that there are points of likeness and of marked contrast between oriental and occidental burial customs in general, as well as between the burial customs of ancient Israel and those of other ancient peoples. These will be brought out, or suggested later in this article.

1. IMMEDIATE BURIAL CONSIDERED URGENT.

1. Reasons for This:

The burial of the dead in the East in general was and is often effected in such a way as to suggest to the westerner indecent haste. Dr. Post says that burial among the people of Syria today seldom takes place later than ten hours after death, often earlier; but, he adds, “the rapidity of decomposition, the excessive violence of grief, the reluctance of Orientals to allow the dead to remain long in the houses of the living, explain what seems to us the indecency of haste.” This still requires the survivors, as in the case of Abraham on the death of Sarah, to bury their dead out of their sight (^{<1231>}Genesis 23:1-4); and it in part explains the quickness with which the bodies of Nadab and Abihu were Carried out of the camp (^{<3904>}Leviticus 10:4), and those of Ananias and Sapphira were hastened off to burial

(~~481~~ Acts 5:1-11). Then, of course, the defilement to which contact with a dead body gave occasion, and the judgment that might come upon a house for harboring the body of one dying under a Divine judgment, further explain such urgency and haste.

2. The Burial of Jesus:

It was in strict accordance with such customs and the provision of the Mosaic law (~~482~~ Deuteronomy 21:23; compare ~~483~~ Galatians 3:13), as well as in compliance with the impulses of true humanity, that Joseph of Arimathea went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus for burial on the very day of the crucifixion (~~479~~ Matthew 27:39 ff).

3. The Usual Time:

The dead are often in their graves, according to present custom, within two or three hours after death. Among oriental Jews burial takes place, if possible, within twenty-four hours after death, and frequently on the day of death. Likewise Mohammedans bury their dead on the day of death, if death takes place in the morning; but if in the afternoon or at night, not until the following day.

4. Duties of Next of Kin:

As soon as the breath is gone the oldest son, or failing him, the nearest of kin present, closes the eyes of the dead (compare ~~440~~ Genesis 46:4, "and Joseph shall put his hand upon thine eyes"). The mouth, too, is closed and the jaws are bound up (compare ~~414~~ John 11:44, "and his face was bound about with a napkin"). The death is announced, as it was of old, by a tumult of lamentation preceded by a shrill cry, and the weeping and wailing of professional mourners (compare ~~403~~ Mark 5:38 ff).

See MOURNING.

2. PREPARATIONS FOR BURIAL.

1. Often Informal and Hasty:

These are often informal and hasty. Under the tyranny of such customs as those noted, it is often impossible to make them elaborate. Canon Tristram says: "As interments take place at latest on the evening of the day of death, and frequently at night, there can be no elaborate preparations. The corpse, dressed in such clothes as were worn in life, is stretched on a bier with a cloth thrown over it, until carried forth for burial" (Eastern Customs, 94).

In ^{<418>}Acts 5:6 we read of Ananias, “The young men wrapped him round, and they carried him out and buried him.” “What they did,” as Dr. Nicol says, “was likely this: they unfastened his girdle, and then taking the loose under-garment and the wide cloak which was worn above it, used them as a winding-sheet to cover the corpse from head to foot.” In other words, there was little ceremony and much haste.

2. Usually with More Ceremony:

Usually, however, there was more ceremony and more time taken. Missionaries and natives of Syria tell us that it is still customary to wash the body (compare ^{<418>}Acts 9:37), anoint it with aromatic ointments (compare ^{<617>}John 12:7; 19:39; ^{<410>}Mark 16:1; ^{<241>}Luke 24:1), swathe hands and feet in grave-bands, usually of linen (^{<614>}John 11:44a), and cover the face or bind it about with a napkin or handkerchief (^{<614>}John 11:44b). It is still common to place in the wrappings of the body aromatic spices and other preparations to retard decomposition. Thus the friends at Bethany prepared the body of Lazarus, and he came forth wrapped in grave-bands and with a napkin bound about his face. And, we are further told that after the burial of Jesus, Nicodemus brought “a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds,” and that they “took the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the custom of the Jews is to bury,” and that Mary Magdalene and two other women brought spices for the same purpose (^{<619>}John 19:39,40; ^{<410>}Mark 16:1; ^{<241>}Luke 24:1). That this was a very old custom is witnessed by such passages as ^{<464>}2 Chronicles 16:14, where it is said that Asa, the king, was laid “in the bed which was filled with sweet odors and divers kinds of spices prepared by the perfumers’ art” (compare ^{<617>}John 12:3,7; Sirach 38:16). From ^{<418>}Acts 5:6; 8:2 it appears that there was in later times a confraternity of young men whose business it was to attend to these proprieties and preparations on behalf of the dead; but it was probably only in exceptional cases that they were called upon to act. Certainly such ministries ordinarily devolved, as they do now, upon loving relatives and friends, and mostly women, among the Jews as well as among the Greeks. The practice among the Greeks, both by similarity and contrast, affords an interesting illustration. The following instance is aptly cited in D B (art. “Burial”): Electra believing Orestes to be dead and his ashes placed in the sepulchral urn (Soph. Electra 1136-52), addresses him thus: “Woe is me! These loving hands have not washed or decked thy corpse, nor taken, as was meet, their sad burden from the flaming pyre. At the hands of strangers, hapless one,

thou hast had those rites, and so art come to us, a little dust in a narrow urn.”

3. Contrasts between Jewish Customs and Other Peoples’:

This brings us to note two marked contrasts between customs in Israel and among other peoples.

(1) Cremation:

With the Greeks it was customary to cremate the dead (*see CREMATION*); but there was nothing in Jewish practice exactly corresponding to this. Tacitus (Hist. v.5) expressly says, in noting the contrast with Roman custom, that it was a matter of piety with the Jews “to bury rather than to burn dead bodies.” The burning of the bodies of Saul and his sons by the men of Jabesh-Gilead (^{<B11>}1 Samuel 31:11-13) seems to have been rather a case of emergency, than of conformity to any such custom, as the charred bones were buried by the same men under the tamarisk at Jabesh, and later, by David’s order, removed and laid to rest in the sepulcher of Kish (^{<B12>}2 Samuel 21:12-14). According to the Mosaic law burning was reserved, either for the living who had been found guilty of unnatural sins (^{<B14>}Leviticus 20:4; 21:9), or for those who died under a curse, as in the case of Achan and his family, who after they had been stoned to death were, with all their belongings, burned with fire (^{<B15>}Joshua 7:25).

(2) Embalming:

As the burning practiced by the Greeks found no place in Jewish law and custom, so embalming, as practiced by the Egyptians, was unknown in Israel, the cases of Jacob and Joseph being clearly special, and in conformity to Egyptian custom under justifying circumstances. When Jacob died it was Joseph, the Egyptian official, who “commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father” (^{<B16>}Genesis 50:2), and it was conventionally the fit thing that when Joseph himself died his body was embalmed and “put in a coffin (sarcophagus) in Egypt” (^{<B17>}Genesis 50:26).

3. ON THE WAY TO THE GRAVE:

When the preparations were made and the time came, the corpse was carried to the grave on a bier, or litter (^{hFmi}[miTTah]).

1. Coffins Unknown:

Coffins were unknown in ancient Israel, as they are among the Jews of the East to this day. The only one mentioned in the Bible is the sarcophagus in which the embalmed body of Joseph was preserved, unless Asa's bed (^{<4164>}2 Chronicles 16:14) be another, as some think. Moslems, like eastern Jews, never use coffins. The bier sometimes has a pole at each corner by means of which it is carried on the shoulders to the tomb.

See BIER.

2. Professional Mourners:

The procession of mourners is made up largely, of course, of relatives and friends of the deceased, but is led by professional mourning women, who make the air resound with their shrieks and lamentations (compare ^{<2125>}Ecclesiastes 12:5; ^{<3497>}Jeremiah 9:17; ^{<3056>}Amos 5:16). *See MOURNING.* ^{<3056>}Amos 5:16 alludes to this custom in describing the mourning that shall be over the desolations of Israel: "Wailing shall be in all the broad ways; and they shall say in all the streets, Alas! alas! and they shall call the husbandman to mourning, and such as are skillful in lamentation to wailing." Jeremiah (9:17,18) breaks out: "Call for the mourning women, that they may come; and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eyelids gush out with waters." Dr. Fred. Bliss tells of a mourning delegation at the mahal, or mourning house, of a great man. "No matter how gaily they may be chatting they approach, when they reach the house they rush forward, handkerchiefs to face, sobbing, weeping, with utmost demonstrations of grief, going through them time after time as occasion requires." Amelia B. Edwards gives a vivid account of her first experience with such mourning: "It rose like the far-off wavering sound of many owls. It shrilled, swelled, wavered, dropped, and then died away, like the moaning of the wind at sea. We never heard anything so wild and plaintive." Among some Jews of today, it is said, the funeral procession moves swiftly, because there are supposed to be innumerable evil spirits ([shedhim]) hovering about, desirous to attack the soul, which is thought to be in the body until interment takes place and the corpse is actually covered (see DB, article "Burial").

4. AT THE GRAVE.

When the grave, or place of entombment, is reached ceremonies more or less characteristic and peculiar to the Orient take place.

1. Graves Dug in the Earth:

When the body is let down into the ground, the bier, of course, is set aside, and at first a heap of stones only is piled over the shallow grave — to preserve the dead from the dreaded depredations of hyenas, jackals or thieves. Beyond question graves among ancient Jews were often simply dug in the earth, as they are with us, and as they are with Jews at Jerusalem and elsewhere in the East today.

2. Family Tombs. Later Customs:

But originally, it would seem to have been customary for each family to have a family tomb: either a natural cave, prepared with stone shelves to receive the bodies, or else hewn out of rock in the hillside, each tomb, or sepulcher, having many niches or loculi, in each one of which a body could be placed (see ^{<0250>}Genesis 25:10; 49:31; 50:13; 35:19; ^{<0340>}Joshua 24:32). As Dr. Nicol says, “All among the Israelites who possessed any land, or who could afford it, had their family tombs, hewn out of the rock, each sepulchre containing many niches. Many generations of a family could thus be placed in the ancestral tomb.” Countless numbers of such tombs are to be found all over Palestine, but Machpelah, of course, is the chief example (Genesis 23). Compare the cases of Joshua buried in his inheritance at Timnath-serah (^{<0240>}Joshua 24:30), Samuel in his house at Ramah (^{<0250>}1 Samuel 25:1), Joab in his house in the wilderness (^{<1034>}1 Kings 2:34), Manasseh in the garden of his house (^{<1218>}2 Kings 21:18), Josiah in the same tomb, it would seem, as his father and grandfather (^{<1230>}2 Kings 23:30), and Asa, singled out for special mention (^{<1464>}2 Chronicles 16:14). According to custom, too, the Jew was not to sell his burying-place, if it was possible for him to hold it. Today in the Orient it is quite different — burying-places of Moslem, Jewish and Christian peoples, while distinct from each other, are community rather than family burying-places.

3. Sealed Stones:

When the tomb was a cave, or was dug out from some rock, the entrance was often closed with a large circular stone set up on its edge or rim and rolled in its groove to the front of the mouth of the tomb, so as to close it

securely. This stone was then often further secured by a strap, or by sealing. In such case it could easily be seen or known if the tomb had been disturbed. Pilate, it will be recalled, directed that the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, in which the body of Jesus was laid, should be carefully sealed and made as secure as the officials could make it. “So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them” (^{<4076>}Matthew 27:66).

4. Stated Times of Mourning:

In Syria, as elsewhere in the East, it is customary to have stated times after the burial for mourning at the tomb — for example on the third, seventh, and fortieth days, and again on the anniversary of the burial. The relatives or friends then go to the tomb without ornaments, often with hair disheveled; sometimes with head covered and faces blackened with soot, or ashes, or earth, in their oldest and poorest clothing, which is sometimes violently rent, and, sitting or moving in a circle around or near to the tomb, they break out in spells into weird, dirge-like singing or wailing.

5. Excessive Mourning:

The violence of grief at times leads to lacerations of the body and the shedding of blood. Morier (Second Journey through Persia), describing a celebration which takes place annually to commemorate the death of the grandson of Mohammed, says: “I have seen the most violent of them, as they vociferated Ya Hosein! walk the streets with their bodies streaming with blood by the voluntary cuts they had given themselves”. Such cutting of the flesh in mourning for the dead was specifically forbidden by the Mosaic law (^{<6828>}Leviticus 19:28; 21:5; ^{<6541>}Deuteronomy 14:1). But excessive mourning for the dead is often alluded to in Scripture (see ^{<1011>}2 Samuel 1:11,12; ^{<3916>}Psalms 6:6; 119:136; ^{<2916>}Lamentations 1:16; 3:48; ^{<2901>}Jeremiah 9:1).

6. Dirge-Songs:

The custom of dirge-songs seems to be alluded to (^{<4023>}Matthew 9:23; ^{<4058>}Mark 5:38) in the narrative of the healing of the ruler’s daughter: “Jesus came into the ruler’s house, and saw the flute-players, and the crowd making a tumult.” A characteristic oriental funeral procession and burial are vividly pictured in the narrative of the burial of Jacob (^{<6516>}Genesis 50:6-13).

5. FAILURE TO RECEIVE BURIAL COUNTED A CALAMITY OR A JUDGMENT.

Any lack of proper burial is still regarded in the East, as it was in ancient times, as a great indignity or a judgment from God. It is esteemed the greatest calamity that can befall a person. It gives men still untold distress to think they shall not receive suitable burial, according to the customs of their respective race, or family, or religion — a fact or sentiment that is often alluded or appealed to by way of illustration in the Scriptures. For a corpse to remain unburied and become food for beasts of prey was the climax of indignity or judgment (^{<1210>}2 Samuel 21:10,11; ^{<1132>}1 Kings 13:22; 14:11; 16:4; 21:24; ^{<1287>}2 Kings 9:37; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:33; 8:1; ^{<3915>}Ezekiel 29:5; ^{<3913>}Psalms 79:3; ^{<6119>}Revelation 11:9), and uncovered blood cried for vengeance (^{<3216>}Ezekiel 24:6 f; 39:11-16), the idea being the same as among other oriental peoples, that the unburied dead would not only inflict trouble upon his family, but bring defilement also and a curse upon the whole land. It was, therefore, an obligation resting upon all to bury even the dead found by the way (Tobit 1:18; 2:8). Even malefactors were to be allowed burial (^{<1212>}Deuteronomy 21:22,23), and the exceptional denial of it to the sons of Rizpah gave occasion for the touching story of her self-denying care of the dead found in ^{<1210>}2 Samuel 21:10,11.

6. PLACES OF BURIAL: HOW MARKED.

Ordinary graves were marked by the heaping of crude stones, but hewn stones and sometimes costly pillars were set up as memorials of the dead (^{<3315>}Ezekiel 39:15; ^{<1237>}2 Kings 23:17 the Revised Version (British and American), “What monument is that which I see?” the reference being to a sepulchral pillar). Jacob set up a pillar over Rachel’s grave (^{<1233>}Genesis 35:20), and her tomb is marked by a monument to this day. Absalom’s grave in the wood of Ephraim had a heap of stones raised over it (^{<1087>}2 Samuel 18:17), but in this case, as in the case of Achan, it was not for honor but for dishonor. In New Testament times the place of burial was uniformly outside the cities and villages (see ^{<1712>}Luke 7:12; ^{<3113>}John 11:30). There was public provision made for the burial of strangers (^{<1217>}Matthew 27:7), as in the closing days of the monarchy there was a public burying-ground at Jerusalem (^{<2423>}Jeremiah 26:23), probably where it is to this day between the city wall and the Kidron Valley. Thousands of Jewish graves on the sloping sides of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, where the Jews have come from all lands to be buried, bear witness today to the belief

that associates the coming of Messiah with a blessed resurrection. Many Jews hold that Messiah, when He comes, will descend upon the Mount of Olives, and will pass through these resting-places of the dead as He enters the Holy City in glory.

LITERATURE.

HDB, article “Burial”; Keil, Biblical Arch., II, 199 f; Nowack, Hebrews Arch., I, 187 ff; “Burial” and “Tombs” in Kitto, Cycl.; Thomson, LB (see “Funerals” in Index); Tristram, Eastern Customs in Bible Lands; Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs.

George B. Eager

BURIER

<ber'-i-er> (rb" q[¹kabhar]): “Set up a sign by it, till the buriers have buried it” (²⁹¹⁵Ezekiel 39:15). “When the searchers found any human remains as they passed through the land, they were to set up a mark to attract the attention of the buriers, who followed them” (Dummelow’s Commentary, in the place cited.).

See BURIAL.

BURN; BURNING

<burn>, <burn'-ing>: Figurative: In addition to the ordinary meaning, burn is used metaphorically in the following passages of the New Testament:

(1) [καίω, kaio] (²²⁸⁰Luke 24:32), “Was not our heart burning within us,” i.e. greatly moved.

(2) [πυρόω, puroo], used twice, once in the sense of inflamed with sexual desire (1 Cor 7:9), “For it is better to marry than to burn” and in ⁴⁷¹²³2 Corinthians 11:29 of the heat of the passions, here of grief, or anger, “Who is offended (the American Standard Revised Version “caused to stumble”) and I burn not?”

See also PUNISHMENTS.

BURNT OFFERING

See SACRIFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BURNT SACRIFICE

See SACRIFICES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BUSH

<boosh>:

(1) (hns)[ceneh], ^{<002>}Exodus 3:2-4; ^{<0316>}Deuteronomy 33:16; [βάτος, batos], ^{<0126>}Mark 12:26; ^{<0644>}Luke 6:44, “bramble bush”; 20:37; ^{<4073>}Acts 7:30,35. All the Old Testament references and the New Testament references, except ^{<0644>}Luke 6:44, are to the same “bush,” namely, Moses’ “burning bush”). From its etymology [ceneh] clearly denotes a “thorny” plant, as does the corresponding [batos] in the Septuagint and New Testament. In the Latin versions rubus, i.e. “bramble,” is used as equivalent. Several varieties of bramble flourish in Palestine, of which the most common is Rubus discolor, but this is not an indigenous plant in Sinai. It is stated by Post that a bush of this plant has been planted by the monks of the Convent of Catherine at Sinai to the rear of the “Chapel of the Burning Bush.” In spite of tradition there is but little doubt that Moses’ “burning bush” must actually have been a shrub of one of the various thorny acacias, or allied plants, indigenous in the Sinaitic peninsula.

(2) (j " yci)[siach] “plant,” ^{<0005>}Genesis 2:5; “shrub,” ^{<0215>}Genesis 21:15; “bush,” ^{<0304>}Job 30:4,7). In the first reference any kind of plant may be meant, but in the other passages the reference is to the low bushes or scrub, such as are found in the desert.

(3) (μλ l b)[nahalolim], the King James Version bushes, the Revised Version (British and American) PASTURES, margin “bushes,” ^{<2079>}Isaiah 7:19). The meaning appears to be rather a place for watering flocks, the corresponding Arabic root [nahal], having the meaning “to quench one’s thirst,” and the corresponding noun of place, [manhal], meaning a watering-place in the desert.

BUSH, THE BURNING

<burn'-ing>.

1. MEANING AND USE:

The scene at the burning bush (**hns**][ceneh], “a bush,” Septuagint [batos], “blackberry bush”) reveals God to the world in one of theophanies with fire, of which there are four mentioned in the Bible (^{<118D>}Exodus 3:2; 13:21; 19:18; also ^{<5008>}2 Thessalonians 1:8 the King James Version, yet to be fulfilled). Many other Divine manifestations were associated with fire. The Burning Bush is mentioned elsewhere in ^{<1536>}Deuteronomy 33:16; ^{<4126>}Mark 12:26; ^{<4218>}Luke 20:37; ^{<4073>}Acts 7:30,31.

2. IDENTIFICATION:

Exact identification of the particular kind of bush in which God appeared to Moses is impossible. Attempts have been made to identify it with the blackberry bush, as by the Septuagint and also by the monks of the Convent of Catharine on Mount Sinai who grow the blackberry there in token of their tradition. The cassia has also been suggested. Both identifications are failures, the former because the blackberry does not grow in that region unless imported and tended, the latter for philological reasons. Nothing in the language used gives any clue to the species of the bush. The generally accepted view that it was some kind of thorn bush is an assumption with scarcely other ground than that there are so many thorny bushes in that region. This fact does, however, give to the assumption much probability.

3. INTERPRETATION:

The old Jewish commentators have many things to say in explanation of this theophany (compare Jewish Encyclopedia). That one thing which will meet with much response from the Christian heart is that the unconsumed bush with the fire in the midst of it indicated that the Israelites would not be consumed by the afflictions in Egypt. The application of this view to God's people under affliction in all ages is often made by Christian homilists. But this cannot have been the primary meaning of theophany. Of the many theophanies and other Divine manifestations with fire, the specific

signification must be learned from a careful study of the circumstances in each case. The fire does not seem to have any one fundamental meaning running through them all. In addition to the references already given, compare ^{<1988>}Psalm 18:8-12; 50:3; ^{<3004>}Ezekiel 1:4; ^{<3006>}Micah 1:1-4; ^{<3888>}Habakkuk 3:3-6; ^{<8229>}Hebrews 12:29.

The exact meaning of the Burning Bush as a method or medium of revelation may appear as follows:

- (1) The flame in this bush was not the flame of persecution by God's enemies without, but the flame of God's presence or the presence of His angel within.
- (2) The idea of burning and yet not being consumed is brought into the narrative by Moses' wonderment in the moment of his ignorance, before he knew that God was in the bush.
- (3) The real significance of the flame in this case seems to be light and glory and preservation where God manifests Himself graciously. This is the universal idea of revealed religion. The prevailing idea of God in the religions round about was that God dwelt in darkness. The approach to the gods in Egyptian temples was through ever-deepening gloom. It was thought that God was very dangerous and apt to be a destroyer, so that a priest must always intervene. God as a gracious Saviour was the new idea revelation was bringing to the world. This was now first clearly announced, but was not to be fully revealed throughout the time of the long line of priests until the Great High Priest should come and make a "way of approach" that we may come "with boldness unto the throne of grace."

M. G. Kyle

BUSHEL

^{<boosh'-el>} ([^{<μ}^{<δ}^{<ι}^{<ο}^{<ς}, modios]): A dry measure containing about a peck, but as it is used in the New Testament (^{<4055>}Matthew 5:15; ^{<4021>}Mark 4:21; ^{<2113>}Luke 11:33) it does not refer to capacity but is used only to indicate a covering to conceal the light.

BUSHY

<boosh'-i>: Found in Song 5:11 as the translation of **ל תל תל** [taltal], meaning trailing, pendulous (Septuagint [ἐλάται, elatai], literally “ductile”); the Revised Version, margin reads “curly.”

BUSINESS

<biz'-nes>: Is the rendering of four Hebrew words:

(1) **hkal m** [mela'khah], in ^{<1391>}Genesis 39:11 (the American Standard Revised Version “work”); ^{<1359>}1 Chronicles 26:29,30; ^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 13:10 (the American Standard Revised Version “in their work”); 17:13 (the American Standard Revised Version “many works”); ^{<14116>}Nehemiah 11:16,22; 13:30 (the American Standard Revised Version “in his work”); Est 3:9; ^{<14723>}Psalms 107:23; ^{<14729>}Proverbs 22:29; ^{<17872>}Daniel 8:27.

(2) **rbD** [dabhar], literally “a word,” is so translated in ^{<15215>}Deuteronomy 24:5; ^{<16214>}Joshua 2:14,20; ^{<17807>}Judges 18:7 (the American Standard Revised Version “dealings”); 18:28 (the American Standard Revised Version “dealings”); ^{<18212>}1 Samuel 21:2,8.

(3) **hc** [ma`aseh], “an action” (^{<19219>}1 Samuel 20:19).

(4) **yn** [inyan], “employment” (^{<21018>}Ecclesiastes 5:3; 8:16).

In the New Testament “business” in ^{<12019>}Luke 2:49 is the rendering of the phrase **ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου**, en, tois, tou patros mou], literally “in the things of my Father,” which the American Standard Revised Version renders “in my Father’s house,” with “about my Father’s business” as the marginal reading. “Business” is also used in the translation of **χρεία**, chreia], literally “need,” of ^{<4016>}Acts 6:3; as the translation of **σπουδή** spoude], literally “haste” of ^{<5121>}Romans 12:11 (the American Standard Revised Version “diligence”); of **πράγμα**, pragma], literally “thing done,” of ^{<5141>}Romans 16:2 (the American Standard Revised Version “matter”); of **πράσσειν**, prassein ta idia], literally “tend to one’s own business,” of ^{<5041>}1 Thessalonians 4:11. In ^{<4192>}Acts 19:24,25 in Paul’s account of the riot in Ephesus, **ἐργασία**, ergasia], literally “working,” “performing,” is translated “little business” in 19:24 (the King James

Version “small gain”), and “by this business” in ^{<4025>}Acts 19:25 (the King James Version “by this craft”).

Arthur J. Kinsella

BUSYBODY

^{<biz’-i-bod-i>} ([^{<περίεργος>}, periergos], [^{<ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοτος>}, allotrioepiskopos]): The word is found twice in Paulinic literature.: ^{<5453>}1 Timothy 5:13, “not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies,” and ^{<5381>}2 Thessalonians 3:11, “work not at all, but are busybodies.” It is also found in ^{<4045>}1 Peter 4:15 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “meddler”) “or as a busybody in other men’s matters.” If these passages be coupled with such others as ^{<508D>}James 3:2-10; 4:11; ^{<4029>}Ephesians 4:29,31; ^{<602D>}Titus 3:2, it becomes evident that sins against the eighth commandment were as common in the apostolic church as they are today. To this day backbiting is a common trait of oriental peoples. And it is this sin which is so repeatedly warned against by the apostles, as in direct conflict with the ethics of Christianity, and in violation of that spirit of brotherly love and mutual trust which Christ has enjoined on His followers, and which is the very marrow of the outward revelation of the Christian faith (1 Cor 13).

Henry E. Dosker

BUTLER

^{<but’-ler>}: An officer in households of kings, or other dignitaries, having charge of wines and other potables. ^{Hqyīn} [mashqeh], “one who gives drink” (^{<0401>}Genesis 40:1-23; 41:9), rendered “cupbearer” in ^{<1005>}1 Kings 10:5; ^{<4306>}2 Chronicles 9:4; ^{<6011>}Nehemiah 1:11. The office was one of considerable importance in oriental courts, because of the danger to the king’s life through plots of poison, etc. Nehemiah held this position to King Artaxerxes. Wealthy courts, as that of Solomon, usually had more than one (^{<1005>}1 Kings 10:5); over these cupbearers or butlers was the [sar ha-mash-qim], or chief butler (^{<0409>}Genesis 40:9).

Edward Bagby Pollard

BUTTER

See FOOD.

BUYING

<bi'-ing> (hrK;[karah], j q" l ;[laqach], anq;[qena'], hnq;[qanah], rb" v;[shabhar]; [ἀγοράζω, agorazo], [ὀνέομαι, oneomai], [ἐμπορεύομαι, emporeuomai]):

1. IN THE EARLIEST PERIODS AND AMONG NOMADS.

1. The Primitive Stage; (the "Shop"):

Among primitive races and nomads there can be, of course, no organized commerce. Yet they buy and sell, by barter and exchange, in rude and simple ways. When tribes become settled and live in villages the "shop" is established — usually at first the simple "stall" of the grocer ([bakkal]) where one can buy bread; cheese, salt and dried fish, olives, oil, bundles of wood or charcoal, and even earthenware vessels for the passing traveler. At a later stage the village will have also, according to demand, other shops, as, for instance, those of the baker, the blacksmith, the cobbler, and, today, will be found in many obscure places in the East the butcher's shop, and the coffee house.

2. In Old Testament Times:

These gradations and the gradual rise to the more organized commerce of the Greek-Roman period are indicated in a way by the succession of words for "buying" used in the Bible and the conditions and circumstances pictured and implied in the various accounts of buying and selling. Even as early as Abraham's time, however, there were buying and weighing of silver in exchange. "Hear me," pleads Abraham with the children of Heth, "and entreat for me to Ephron the son of Zohar, that he may give me the cave of Machpelah which is in the end of his field; for the full price let him give it to me." And Ephron said, "Nay, my lord, hear me: the field give I thee, and the cave that is therein." But Abraham said, "If thou wilt I will give the price of the field; take it of me, and I will bury my dead there. And Ephron answered My lord, hearken unto me: a piece of land worth four hundred shekels of silver, what is that betwixt me and thee? bury therefore thy dead And Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant. So the field, and the cave, and all the trees that were in the field, were made sure unto Abraham for a possession" (⁰¹²³⁸Genesis 23:8-18). Other

examples of primitive buying are found in ~~(Gen)~~ Joshua 24:32 (“the parcel of ground which Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor the father of Shechem for a hundred pieces of money”); in ~~(Ruth)~~ Ruth 4:5-9, where Boaz is represented as buying “the parcel of land which was Elimelech’s of the hand of Naomi and of Ruth the Moabite, the wife of the dead all that was Elimelech’s”; and in ~~(2 Sam)~~ 2 Samuel 24:21-24, where David is said to have “bought the threshing-floor” of Araunah at “a price.” Such cases, however, are in a sense exceptional; trade in general at that time was by barter and exchange, without intermediary or market-place.

3. In New Testament Times:

In New Testament times things have so changed that the word most commonly used for buying ([agorazo]) means “to use the market-place,” and another ([emporoumai]) points to a class of traders or merchants who go on, from city to city — “continue” here or there “and buy and sell” (~~(James)~~ James 4:13 the King James Version).

2. ORIENTAL BUYING A TEDIOUS PROCESS.

Something of this is seen even in the fine examples given above. Doubtless, however, eastern buyers and sellers of old haggled over prices with controversy and heat, even as such buyers do today. Every where you find them now keen for bargains, but “striking a bargain” is a tedious process. They grow warm and then cool off; they are swept into a frenzy by some new turn of the strife and then calm down; but soon the haggling and arguing begin over again, becoming more heated and seemingly more hopeless than ever, and often they become so excited as to threaten to come to blows. But they don’t mean it all, and at last they find a common basis; the sale is made with flattering compliments to one another, and, if we may believe appearances, to the rapturous delight of both parties to the bargain.

The native Oriental clearly takes pleasure in such exercise, and sees great possibilities before him. He graciously assures you at the outset that the bargain shall be “just as you like it — just as you like it!” Is he not a servant of God? What cares he for money? What he most wants is your happiness and good will — that is the sweetest thing in life — the love and favor of brothers. After a while you offer a price. He says, “What is such a trifle between us? Take it for nothing!” But he is far from meaning it, and

so the haggling begins and the fire and heat of controversy follow — perhaps for hours.

3. SHOPS AND BAZAARS.

1. Oriental Shops:

Oriental shops are all of a pattern — the workshop and the place to store and sell goods is one and the same. It is on the street, of course, and a platform, usually about 2 ft. high, extends along the whole front. A small door opens to a room back, which, as far as such a thing is possible in the Orient, is private. The goods, particularly the best articles, are displayed in front, somewhat as they are in the windows of our department stores. In the center of the platform is a sejadeh, a rug or mat. Upon this the keeper sits in true oriental fashion — cross-legged. He is never too busy with his accounts to let the passerby escape his keen eye. He will give up his [nargileh] any time to hail the stranger, display his goods, and coaxingly invite him to look at the special beauty and quality of his articles.

2. The Market-Place:

All the shops or storerooms of the oriental village line the “market,” which as a rule, is in the center of the village, or on the chief street. This the Arabs call [suk], sookh (compare ~~am~~ Matthew 20:3). Here the peasant is found with his donkeys or camels laden with food-stuffs and country produce. The gardener is there with his small fruits, and the fisherman with his latest “catch.” All the shopkeepers, too, are on or near to this street or market center. “The sookh in a country village,” says J. Carrow Duncan, “is one of the most interesting sights of modern Egypt. Formerly the cattle and dry-goods markets were uniformly held in an open space in the center of each village. Now the government compels them to go to a fenced enclosure outside of the town. At Belbeys the ordinary market is still held in the center of the town, but the cattle market is a mile away, across the canal. As in a bazaar, such as the traveler sees in Cairo, the merchants of the various trades dispose themselves here in lanes, all easily accessible from the main street, which is thus left clear. On the left are the dealers in copper utensils, busily plying their trade; next to them the makers of sieves and riddles; then comes a large space filled with pottery ware, and, close by, the vegetable yentiers. There, jammed in between the pottery space and the coppersmiths, is a lane of gold- and silversmiths — the greatest sharks in the market, their chief prey being the women. On the other side of the

main street are the shoemakers' lane, the drapers' lane, the grocers, the seed men, the sweetmeat-sellers, fruit-merchants, dealers in glass and carnelian jewelry and, lastly, the butchers' stalls, all arranged in lanes, and all equally ready to trade or to enjoy a joke at each other's expense. There is apparently little eagerness to trade — except when a tourist appears." To one who is ignorant of the value of his wares, the oriental dealer has no fixed price. This is really regulated by the supposed ignorance of the purchaser. If you choose, you may give him what he asks, and be laughed at all round the sookh. If you are wise, you will offer something near to the real value and firmly refuse to vary or haggle, and he will come to terms.

Professor Elihu Grant tells of a shop in a Syrian village — "a small room, 6 to 12 ft. square, with a door, but no window, a counter or bench, and shelves and bins along the sides, where sugar, flour, oil, matches, candies, spice, starch, coffee, rice, dried figs, etc., were found, but no wrapping-paper. The buyer must bring his own dish for liquids; other things he carries away in the ample folds of his skirt or in a handkerchief." "Every considerable Turkish town," says Van Lennep, "has a bazaar, bezesten, or 'arcade': a stone structure, open at both ends, a narrow alley or street running through it, covered with an arched roof, the sides pierced with openings or windows. This covered street is lined on both sides with shops, narrow and shallow. Dealers in similar goods and articles flock together here, as do the artisans of like trades in all oriental cities." Such shops can yet be seen in quite characteristic form in Damascus, Bagdad, Cairo and Constantinople, as in ancient days they were found in Babylon, Jerusalem and Noph (see ~~32713~~ Ezekiel 27:13-24).

4. BUYING ON CREDIT.

The shop-keeper does not always get cash from the native buyer. Dr. Post found that debt was well-nigh universal in Syria. The peasant sows "borrowed" seed, in "borrowed" soil, plants and reaps with "borrowed" tools, and lives in a "borrowed" house. Even in case of an abundant harvest the proportion of the crop left by the landlord and the tax-gatherer leaves the man and his family but the barest living at best; at times he can barely pay the debt accumulated in making and gathering in the crop, and sometimes fails in doing this.

Paying Cash (Money):

In the rare cases when the buyer pays cash for his purchases, he makes payment, after a true oriental fashion, in coin of the most various or varying values, or in rings of copper, silver or gold, such as are now common in the market-places of China. This throws light upon some Scriptural passages, as, for example, ^{<01432>}Genesis 43:21,22, where the language implies that the “rings” or “strings of money” were weighed: “Behold, every man’s money was in the mouth of his sack, our money in fill weight and other money have we brought down in our hand to buy food.” In ^{<15189>}Ezra 2:69, three kinds of currency are mentioned, “darics of gold,” “pounds of silver,” and “priests’ garments,” as having been given into the treasury for the house of God. The term rendered “darics of gold,” ‘adharkonim, stands for Persian coins, which were similar to the Greek “darics.” The Persians are said to have got the idea of coining from Lydia, at the capture of Sardis, 564 BC. Early Lydian coins were of electrum, but Croesus changed this to coins of gold and silver, probably about 568 BC. Examples of these ancient coins are now known (Rice, Orientalisms in Bible Lands, 234).

5. OPEN-AIR MARKETS AND FAIRS.

In inland towns and cities, markets and market-places are often found in the open air, as well as under cover. Great fairs are held thus on certain days of the week. Several towns will agree upon different days as market days and will offer in turn whatever they have for sale: lambs, sheep, cattle, horses, mules, chickens, eggs, butter, cheese, vegetables, fruits, and even jewelry and garments. In such a case it is as if the whole town for the day was turned into a market or exhibition, where everything is for sale. On such days peasants and townspeople come together in much larger numbers than is ordinary, and mingle freely together. The day thus chosen now, as in olden times, is often a holy day — Friday, which is the Moslem Sabbath, or the Christian Sunday, where Christians abound. Such instances form a side-light on such passages as ^{<16315>}Nehemiah 13:15-22: “In those days saw I in Judah some men treading winepresses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses therewith; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath day: and I testified against them.” Morier testifies that he attended similar fairs in Persia, where were gathered sellers of all sorts of goods in temporary shops or tents, such as sellers of barley and flour, as it was at

the gate of Samaria after the famine (2 Kings 7). Layard also speaks of having seen at the gate of the modern town of Mosul, opposite the site of ancient Nineveh shops for the sale of wheat, barley, bread-stuffs, and drinks for the thirsty. It will be recalled that it was “at the gate” that Boaz (^{<R01B>}Ruth 4:1-3) called the elders and people to witness that he had bought all that was Elimelech’s. For similar allusions see ^{<R04>}Job 5:4; ^{<I023>}Proverbs 31:23; ^{<I075>}Psalms 127:5; ^{<S014>}Lamentations 5:14.

See MONEY; TRADE, etc.; also DB, DCG, etc.

George B. Eager

BUZ; BUZI; BUZITE

^{<buz>}, ^{<bu’-zi>}, ^{<buz’-it>} (^{zWB} [buz]):

(1) Second son of Nahor (^{<0221>}Genesis 22:21). The word occurs again in ^{<S23>}Jeremiah 25:23, by the side of Dedan (^{<0107>}Genesis 10:7) and Tema (^{<0255>}Genesis 25:15), and is probably, therefore, the name of a people living in the neighborhood of Edom. Buz and Hazo (^{<0222>}Genesis 22:22) are probably the countries of [Bazu] and [Chazu] (the former described as full of snakes and scorpions), which Esarhaddon invaded (KB, II, 131).

(2) A Gadite (^{<I014>}1 Chronicles 5:14) (^{yzWB} [buzi]), “an inhabitant of Buz”), a title given to Elihu, the fourth speaker in the Book of Job (^{<R01>}Job 32:2).

Horace J. Wolf

BY

In the sense of “against” which survives only in dialectal English (compare Wright, Dialect Dict., I, 470, for examples) is the King James Version rendering of the dative [ἐξαντῆς, emauto] of ^{<R04>}1 Corinthians 4:4 (the American Standard Revised Version renders this “against”). In classical Greek the same idiom [sunoida] with dative = “be conscious” or “be cognizant of” a thing.

BY AND BY

In the sense of “immediately” is the King James Version translation of [ἐξαυτής, exautes], of ^{<4065>}Mark 6:25 (the American Standard Revised Version “forthwith”); of [εὐθύς, euthus], ^{<4032>}Matthew 13:21 (the American Standard Revised Version “straightway”); of [εὐθέως, eutheos], ^{<2072>}Luke 17:7 (the American Standard Revised Version “straightway”); 21:9 (the American Standard Revised Version “immediately”). In English literally this meaning is obsolete (compare: “After you have dyned and supte, laboure not by and by after, but make a pause — the space of an howre or more with some pastyme” (Babees Book, EETS, 247).

BYBLUS

<bi’-lus>.

See *GEBAL*.

BYPATHS

<bi’-pathz>.

See *BYWAY*.

BYSSUS

<bis’-us>.

See *LINEN*.

BYWAY

<bi’-wa> (**twByti**) [nethibboth]: Only in ^{<0086>}Judges 5:6. Compare ^{<4885>}Jeremiah 18:15; the King James Version “paths” (the Revised Version (British and American) “by-paths”).

BYWORD

<bi’-wurd>: **hMy** [shammah] = “consternation,” “astonishment,” “waste,” “wonderful language,” “object of remark” (^{<6887>}Deuteronomy 28:37; ^{<1002>}1 Kings 9:7; ^{<4070>}2 Chronicles 7:20); **I vṁ**[mashal], or **I vṁ**[

meshol] = “a satire,” “byword” (~~<8776>~~ Job 17:6; ~~<9444>~~ Psalm 44:14); **hLmi**
 [millah], or **hLøi**[milleh] = “a topic,” “object of talk,” “byword” (~~<8319>~~ Job
 30:9).

C

CAB

See KAB.

CABBON

<*kab'-on*> (^{ⲕⲁⲃⲕ} [kabbon]; [^{αβρά}, Chabra]): An unidentified place in the Shephelah of Judah near Eglon (^{ⲕⲁⲃⲕ} Joshua 15:40). It is possibly the same as *MACHBENA*, which see.

CABIN

<*kab'-in*> (^{ⲕⲁⲃⲓⲛ} [chanuyyoth], “vaults”; ^{ⲕⲁⲃⲓⲛ} Jeremiah 37:16 the Revised Version (British and American), “cells”): In the East the prison often consisted of a pit (compare “dungeon-house” the Revised Version (British and American) and “house of the pit” the Revised Version, margin) with vaulted cells around it for the confinement of prisoners. The word is probably a gloss. The phrase “and into the cells” seems superfluous after “into the dungeonhouse.”

CABUL

<*ka'-bul*> (^{ⲕⲁⲃⲓⲛ} [kabhul]; Codex Vaticanus, [^{ωβαμασομέλ}, Chobamasomel]; Codex Alexandrinus, [^{αβὼλ ἀπὸ ἀριστερῶν}, Chabol apo aristeron]):

(1) A city on the boundary between Asher and Zebulun (^{ⲕⲁⲃⲓⲛ} Joshua 19:27). It corresponds to the Chabolo of Josephus (Vita, 43, etc.), and is represented by the modern village Kabul, about nine miles Southeast of Acre.

(2) A district probably connected with (1), containing 20 cities, given by Solomon to Hiram king of Tyre (^{ⲕⲁⲃⲓⲛ} 1 Kings 9:10 ff).

CADDIS

<kad'-is>.

See GADDIS.

CADES

<ka'-dez>.

See KEDESH (Apocrypha).

CADES-BARNE

<ka'-dez bar'-ne>.

See KADESH-BARNEA (Apocrypha).

TSADHE

<tsa-tha'> (“ts”): The eighteenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and as such employed in Psalm 119 to designate the 18th part, every verse of which begins with this letter. It is transliterated in this Encyclopedia as “ts”. It came also to be used for the number 90. For name, etc., *see ALPHABET; TSADHE.*

CAESAR

<se'-zar> ([αἰσαρ, Kaisar]): Originally the surname of the Julian gens (thus, Caius Julius Caesar); afterward a name borne by the Roman emperors. In the New Testament the name is definitely applied to Augustus ([Ⓦ]Luke 2:1, “Caesar Augustus”), to whom it belonged by adoption, and to Tiberius ([Ⓦ]Luke 3:1, “Tiberius Caesar”; compare [Ⓦ]Matthew 22:17,21). The “Caesar” to whom Paul appealed ([Ⓦ]Acts 25:11,12,21) was Nero. The form is perpetuated in “Kaiser” and “Czar.”

CAESAREA

<ses-a-re'-a>, <se-za-re'-a> ([αἰσαρεία, Kaisareia]):

(1) Caesarea Palestina (pal-es-ti'na). The ancient name in the Arabic form [Qaisariyeh] still clings to the ruins on the sea shore, about 30 miles North of Jaffa. It was built by Herod the Great on the site of Strato's Tower

(Ant., XIII, xi, 2; XV, ix, 6), and the name Caesarea Sebaste was given it in honor of Augustus (ibid., XVI, v, 1). With his usual magnificence Herod lavished adornments on the city. He erected sumptuous palaces and public buildings, a theater, and amphitheater with prospect to the sea; while a spacious system of sewers under the city secured cleanliness and health. But “the greatest and most laborious work of all” was a magnificent harbor “always free from the waves of the sea,” which Josephus says was not less than the Piraeus: this however is an exaggeration. It was of excellent workmanship, and all the more remarkable because the place itself was not suitable for such noble structures. The whole coast line, indeed, is singularly ill-fitted for the formation of harbors. The mighty breakwater was constructed by letting down stones 50 x 18 x 9 ft. in size into twenty fathoms deep. The mole was 200 ft. wide. Part was surmounted by a wall and towers. A promenade and dwellings for mariners were also provided. The work was done in ten or twelve years. It became the residence of the Roman procurator. It passed into the hands of Agrippa I; and here he miserably died (~~4129~~ Acts 12:19,23). Here dwelt Philip the Evangelist (~~4180~~ Acts 8:40; 21:8). To Caesarea Peter was sent to minister to the Roman centurion Cornelius (Acts 10). Thrice Paul passed through Caesarea (~~4181~~ Acts 9:30; 18:22; 21:8); hither he was sent under guard from Jerusalem to escape danger from the Jews (~~4233~~ Acts 23:23); and here he was imprisoned till his final departure for Rome.

Riots between Gentiles and Jews in Caesarea gave rise to the war (BJ, II, xiii, 7; xiv, 4 f). Terrible cruelties were practiced on the Jews under Felix and Florus. Here Vespasian was hailed emperor by his soldiers. Titus here celebrated the birthday of his brother Domitian by setting 2,500 Jews to fight with beasts in the amphitheater. Eusebius was bishop of Caesarea (313-40 AD). In 548 AD a massacre of the Christians was organized and carried out by the Jews and Samaritans. The city passed into Moslem hands in 638. In the time of the Crusades it fell, now to the Christians and now to the Moslems; and was finally overthrown by Sultan Bibars in 1265 AD.

The cathedral stood on the site of a temple built by Herod, where the ruins are seen today; as are also those of two aqueducts which conveyed water from Nahr ez-Zerqa. The landward wall of the Roman city was nearly 3 miles in length.

(2) Caesarea Philippi (fi-lip’-i) ([αἰσαρεία ἡ ἱλίππου, Kaisareia he Philippou]). At the Southwest base of Mt. Hermon, on a rocky terrace, 1,150 ft. above sea-level, between [Wady Khashabeh] and [Wady Za`areh],

lie the ruins of the ancient city. It was a center for the worship of Pan: whence the name Paneas, applied not only to the city, but to the whole district (Ant., XV, x, 3). It is possible that this may have been the site of ancient Baal-hermon; while Principal G. A. Smith would place Daniel here (HGHL, 480). The district was given by Augustus to Herod the Great 20 BC, by whom a temple of white marble was built in honor of the emperor. Paneas formed part of the tetrarchy of Philip. He rebuilt and beautified the town, calling it Caesarea as a compliment to Augustus, and adding his own name to distinguish it from Caesarea on the coast of Sharon (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1). From Bethsaida Jesus and His disciples came hither, and on the way Peter made his famous confession, after which Jesus began to tell them of His coming passion (~~<0163>~~ Matthew 16:13 ff; ~~<4087>~~ Mark 8:27 ff). Some think that on a height near Caesarea Philippi Jesus was transfigured. *See TRANSFIGURATION, MOUNT OF.* Agrippa II renamed the town Neronias (Ant., XX, ix, 4). The ancient name however outlived both Caesarea and Neronias, and survives in the Arabic form Banias. The modern village, built among the ruins, contains 350 inhabitants. The walls and towers of which the remains are seen date from Crusading times. The castle, ec-Cubeibeh, crowns the hill behind the town, and must have been a place of strength from the earliest times. Its possession must always have been essential to the holding of the valley to the west. Immediately to the north of the town, at the foot of a steep crag, the fountain of the Jordan rises. Formerly the waters issued from a cave, Magharet ras en-Neba`, “cave of the fountain head,” now filled up with debris. Two niches cut in the face of the rock recall the idolatries practiced here in olden times. A shrine of el-Khudr stands on the west of the spring. With the rich soil and plentiful supplies of water, in a comparatively temperate climate, average industry might turn the whole district into a garden. As it is, the surroundings are wonderfully beautiful.

W. Ewing

CAESAR'S HOUSEHOLD

~~<hous'-hold>~~ ([οἱ ἐκ τῆς αἰσαρος οἰκίας, hoi ek tes Kaisaros oikias], “they that are of Caesar’s household,” ~~<1042>~~ Philippians 4:22): These words occur in the epistle which Paul wrote from Rome near the end of his first imprisonment there, probably in the end of 61 AD, to the church in Philippi. They give us most interesting information in regard to the progress made in the propagation of the gospel in Rome.

It is necessary to ask, in the first place, What is meant by the words “Caesar’s household”? and when the meaning of that phrase is known, then it is needful to discuss the question which rises at once, In what way did the gospel enter Caesar’s household? How is it that the gospel, which at the first chiefly advanced among the poorer classes in the Empire, made its way at a bound into the very palace of the Caesars?

1. WHAT EXACTLY WAS CAESAR’S HOUSEHOLD?:

“Caesar’s household” meant the whole of the persons, slaves and freemen alike, composing the establishment of the emperor in his palace on the Palatine Hill at Rome. The slaves of the imperial household formed a host in themselves. At a time when many a private citizen in Rome owned several hundreds of slaves, it need not surprise anyone to know that there was a vastly larger number of such persons in the palace of the emperor. This was a period when the city of Rome and the court of the Caesars swarmed with Asiatics, many of whom were Jews, and many of them would be in slavery, or in employment, in the imperial court. It cannot be forgotten that Poppea, Nero’s shameless consort, was a proselyte to Judaism and that she continued to advocate successfully the cause of the Jews before the emperor as occasion arose.

These persons in the emperor’s palace would be employed in every conceivable capacity as household servants, cooks, bathmen, gardeners, grooms, kennel-keepers, porters, doorkeepers, messengers, secretaries, amanuenses, teachers, librarians, architects, carpenters, shoemakers, and in all other forms of service. Of course they were not all slaves: there was a very large number of freemen. The *domus* or *familia Caesaris* (represented by the Greek [*oikia Kaisaros*]) included the whole of the imperial household, the meanest slaves as well as the most powerful courtiers. On the character and constitution of this household we happen to possess more information than perhaps on any other department of social life in Rome. “In Rome itself, if we may judge by these inscriptions, the *domus Augusta* must have formed no inconsiderable fraction of the whole population; but it comprised likewise all persons in the emperor’s service, whether slaves or freemen, in Italy and even in the provinces” (Lightfoot, *Commentary on Phil*, 171). In the list of offices filled by members of the imperial household were also such functions as those of keepers of the wardrobe or of the plate-chest; even the “tasters” formed a separate class of servants under a chief of their own. To belong to Caesar’s household

would secure even to the lowest grade of slaves substantial privileges and immunities, and would give a certain social importance, which made this position a valued one. An office in the emperor's household, however mean, was thought of so highly, that in the monumental inscriptions such a fact is recorded with scrupulous care.

2. HOW DID THE GOSPEL ENTER INTO CAESAR'S HOUSEHOLD?:

The next inquiry is, How did the gospel win its way into Caesar's household? And, first, there is no need at all to suppose that the gospel was unknown, even in the palace, previous to the arrival of Paul in Rome.

3. THE GOSPEL KNOWN THERE BEFORE PAUL'S ARRIVAL:

For in that numerous household of the emperor there would be Jews, perhaps many of them; and all the Jews were at that time filled with Messianic hopes, and thus were ready to listen to the gospel. As soon therefore as the gospel entered Rome, as soon as it was proclaimed in the many synagogues there, these members of Caesar's household could not fail, equally with the other members of the synagogue, to hear the story of Jesus Christ and of His cross and resurrection. A fact such as this, that the gospel was known in Rome previous to Paul's arrival there, is quite sufficient to account for the other fact, that the gospel was known in Caesar's palace.

4. THE GOSPEL ADVANCES IN THE PALACE:

But the propagation of the gospel received a great impetus and help forward, when Paul arrived in the city. For although he was a "bound prisoner," his wrist fastened by an iron chain, day and night, to the soldier who guarded him, he was able to "preach the kingdom of God and to teach those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him" (~~<408>~~ Acts 28:31 the King James Version). And in this way the gospel would again reach members of the emperor's household. Immediately after his arrival in Rome, Paul had put himself in communication with "the chief of the Jews" — probably the rulers of the synagogues in Rome — and many of them came to him in his lodging and conferred with him. Those chief men of the Jews expressed their great desire to hear from him what his thoughts were in regard to the hope of Israel (~~<408>~~ Acts 28:22); and naturally all the Jews in Rome would be equally

desirous to gain this information from a man of the outstanding position and character of Paul. The Jewish community in Rome had for years past been permeated with the hope of the coming of the Messiah; indeed successive rumors of false Christs had kept them in a fever of excitement, which, on one occasion at least, had broken out in tumult, so strong was their hope of His speedy appearing. Thus it would come about, as a matter of course, that the gospel would reach all the Jews in Rome, and from this knowledge of Jesus, whom Paul proclaimed, the Jews who were in the service of the emperor could not possibly be excluded.

5. THE GOSPEL CARRIED BY PAUL'S SOLDIER-GUARD:

But besides this, the fact that Paul was in daily contact and intercourse with the soldiers who guarded him could not fail to lead to the introduction of the gospel into Gospel the regiment. And as part of the Praetorian Guard was quartered in buildings on the Palatine Hill, attached to the emperor's palace there, there was thus one other channel through which the gospel would be made known to some of those who resided in the palace of Caesar. It is thus seen that there is nothing at all surprising in the fact that there were Christians in Caesar's household.

6. LIGHTFOOT'S CONJECTURE:

Some of Lightfoot's suggestions and conjectures on this subject are exceedingly interesting. He reviews the names of the persons to whom Paul sends greeting in Romans 16 and compares them with the names of persons who lived at that time, and which have been found in monumental inscriptions on the columbaria or places of sepulture exhumed on the Appian Way. Many of the occupants of those columbaria were freedmen or slaves of the emperors, and were contemporaries of Paul. The result of Lightfoot's review of the names is that he claims to have established a fair presumption that among the salutations in Romans 16 some members at least of the imperial household are included (Phil, 177).

In the household of the emperor there were necessarily many persons of high rank. Perhaps we may find a hint that the gospel had been embraced by some in the higher grades of society, in such strange facts as the execution of Titus Flavius Clemens, a man of consular rank and cousin to the emperor, and also in the fact that Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Flavius Clemens, was banished by Domitian, notwithstanding her near relationship to him, for she was the emperor's niece. Her daughter Portia also shared in

the same punishment of exile. The charges brought against all three were atheism and inclination to Jewish customs: surely such charges were sufficiently vague and even self-contradictory. The opinion has been suggested that probably these three persons in the inner circle of the emperor's kinsmen were Christians.

7. ARISTOBULUS AND NARCISSUS:

Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, etc., 353), speaking of Lightfoot's conjectures, already referred to, writes, "In all probability he is right in thinking that all the slaves of Aristobulus (son of Herod the Great) and of Narcissus (Claudius' favorite freedman) had passed into the imperial household, and that members of their two families are saluted as Christians by Paul (~~<610>~~ Romans 16:10 ff)."

The fact of greatest interest in the whole subject is, that in society so profligate and corrupt as the court of Nero, there were "saints," Christian men whose garments were clean and who kept themselves unspotted from the world amid surroundings so dreadful and in temptation so unceasing; that the gospel was known and obeyed and loved, and that hearts and lives were loyal to Christ even in the palace of Nero Caesar.

John Rutherford

CAGE

<kaj> (bwl K)[kelubh]; [φυλακή, phulake]): The earliest known form of cage made to confine a bird, for the pleasure of its song or the beauty of its coloring, was a crude affair of willows or other pliable twigs. Later cages were made of pottery, and now they are mostly made of wire. References in the Bible make it very clear that people were accustomed to confine in cages such birds as they especially prized for pets, or to detain them for market purposes. James indicated that cages were common when he wrote (3:7): "For every kind of beasts and birds is tamed, and hath been tamed by mankind." In Job (41:5) we find these lines

*"Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?
Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?"*

The only way to play with a bird is to confine it so that it grows accustomed to you and thus loses fear. Jeremiah compared the civil state of Judah to a "cage (crate) full of birds" (5:27), "the houses of the rich being

stuffed with craftily-obtained wealth and articles of luxury” (HDB). The sale of sparrows as an article of food still continues in the eastern markets. Jesus referred to this (~~4019~~ Matthew 10:29) and it was He who entered the temple and overthrew “the seats of them that sold the doves” (~~4012~~ Matthew 21:12). In ~~6682~~ Revelation 18:2 we find a reference to “a hold (the King James Version “cage”) of every unclean and hateful bird.” See also Ecclesiasticus 11:30.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CAIAPHAS

<ka'-a-fas>, <ki'-a-fas> ([~~αἰάφας~~, Kaiaphas]; Caiaphas = Kephas (compare Dods in Expositor's Greek Test, I, 803), and has also been interpreted as meaning “depression”): Caiaphas was the surname of Joseph, a son-in-law of Annas (compare ~~6183~~ John 18:13), who filled the post of high priest from about 18-36 AD, when he was deposed by Vitellius (compare Josephus, Ant, XVIII, ii, 2; iv, 3). He is mentioned by Luke as holding office at the time of John the Baptist's preaching in the wilderness (~~4042~~ Luke 3:2).

Caiaphas took a leading part in the trial and condemnation of Jesus. It was in his court or palace that the chief priests (Sadducees) and Pharisees, who together constituted the Sanhedrin, assembled “that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him” (compare ~~4008~~ Matthew 26:3,4; ~~6140~~ John 11:49). The regal claims of the new Messiah and the growing fame of His works had made them to dread both the vengeance of imperial Rome upon their nation, and the loss of their own personal authority and prestige (compare ~~6148~~ John 11:48). But Caiaphas pointed a way out of their dilemma: let them bide their time till the momentary enthusiasm of the populace was spent (compare ~~4015~~ Matthew 26:5), and then by the single sacrifice of Jesus they could at once get rid of a dangerous rival and propitiate the frowns of Rome (compare ~~6140~~ John 11:49,50; 18:14). The commentary of John upon this (~~6151~~ John 11:51,52) indicates how the death of Jesus was indeed to prove a blessing not only for Israel but also for all the children of God; but not in the manner which the cold-blooded statecraft of Caiaphas intended. The advice of the high priest was accepted by the Sanhedrin (~~6153~~ John 11:53), and they succeeded in arresting Jesus. After being led “to Annas first” (~~6183~~ John 18:13), Jesus was conducted thence in bonds to Caiaphas (~~6180~~ John 18:24), According to Matthew He was led immediately upon His arrest to Caiaphas (~~4057~~ Matthew 26:57). Mark and Luke do not refer to

Caiaphas by name. His conduct at this preliminary trial of Jesus (^{<126>}Matthew 26:57-68), its time and its procedure, were almost entirely illegal from the standpoint of then existing Jewish law (compare *JESUS CHRIST, TRIAL OF*; and A. Taylor Innes, *The Trial of Jesus Christ*). False witnesses were first called, and when Jesus refused to reply to their charges, Caiaphas asked of Him if He were “the Christ, the Son of God” (^{<126>}Matthew 26:63). Upon our Lord’s answering “Thou hast said” (^{<126>}Matthew 26:64), Caiaphas “rent his garments, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy” (^{<126>}Matthew 26:65). Upon this charge was Jesus found “worthy of death” (^{<126>}Matthew 26:66). Caiaphas is also mentioned in ^{<106>}Acts 4:6 as being among those who presided over the trial of Peter and John.

C. M. Kerr

CAIN

<kan> (ִּיָּקַן [qayin], “spear” or “smith,” resembling in sound the root [qanah], “get,” “acquire,” ^{<1006>}Genesis 4:1 the Revised Version, margin, but not necessarily derived from that root; Septuagint [*ἄϊν*, Kain]):

1. THE SCRIPTURE NARRATIVE:

(1) In ^{<1006>}Genesis 4:1-24 Cain is the first son of Adam and Eve. His birth is hailed as a manifestation of Yahweh’s help. He becomes “a tiller of the ground,” and brings to Yahweh an offering of the produce of the soil, his brother Abel, the shepherd, bringing at the same time the fat of the first-born of his own flock. From Cain and from his offering Yahweh withholds the sign of acceptance which he grants to Abel. That the ground of this difference of treatment is to be found (so ^{<8106>}Hebrews 11:4) in Cain’s lack of right disposition toward Yahweh is shown by his behavior (*see ABEL*). Instead of humbling himself he gives signs of strong indignation at Yahweh’s refusal to favor him. Under the just rebuke of Yahweh he hardens his heart and is further confirmed in impenitence. His jealousy of Abel, unrepented of, increases until it culminates in deliberate murder. Deliberate, for in ^{<1008>}Genesis 4:8 we must restore a clause to the Hebrew text, all the ancient versions bearing witness, and read “And Cain said unto Abel his brother, Let us go into the field,” etc. In the vain attempt to conceal his crime Cain adds falsehood to his other sins. He is cursed

“from,” i.e. away from, that soil upon which he poured out his brother’s blood, and must become a fugitive and a wanderer, far from the immediate presence of Yahweh. Although his remonstrance against the severity of his sentence displays no genuine contrition, still Yahweh in pity appoints a “sign” for his protection. Cain takes up his abode in the land of Nod (“wandering”), and there builds a city and becomes the ancestor of a line which includes Jabal, forefather of tent-dwelling cattle-keepers; Jubal, forefather of musicians; Tubal-cain, forefather of smiths; and Lamech, like Cain, a man of violence. In Cain’s character we see “a terrible outburst of selfwill, pride, and jealousy, leading to a total and relentless renunciation of all human ties and affection.” “Among the lessons or truths which the narrative teaches may be instanced: the nature of temptation, and the manner in which it should be resisted; the consequences to which an unsubdued temper may lead a man; the gradual steps by which in the end a deadly crime may be committed; the need of sincerity of purpose lest our offering should be rejected; God’s care for the guilty sinner after he has been punished; the interdependence upon one another of members of the human race; and the duties and obligations which we all owe to each other” (Driver). In ^{שׁוֹרָה} Hebrews 11:4 Cain’s spiritual deficiency is pointed out; ^{אֶבְרָם} 1 John 3:12 observes his envy and jealousy, as “of the wicked one,” and ^{אֶבְרָם} Jude 1:11 makes him a very type of the ungodly.

2. DIFFICULTIES:

With few and bold strokes the story of Cain as it stands paints for us the character of the first of murderers and the scene of his detection and condemnation. To the religious purpose of the narrative all other things are made tributary. But if we can not refrain from putting the familiar question, Who was Cain’s wife? it is also impossible upon close study of Genesis 4, as it stands, to avoid asking what was the nature of the sign of Yahweh’s acceptance (verse 4), or of the “sign” appointed for Cain (verse 15); or what we are to think of the introduction in the midst of the narrative, without explanation, of such important institutions as sacrifice (verses 3,4) and blood-revenge (verse 14); who were the persons of whom Cain stood in fear (verse 14); who inhabited the city he built (verse 17); how the wanderer and fugitive could become the city-builder; and why the shepherd life should be represented as beginning with Abel (verse 2) and again with Jabal (verse 20); also whether the narrator means that not only the collection of men in cities (verse 17), but also animal husbandry, music and metal-working (verse 20-22) are to be looked upon with disfavor as having

sprung from Cain or from his descendants? Most of these questions find their answers in one consideration: the narrative is not exhaustively complete and is not intended to be so. That a large body of racial traditions existed, from which, with the severest condensation, the author of Genesis selected his material, is the conclusion forced by close examination of the Genesis narrative and comparison of it with the most ancient extant traditions. "In Genesis 4 these old stories are not told for their own sakes. The incompleteness and the difficulties left unsolved do not allow this assumption to be made. They form simply the material foundation, to which higher ideas and doctrines are attached" (Dillmann).

3. CRITICAL THEORIES:

Without going outside the Scripture text we may find strong evidence that the narrative under consideration is founded in part upon ancient sources. Let the line of Cain (~~<OCH7>~~ Genesis 4:17-24) be compared with that of Seth (~~<OCH7>~~ Genesis 5:1-29):

The Hebrew forms of the names show even more clearly that Cain = Kenan, Irad = Jared, Methushael = Methuselah; a single transposition, that of the first and third names after Cain, brings the two Enochs together, and likewise the similar names Mehujael and Mahalalel. Thus we have six names nearly or quite identical; seven ancestors in one list and ten in the other, ending in both cases with a branching into three important characters. Resemblances equally certain, though not by any means so obvious, exist between the names in this double list and the names of the ten kings of Babylonia who reigned before the Flood, as the latter are given by Berosus, the Babylonian historian of the 3rd century BC (see Skinner, Driver, Sayce as below). Thus one source of which the author in Genesis 4 made use appears to have been an ancient list in genealogical form, by which the first of mankind was linked with the beginnings of civilized institutions and articles. Another part of his material was the story of a brother's murder of a brother (4:1-16). Many maintain at this point that the narrative must be based upon the doings of tribes, rather than of individuals. It is true that not seldom in the Old Testament tribal history is related under individual names (compare Genesis 49; Jgs 1, and the tables of tribes in ~~<OCH7>~~ Genesis 25:1-4; 36); yet the tribe referred to can hardly be the Kenites of the Old Testament, who appear as the close allies of Israel, not especially bloodthirsty or revengeful, and haunted by no shadow of early crime against a brother tribe (*see KENITES*). The indications in

~~<0001>~~Genesis 4:1-16 of a developed state of society and a considerable population may go to show that the narrative of the murder was not originally associated with the sons of the first man. Thus there is room to suppose that in the process of condensation and arrangement Cain, son of Adam; Cain, the murderer; and Cain, city-builder and head of a line of patriarchs, have been made one. The critical conclusions here epitomized are indeed reached by a delicate and difficult process; but it is asserted in their favor that they make possible the removal of difficulties which could be explained in no other manner. The question which will arise with many, What theory of inspiration can be held consistently with the application of such critical processes? is dealt with at length by most modern commentators (*see CRITICISM; INSPIRATION*).

LITERATURE.

A. Dillmann, Genesis (English translation); S. R. Driver, Genesis ("Westminster Commentaries"); H. E. Ryle, Early Narratives of Genesis; J. Skinner, Genesis (ICC); A. H. Sayce, "Archaeology of the Book of Genesis," The Expositor T, August, 1910, June, 1911.

(2) In ~~<0057>~~Joshua 15:57, the Revised Version (British and American) *KAIN*, which see.

See also KENITES.

F. K. Farr

CAINAN

~~<ka'-nan>~~, ~~<ka-i'-nan>~~ ([~~αἰνάν~~, Kainan]):

(1) Greek form of Kenan (~~<0037>~~Luke 3:37): also the King James Version form in Old Testament (except ~~<0002>~~1 Chronicles 1:2).

(2) A son of Arphaxad (~~<0036>~~Luke 3:36), omitted in ~~<0004>~~Genesis 10:24; 11:12.

CAKE

See BREAD.

CALAH

<ka'-la> (𐎵 𐎠 " K;[kalach]; [ἁλαχ, Chalach], also [Chalak] or [Kalach]; in Assyrian Kalhu, Kalha, Kalhi, Kalah): The name of one of the great cities of Nimrod (^{<𐎠𐎵𐎠𐎵>}Genesis 10:11), or rather, Asshur (text), which formed, with Nineveh, Resen between Calah and Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir (probably lying more to the North), Asshur's great fourfold capital. The meaning of the name is unknown, but if a Sumerian etymology be accepted, some such signification as "Holy Gate" (Ka-lah) or the like — a parallel to Ka-dingira = Bab-ili, "Gate of God" (*see BABEL, BABYLON*) — might be regarded as possible.

1. DATE OF THE CITY'S FOUNDATION:

As Nineveh is mentioned by Hammurabi, who reigned about 2000 BC, it is clear that that city was already, in his time, an important place; and the passage in ^{<𐎠𐎵𐎠𐎵>}Genesis 10:11 implies, though it does not actually prove, that Calah was of about the same period.

2. EARLY REFERENCES TO THE CITY:

The Assyrian king Assur-nacir-apli (circa 885 BC) states that Calah was made (probably = founded) by Shalmaneser

(I) circa 1300 BC, but this is possibly simply an indication that he rebuilt it. Later on, the site seems to have become neglected, for Assur-nacir-apli states that, the city having fallen into ruin, he rebuilt it, and it thereafter became practically the capital of the country, for he not only reerected or restored its shrines and temples — the temple of Ninip, with the god's image; the temple of "the Lady of the Land," and the temples of Sin, Gula, and Enlil — but he also received tribute there. Among his other works may be mentioned the water-channel Pati-chengala, and the plantations, whose fruits, apparently, he offered to the god Assur (Asshur), and the temples of the city. It also became a favorite place of residence for the later kings of Assyria, who built palaces, and restored the city's temples from time to time.

3. ITS POSITION:

Calah occupied the roughly triangular tract formed by the junction of the Greater Zab with the Tigris, which latter stream in ancient times flowed

rather closer to the western wall than it does now, and would seem to have separated the small town represented by Selamiyeh from the extensive ruins of Calah, which now bear the name of Nimroud. The main ruins are situated on a large, rectangular platform on the bank of the old bed of the Tigris.

4. THE TEMPLE-TOWER:

The most prominent edifice was the great Temple-tower at the Northwest corner — a step-pyramid (ziq-qurat) like the Bah towers, constructed of brick faced with stone, and rising, in stages, to a height of circa 126 ft., probably with a sanctuary at the top (*see BABEL, TOWER OF*). A long vault occupies the basement-stage of this structure, and caused Sir A. H. Layard, its discoverer, to regard it as the probable traditional tomb of Ninus, under whose shadow the tragedy of Pyramis and Thisbe took place. Ovid (*Metam.* iv.98) describes the tomb of Ninus as having been situated “at the entrance of Nineveh,” and, if this be correct, Calah must have been regarded as the southern portion of that great city, which, on a preaching journey, may well have taken three days (*Jon* 3:3) to traverse, provided Khorsabad was in reality its northern extremity.

5. THE TEMPLES AND PALACES:

The platform upon which the temple-tower of Calah was situated measures circa 700 x 400 yds., and the portion not occupied by that erection afforded space for temples and palaces. In the center of the East side of this platform lie the remains of the palace of Assur-nacir-apli, the chambers and halls of which were paneled with sculptured and inscribed slabs, the principal doorways being flanked with finely carved winged and human-headed lions and bulls. In the Southeast corner are the remains of the palace of Esarhaddon, built, at least in part, with material taken from the palace of Tiglath-pileser IV, which was situated in the South portion of the platform. The remains of this last are, as a result of this spoliation, exceedingly meager. The Southwest corner of the platform contains the remains of the last palace built on the site — a very inferior erection constructed for Assur-etil-ilani (circa 626 BC).

6. THE TEMPLE OF NINIP:

One of the temples on this platform was that dedicated to Ninip, situated at the Southwest corner of the temple-tower. The left-hand entrance was

flanked by man-headed lions, while the sides of the right-hand entrance were decorated with slabs showing the expulsion of the evil spirit from the temple — a spirited sculpture now in the Nimroud Gallery of the British Museum. On the right-hand side of the entrance was an arch-headed slab with a representation of King Assur-nacir-apli in low relief, standing in the usual conventional attitude. Before it stood a stone tripod altar, implying that Divine honors were paid to this king. (Both these are now in the British Museum.) The remains of another temple were found to the East of this, and there are traces of further buildings at other points of the platform.

7. THE SCULPTURES OF ASSUR-NACIR-APLI:

The slabs from Assur-nacir-apli's palace show this king's warlike expeditions, but as descriptive lettering is wanting, the campaigns cannot be identified. Notwithstanding this disadvantage, however, they are of considerable importance, showing, as they do, incidents of his various campaigns — the crossing of rivers, the march of his armies, the besieging of cities, the reception of tribute, the life of the camp and hunting the lion and the wild bull. The reliefs from the temples, which are much larger and finer, show the king engaged in various religious ceremonies and ritual acts, and are among the most striking examples of Assyrian sculpture. When looking at these works of art, the student's thoughts go back with thankfulness to those Assyrians who, through the generations, cared for and preserved these monuments, though the vandalism of Esarhaddon in dressing off the slabs of Tiglath-pileser IV to carve his own bas-reliefs thereon will ever be regretted.

8. THE CITY WALLS:

The site is described as being 14 miles South of Kouyunjik (Nineveh) and consists of an enclosure formed of narrow mounds still having the appearance of walls. Traces of no less than 108 towers, the city's ancient defenses, are said to be visible even now on the North and East, where the walls were further protected by moats. The area which the walls enclose — about 2,331 x 2,095 yards — would contain about 1,000 acres.

Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains*, and *Nineveh and Babylon*, still remain the standard works upon the subject, and his *Monuments of Nineveh* gives the most complete collection of the sculptures found. See also George Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, and Rassam, *Asshur and the Land of Nimrod*.

CALAMITY

<ka-lam'-i-ti> (**dyae'**edh], “a load” or “burden” under which one is crushed, hence, “misfortune”; **hyh''** [hayyah], **hwh''** [hawwah], “fall,” “ruin,” the latter word used only in the plural; [**r'**][ra`], “evil in essence” hence, “adversity,” once only, ^{<1910>}Psalm 141:5, the Revised Version (British and American) “wickedness”): Purely an Old Testament term, signifying adversities — natural, but more often those that result from wickedness or moral evil. Various kinds:

- (1) folly, “a foolish son” (^{<2013>}Proverbs 19:13);
- (2) disease, poverty, bereavement, as in Job’s experience (^{<1812>}Job 6:2; 30:13);
- (3) persecution (^{<1779>}2 Samuel 22:19; ^{<1918>}Psalm 18:18);
- (4) Divine retribution and judgment (^{<1525>}Deuteronomy 32:35); compare ruin of the wicked (^{<1013>}Proverbs 1:26, also 27 the Revised Version (British and American) for “destruction” the King James Version);
- (5) the devastation of war (^{<2442>}Jeremiah 46:21
- (6) adversities of any kind (^{<1270>}Proverbs 27:10).

Dwight M. Pratt

CALAMOLALUS

<kal-a-mol'-a-lus>, <-mol-a'-lus> (Codex Alexandrinus, [**αλαμωλάλος**, Kalamolalos], Codex Vaticanus, [**αλαμωκάλος**, Kalamokalos]): This name is corrupt (1 Esdras 5:22). It has evidently arisen through combining the two names Lod and Hadid, in the lists of Ezra (2:33) and Nehemiah (7:37).

CALAMUS

<kal'-a-mus>.

See REED.

CALCOL; CHALKOL

<kal'-kol>, <kal'-kol> (𐤀 𐤊𐤏𐤊𐤏 [kalkol]): Mentioned in <108>1 Kings 4:31 as one of the wise men with whom Solomon was compared. The better orthography is Calcol which the King James Version gives for the same name in <316>1 Chronicles 2:6. In the former passage, Calcol is the son of Mahol, while in the latter he is called the son of Zerah of the tribe of Judah, and a brother of Heman and Ethan.

CALDRON

<kol'-drun> (the rendering of 𐤊𐤏𐤊𐤏𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 [qallachath], 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤓 [cir], 𐤔𐤕𐤕𐤓 [dudh] 𐤀𐤌𐤒𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 ['aghmon]) : [Qallachath] is found only in <1024>1 Samuel 2:14; <316>Micah 3:3. It is a pot for cooking, of undefined size and characteristics, in the former passage for sanctuary use, in the latter for domestic. [Cir] is translated caldron in <2013>Jeremiah 1:13 (Revised Versions); <2528>Jeremiah 52:18 f(the King James Version); <2108>Ezekiel 11:3,7,11. It was distinctly a large pot, employed both for domestic use and in the sanctuary. [Dudh] is translated caldron only in <4513>2 Chronicles 35:13. It was also a pot for cooking. ['Aghmon] is translated caldron by the King James Version in <3817>Job 41:20, but it is a mistranslation; the Revised Version (British and American) correctly has “rushes.”

George Ricker Berry

CALEB

<ka'-leb> (𐤀 𐤊𐤏𐤊𐤏 [kalebh]; in the light of the cognate Syriac and Arabic words, the meaning is not “dog,” which is 𐤀 𐤊𐤏𐤊𐤏 [kelebh], in Hebrew, but “raging with canine madness”; [αλέβ, Chaleb]): As a person, Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, occurs in the story of the spies (Numbers 13 ff). He represents the tribe of Judah as its prince (<108>Numbers 13:6; compare 13:2). While the majority of the men sent out by Moses bring back evil report, Caleb and Hoshea, or Joshua, the son of Nun, are the only ones to counsel the invasion of the promised land (<1030>Numbers 13:30; 14:6 ff). Accordingly, these two alone are permitted to survive (<1048>Numbers 14:38; 32:12). Upon the conquest and distribution of the land by Joshua, Caleb reminds the leader of the promise made by God through Moses, and so he receives Hebron as an inheritance for himself and his descendants

(^{<6446>}Joshua 14:6-15), after driving out from thence the Anakim who were in possession of the city (^{<6654>}Joshua 15:14). In the parallel account in ^{<0008>}Judges 1:8 ff, the dispossession of the Canaanite inhabitants of Hebron is ascribed to Judah (verse 10). Both accounts agree in mentioning Othniel, a younger brother of Caleb, as the conqueror of Kiriath-sepher or Debir; as his reward he receives the hand of Achsah, Caleb's daughter. Achsah is given by her father a portion of the Southland; but, upon request, she obtains a more fruitful locality with upper and nether springs (^{<6655>}Joshua 15:15-19; ^{<0012>}Judges 1:12-15).

In ^{<0814>}1 Samuel 30:14 Caleb is undoubtedly the name of a clan which is, moreover, differentiated from Judah. Modern scholars therefore assume that Caleb was originally an independent clan which in historical times merged with Judah. As Caleb is called the son of Kenaz (^{<0013>}Judges 1:13) or the Kenizzite (^{<0612>}Numbers 32:12), it is further believed that the Calebites were originally associated with an Edomite clan named Kenaz (^{<0331>}Genesis 36:11), and that they entered their future homes in the southern part of Palestine from the south. Their migration up north would then be reflected in the story of the spies.

In the genealogical tables (1 Chronicles 2), Caleb is made a descendant of Judah through his father Hezron. He is the brother of Jerahmeel, and the "father" of Hebron and of other towns in Judah. (Chelubai, ^{<0309>}1 Chronicles 9:9, is apparently identical with Caleb.)

Nabal, with whom David had an encounter, is called a Calebite, i.e. one belonging to the house of Caleb (^{<0208>}1 Samuel 25:3).

Max. L. Margolis

CALEB-EPHRATHAH

<ka'-leb ef'-ra-tha>, *<-ef'-ra-ta>* (the King James Version Caleb-ephratah, <http://bl.ks>[kalebh 'ephratah]): The place where Hezron died (^{<0324>}1 Chronicles 2:24). Many scholars, however, read with the Septuagint "after the death of Hezron, Caleb came unto Ephrath, the wife of Hezron, his father." The name does not occur elsewhere, and none resembling it has been recovered.

CALENDAR

<kal'-en-dar> (Latin *calendarium*, “an account book,” from [calendae], “day on which accounts were due”): The Hebrew or Jewish calendar had three stages of development: the preexilic, or Biblical; the postexilic, or Talmudic; and the post-Talmudic. The first rested on observation merely, the second on observation coupled with calculation, and the third on calculation only. In the first period the priests determined the beginning of each month by the appearance of the new moon and the recurrence of the prescribed feasts from the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. Thus, the month [Abib (‘abhibh)], the first month of the year according to the Levitical law, in which the Passover was to be celebrated, was determined by observation (**<012>**Exodus 12:2; Deuteronomy 16). After the exile more accurate methods of determining the months and seasons came into vogue, and calculation was employed to supplement and correct observations and the calendar was regulated according to the Babylonian system, as is evidenced by the names of the months which are derived from it. In later times the calendar was fixed by mathematical methods (see the article “Calendar” in the Jewish Encyclopedia). The difficulty of ascertaining the first day of the new moon by observation, in the early period, led to the celebration of two days, as seems to be indicated in **<017>**1 Samuel 20:27. We have only four names of months belonging to the pre-exilic period, and they are Phoenician. Of these [Abib (‘abhibh)] was the first month, as already indicated, and it corresponded to [Nis (nican)] in the later calendar. It was the month in which the Exodus occurred and the month of the Passover (**<013>**Exodus 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; **<016>**Deuteronomy 16:1).

The 2nd month of this calendar was [Ziv (ziw)] (**<016>**1 Kings 6:1,37); [Ethaniam (‘ethanim)] was the 7th (**<018>**1 Kings 8:2), corresponding to [Tishri] of the later calendar, and [Bul (bul)] the 8th, corresponded to [Marchesvan (marcheshwan)] (**<015>**1 Kings 6:38). There were course other month names in this old calendar, but they have not come down to us. These names refer to the aspects of the seasons: thus [Abib (‘abhibh)] means grain in the ear, just ripening (**<014>**Leviticus 2:14; **<013>**Exodus 9:31); [Ziv (ziw)] refers to the beauty and splendor of the flowers in the spring; [Ethaniam (‘ethanim)] means perennial, probably referring to living fountains; and [Bul (bul)] means rain or showers, being the month when the rainy season commenced. The full calendar of months used in the postexilic period is given in a table accompanying this article. The names given in the table are not all found in the Bible, as the months are usually

referred to by number, but we find [Nican] in ^{<1610>}Nehemiah 2:1 and Est 3:7; [Siwan] in Est 8:9; [Tammuz] in ^{<1609>}Ezekiel 8:4, although the term as here used refers to a Phoenician god after whom the month was named; ['Elul] occurs in ^{<1615>}Nehemiah 6:15; [Kiclew] (the American Standard Revised Version "chislev") in ^{<1610>}Nehemiah 1:1 and ^{<1601>}Zechariah 7:1; [Tebheth] in Est 2:16; [ShebhaT] in ^{<1607>}Zechariah 1:7 and ['Adhar] in ^{<1615>}Ezra 6:15 and several times in Est. These months were lunar and began with the new moon, but their position in regard to the seasons varied somewhat because of the intercalary month about every three years.

The year (^{hnv};^{shana}h)) originally began in the autumn, as appears from ^{<1236>}Exodus 23:16 and 34:22, where it is stated that the feast of Ingathering should be at the end of the year; the Sabbatic year began, also, in the 7th month of the calendar year (^{<16218>}Leviticus 25:8-10), indicating that this had been the beginning of the year. This seems to have been a reckoning for civil purposes, while the year beginning with [Nican] was for ritual and sacred purposes. This resulted from the fact that the great feast of the Passover occurred in this month and the other feasts were regulated by this, as we see from such passages as ^{<1234>}Exodus 23:14-16 and ^{<1610>}Deuteronomy 16:1-17. Josephus (Ant., I, iii, 3) says: "Moses appointed that [Nican], which is the same with [Xanthicus], should be the first month of their festivals, because he brought them out of Egypt in that month; so that this month began the year as to all solemnities they observed to the honor of God, although he preserved the original order of the months as to selling and buying and other ordinary affairs." A similar custom is still followed in Turkey, where the Mohammedan year is observed for feasts, the pilgrimage to Mecca and other sacred purposes, while the civil year begins in March O.S.

The year was composed of 12 or 13 months according as to whether it was ordinary or leap year. Intercalation is not mentioned in Scripture, but it was employed to make the lunar correspond approximately to the solar year, a month being added whenever the discrepancy of the seasons rendered it necessary. This was regulated by the priests, who had to see that the feasts were duly observed at the proper season. The intercalary month was added after the month of ['Adhar] and was called the second ['Adhar] (^{ynlve} [sheni], ^{rdaw}['wa-'adhar], "and Adar"), and, as already indicated, was added about once in 3 years. More exactly, 4 years out of every 11 were leap years of 13 months (Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Calendar"), this

being derived from the Babylonian calendar. If, on the 16th of the month [Nican], the sun had not reached the vernal equinox, that month was declared to be the second [ʿAdhar] and the following one [Nican]. This method, of course, was not exact and about the 4th century of our era the mathematical method was adopted. The number of days in each month was fixed, seven having 30 days, and the rest 29. When the intercalary month was added, the first [ʿAdhar] had 30 and the second 29 days.

H. Porter

CALF

<kaf> (l għeghel]; rP" [par], or rP;[par], often rendered "bullock"): The etymology of both words is uncertain, but the former has a close parallel in the Arabic ʿijl, "calf." [Par] is generally used of animals for sacrifice, [ʿeghel], in that and other senses. [ʿEghel] is used of the golden calves and frequently in the expression, [ʿeghel marbeq], "fatted calf," or "calf of the stall," the latter being the literal meaning (^{<983>}1 Samuel 28:24; ^{<342>}Jeremiah 46:21; ^{<306>}Amos 6:4; ^{<302>}Malachi 4:2).

At the present day beef is not highly esteemed by the people of the country, but mutton is much prized. In the houses of the peasantry it is common to see a young ram being literally stuffed with food, mulberry or other leaves being forced into its mouth by one of the women, who then works the sheep's jaw with one hand. The animal has a daily bath of cold water. The result is deliciously fat and tender mutton. Such an animal is called a [maʿluf]. From the same root we have [maʿlaf], "manger," suggestive of the Hebrew [marbeq], "stall."

The calf for sacrifice was usually a male of a year old. Other references to calves are: "to skip like a calf" (^{<926>}Psalm 29:6); "the calf and the young lion and the fatling together" (^{<306>}Isaiah 11:6); "a habitation deserted there shall the calf feed, and there shall he lie down, and consume the branches thereof" (^{<270>}Isaiah 27:10).

See CATTLE.

Alfred Ely Day

CALF, GOLDEN

<kaf>, <gol'-d'-n>:

I. THE NAME.

The term **l gēḡēghel**], is the ordinary Hebrew name for a male calf and is as flexible as the English name, applying to any animal from one a year old (^{<306>}Micah 6:6) or perhaps younger (^{<308>}Leviticus 9:3; 12:6) to one three years old (^{<159>}Genesis 15:9; compare ^{<248>}Jeremiah 34:18,19). It has been thought that the habitual use of this diminutive term for the golden bulls which Aaron and Jeroboam set up — especially as it is twice made feminine (^{<305>}Hosea 10:5; 13:2) — was intended to indicate their small size and thus to express contempt for them. This however, though plausible, is by no means certain. It was not their size which made these bulls contemptible in the eyes of the prophets, and besides there were no life-size bulls of molten gold in any surrounding countries so far as known. The reference to female calves that were kissed (^{<282>}Hosea 13:2), presumably at Bethel, may refer not to the worship of the bulls, but to their female counterparts, since in all other countries such female deities invariably accompanied the bull gods. Bethel may be especially mentioned because it was the “king’s sanctuary” (^{<307>}Amos 7:13) or because of the multitude of altars and high places found there (^{<308>}Hosea 10:8; compare 8:11; ^{<306>}Amos 5:26). False worship is also mentioned in connection with Jeroboam’s apostasy, at Gilgal and Gilead (^{<304>}Hosea 4:15; 12:11; ^{<304>}Amos 4:4; 5:5), Samaria (^{<306>}Hosea 8:6; 10:5; 13:2,16); and Beersheba (^{<305>}Amos 5:5; 8:14) where no bulls had been set up by Jeroboam so far as stated. That these places receive more condemnation than Dan — which is explicitly mentioned in only one passage (^{<304>}Amos 8:14) though it was a chief center of the bull worship (^{<123>}1 Kings 12:30) — may be due to the fact that the worship of the female deity was the more popular. This was certainly true in neighboring countries and also in other cities in Palestine, as has recently been proved by the excavations (see below).

II. ANCIENT CALF WORSHIP.

The origin of animal worship is hidden in obscurity, but reverence for the bull and cow is found widespread among the most ancient historic cults. Even in the prehistoric age the influence of the bull symbol was so powerful that it gave its name to one of the most important signs of the Zodiac, and from early historic times the horns of the bull were the familiar emblem of the rays of the sun, and solar gods were very commonly represented as bull-gods (Jensen, [Kosmologie], 62-90; Winckler, [Altorientalische Forschungen], 1901-5, passim; Jeremias, [Das Alter der

bah. *Astronomie*], 1909, *passim*). The Egyptians, close neighbors of the Hebrews, in all eras from that of the Exodus onward, worshipped living bulls at Memphis (not Mendes, as EB) and Heliopolis as incarnations of Ptah and Ra, while one of the most elaborate rituals was connected with the life-size image of the Hathor-cow (Naville, [Deir el Bahari], Part I (1907), 163-67), while the sun was revered as the “valiant bull” and the reigning Pharaoh as “Bull of Bulls.” But far more important in this connection is the fact that “calf” worship was almost if not quite universal among all the ancient Semitic peoples. If the immediate ancestors of Abraham did not revere this deity, they were certainly quite unlike their relatives, the Babylonians, among whom, according to all tradition, they lived before they migrated to Palestine (⁰¹¹²⁸Genesis 11:28,30; Josephus, *Ant*, I, vi, 5), for the Babylonians revered the bull as the symbol of their greatest gods, An and Sin and Marduk — the ideograph of a young bullock forming a part of the latter’s name — while Hadadrimmon, an important Amorite deity, whose attributes remarkably resemble those of Yahweh (see Ward, *AJSL*, XXV, 175-85; Clay, [Amurru] (1909), 87-89), is pictured standing on the back of a bull. In Phoenicia also the bull was a sacred animal, as well as in northern Syria where it ranked as one of the chief Hittite deities its images receiving devout worship (see further, Sayce, *Encyclopedia of Rel. and Ethics*, under the word “Bull”). Among all these peoples the cow goddess was given at least equal honor. In Babylonia the goddess Ishtar has the cow for her symbol on very ancient seal cylinders, and when this nude or half-nude goddess appears in Palestine she often stands on a bull or cow (see William Hayes Ward, *Cylinders and Other Ancient Oriental Seals*), and under slightly different forms this same goddess is revered in Arabia, Moab, Phoenicia, Syria and elsewhere, while among the Semitic Canaanites the bull was the symbol of Baal, and the cow of Astarte (see particularly Barton, *Hebraica*, IX, 133-63; X, 1-74, and *Semitic Origins*, chapter vii; Driver, “Astarte” in *DB*). Recent excavations in Palestine have shown that during all eras no heathen worship was as popular as that of Astarte in her various forms (see S. A. Cook, *Rel. of Ancient Palestine*, 1909). That she once is found wearing ram’s horns (PEFS (1903), 227) only reveals her nature more clearly as the goddess of fertility. Her relation to the sacred fish at Carnion in Gilead and to the doves of Ascalon, as well as to female prostitution and to Nature’s “resurrection” and fruitage, had been previously well known, as also her relation to the moon which governs the seasons. Is there any rational motif which can account for this widespread “calf” worship? Is it conceivable

that this cult could so powerfully influence such intelligent and rather spiritually-minded nations as the Egyptians and Babylonians if it were wholly irrational and contained no spiritual content? And is there no rational explanation behind this constant fusion of the deity which controls the breeding of cattle with the deity which controls vegetation? How did the bull come to represent the “corn spirit,” so that the running of a bull through the corn (the most destructive act) came to presage good crops; and how did the rending of a bull, spilling his life blood on the soil, increase fertility? (See Fraser, *Golden Bough*, II, 291-93, 344.) The one real controlling motif of all these various representations and functions of the “calf” god may be found in the ancient awe, especially among the Semites, for the Mystery of Life. This seems to offer a sufficient reason why the bull, which is a most conspicuous example of life-giving power, should be so closely connected with the reproductive processes of the animal and vegetable kingdoms and also with the sun, which from earliest historic times was considered as preeminently the “giver of life.” Bull worship was not always an exhibition of gross animalism, but, certainly in Bible times, often represented a concept which was the product of reflection upon one of the deepest mysteries of Nature. Few hymns in Egypt or Babylon express higher spiritual knowledge and aspiration than those addressed to the bull gods or to others honored with this title, e.g. this one to the god Sin of Ur, the “heifer of Anu,” “Strong young bull; with strong horns, with beard of lapislazuli color self-created, full of developed fruit Mother-womb who has taken up his abode, begetter of all things, exalted habitation among living creatures; O merciful gracious father, in whose hand rests the life of the whole world; O Lord, thy divinity is full of awe like the far-off heaven and the broad ocean!” (Rogers, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1908), 164). Many modern scholars believe that the primitive Egyptians and Babylonians really thought of their earthly and heavenly gods as animals (see especially Maspero, *Bulletin critique*, 1886; *Revue de l’histoire des religions*, 1888), but it seems certain that at least as early as the date of the Exodus these stars and beasts were not regarded by all as being themselves deities, but rather as symbols or representations of deity (Davis and Cobern, *Ancient Egypt*, 281-89; Brugsch, *Die Aegyptologie*, I, 135; Chwolson, *Die Ssabier u. der Ssabismus*, II, 134).

1. Narrative of Aaron’s Golden Calf:

The text of Exodus 32 is certainly composite (see e.g. Bacon’s “Exodus” in the place cited. and DB), and some words and phrases are a verbal dupli

care of the narrative of Jeroboam's calf worship (compare ^{<1230>}Exodus 32:4 with ^{<1128>}1 Kings 12:28, and see parallel columns in Driver's Deuteronomy). Some Bible critics so analyze the text as to make the entire calf story a later element, without ancient basis, added to some short original statement like ^{<1231>}Exodus 32:7-11, for the sake of satirizing Jeroboam's bull worship and its non-Levitical priesthood (see e.g. Kuenen, *Hexateuch*). Most recent critics have however accepted the incident as an ancient memory or historic fact attested by the oldest sources, and used thus by the Deuteronomist (Deuteronomy 9), though the verbal form may have been affected by the later editor's scorn of the northern apostasy. It seems clearly unreasonable to suppose that a Hebrew writer at any era would so fiercely abuse his own ancestors, without any traditional basis for his statements, merely for the sake of adding a little more which cast reproach upon his northern neighbors, and it seems equally unlikely that any such baseless charges would have been accepted as true by the slandered nation. The old expositors, accepting the essential historicity of the account, generally followed Philo and the early Fathers in supposing this calf of gold was an image of the Apis or Mnevis bulls of Egypt, and this is occasionally yet advocated by some Egyptologists (e.g. Steindorf, *Ancient Egypt* (1903), 167; compare also Jeremias, *Old Testament in Light of Ancient East* (1911), II, 138). The objections made to this view by the skeptics of the 18th century, based on the supposed impossibility of such chemical and mechanical skill being possessed at that era, have mostly been made obsolete by recent discovery. The common modern objection that this could not have been Apis worship because the Apis was a living bull, is by no means conclusive, since images of Apis are not uncommon and were probably worshipped in the temple itself. It may be added that a renaissance of this worship occurred at this very era. So Erman, *Handbook of Egyptian Rel.* (1907), 23-79. Modern Bible scholars, however, are practically unanimous in the opinion that the Golden Calf, if worshipped at all, must have been a representation of a Semitic, not an Egyptian, deity. In favor of this it may be suggested:

- (1) It was an era when each deity was considered as the god of a particular country and it would seem impossible that a native Egyptian god should be thought of as joining with Egypt's enemies and assisting them to reach a land over which he had no control.
- (2) The Israelite religion shows little influence from Egypt, but was immensely influenced from Canaan and Babylon, Apis only being

mentioned once (^{<246D>}Jeremiah 46:20 (translated “heifer”); compare ^{<241E>}Ezekiel 20:7,8, and see Brugsch, *Steinschrift und Bibelwort*, passim, and Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, 217).

(3) The bull and cow are now known to have been ordinary symbols for the most popular deities which were worshipped by all the race-relatives of the Hebrews and nowhere more devoutly than in Canaan and in the adjoining districts (see above).

(4) Some of the chief gods of the pasture land of Goshen, where the Hebrews had resided for centuries (^{<047E>}Genesis 47:6; 50:8), were Semitic gods which were worshipped not only by the Edomitic Bedouin and other foreigners living there by the “pools of Pithom” (compare ^{<001E>}Exodus 1:11) but by the native Egyptians, Ramses II even naming a daughter after one of these. The special god of this district had as its symbol a bull calf, and one inscription actually speaks of the statue of a “golden calf of 600 pounds weight” which it was the custom to dedicate annually to one of these Semitic gods, while another inscription mentions a statue of gold “a cubit in height” (Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (1905), III, 630-38; Naville, *Goshen, Store City of Pithom*; Erman, *Handbook*; 173-74; Brugsch, *op. cit.*).

(5) The chief proof, however, is the statement of the text that the feast in connection with this worship was a “feast to Yahweh” (^{<031E>}Exodus 32:5). When Moses disappeared for forty days in the Mount, it was not unnatural that the people should turn back to the visible symbols worshipped by their ancestors, and should give to them the new name or new attributes which had been attached to deity by Moses. The worship was condemned for much the same reason as that of Jeroboam’s calves (see next section).

2. Jeroboam’s Golden Calves:

Though this passage (^{<112E>}1 Kings 12:26-33; compare ^{<4004>}2 Chronicles 10:14,15) may have been reedited later, “there is no reason to infer that any detail of fact is underived from the olden time” (Burney, *Hebrew Text of Kings* (1902), and DB). These calves which Jeroboam set up were doubtless bulls (^{<112E>}1 Kings 12:28, Hebrew) but at least as early as Hosea’s time it seems probable (see above) that the more licentious worship of the feminine principle had been added to the official worship (^{<230E>}Hosea 10:5; 13:2, Hebrew). This which else here naturally and

universally accompanied the bull worship could most truly be called “the sin of Samaria” (^{<3084>}Amos 8:14) and be classed as the “sin of Jeroboam” (^{<1149>}1 Kings 14:9,16; 16:26; ^{<1209>}2 Kings 10:29). There is no sufficient reason for explaining the term “molten” in any other than its most natural and usual sense (^{<1238>}Exodus 32:8,24; ^{<1276>}2 Kings 17:16; ^{<1896>}Deuteronomy 9:16), for molded metal idols were common in all eras in Palestine and the surrounding countries, though the core of the image might be molten or graven of some inferior metal overlaid with gold (^{<2312>}Isaiah 30:22; 40:19, Hebrew; ^{<1875>}Deuteronomy 7:25; ^{<1304>}Exodus 32:4). These bull images were undoubtedly intended to represent Yahweh (yet compare Robertson, op. cit., and Orr, Problem of Old Testament (1906), 145). The text explicitly identifies these images with Aaron’s calf (^{<1128>}1 Kings 12:28), so that nearly all the reasons given above to prove that Aaron’s image represented not an Egyptian but an ancient Semitic deity are equally valid here. To these various other arguments may be added:

(1) The text itself states that it is Yahweh who brought them from Egypt (^{<815>}Hosea 2:15; 12:13; 13:4), whom they call “My lord,” and to whom they swear (^{<816>}Hosea 2:16, King James Version margin; ^{<815>}Hosea 4:15); and to whom they present their wine offerings, sacrifices and feasts (^{<883>}Hosea 8:13; 9:4,5, Hebrew; compare ^{<308>}Amos 5:8).

(2) Jehu, though he destroyed all Baal idols, never touched these bulls (^{<1208>}2 Kings 10:28,29).

(3) The ritual, though freer, was essentially that of the Jerusalem temple (^{<1123>}1 Kings 12:32; ^{<886>}Hosea 5:6; ^{<3045>}Amos 4:5; 5:22,23; see, Oettli, Greifswalder Studien (1895), quoted in DB, I, 342).

(4) Even the southern prophets recognized that it was Yahweh who had given Jeroboam the kingdom (^{<1113>}1 Kings 11:31; 12:15,24) and only Yahweh worship could have realized Jeroboam’s purpose of attaching to the throne by this cult such devout citizens as would otherwise be drawn to Jerusalem to worship. It was to guard against this appeal which the national sanctuary made to devout souls that this counter worship had been established. As Budde says, “A foreign cult would only have driven the devout Ephraimites the more surely over to Jerusalem” (Rel. of Israel (1899), 113). Jeroboam was not attempting to shock the conscience of his religious adherents by making

heathenism the state religion, but rather to win these pious worshippers of Yahweh to his cause.

(5) The places selected for the bull worship were places already sacred to Yahweh. This was preeminently true of Bethel which, centuries before Jerusalem had been captured from the Jebusites, had been identified with special revelations of Yahweh's presence (^{<0133>}Genesis 13:3,4; 28:19; 31:13; 35:15; ^{<0076>}1 Samuel 7:16; ^{<2824>}Hosea 12:4).

(6) The story shows that the allegiance of his most pious subjects was retained (^{<1123>}1 Kings 12:20) and that not even Elijah fled to the Southern, supposing that the Northern Kingdom had accepted the worship of heathen gods as its state religion. Instead of this, Elijah, though the boldest opponent of the worship of Baal, is never reported as uttering one word against the bull worship at Daniel and Bethel.

III. ATTITUDE OF ELIJAH TO THE BULL SYMBOLS.

This surprising silence is variously explained. A few scholars, though without any historic or textual evidence for the charge, are sure that the Bible narratives (though written by southern men) are fundamentally defective at this point, otherwise they would report Elijah's antagonism to this cult. Other few, equally without evidence, are comfortably sure that he fully approved the ancient ancestral calf cult. Others, with more probability, explain his position on the ground that, though he may not have favored the bull symbol — which was never used by the Patriarchs so far as known, and certainly was not used as a symbol of Yahweh in the Southern Kingdom, or Hosea the northern prophet would have spoken of it — yet being himself a northern man of old ideals and simple habits, Elijah may have believed that, even with this handicap, the freer and more democratic worship carried on at the ancient holy places in the North was less dangerous than the elaborate and luxurious ritual of the aristocratic and exclusive priesthood of the South, which insisted upon political and religious centralization, and was dependent upon such enormous revenues for its support (compare ^{<1120>}1 Kings 12:10,14). At any rate it is self-evident that if Elijah had turned against Jeroboam and the state religion, it would have divided seriously the forces which needed to unite, in order to oppose with all energy the much fouler worship of Baal which just at this crisis, as never before or afterward, threatened completely to overwhelm the worship of Yahweh.

IV. ATTITUDE OF AMOS AND HOSEA TO THE BULL SYMBOLS.

It is easy to see why Hosea might fiercely condemn a ritual which Elijah might rightly tolerate.

(1) This calf worship may have deteriorated. Elijah lived closer to the time when the new state ritual was inaugurated and would naturally be at its best. Hosea lived at an era when he could trace the history of this experiment for nearly two cents, and could see clearly that these images had not helped but greatly hindered the development of the ethical and spiritual religion of Yahweh. Even if at first recognized as symbols, these images had become common idols (^{<3821>}Hosea 12:11; 13:2, and passim). “This tiring became a sin” (^{<4120>}1 Kings 12:30; 13:34). The history of religion shows many such instances where the visible or verbal symbol which in one era had been a real aid to devotion at a later time became positively antagonistic to it (*see IMAGES*). As Baal was also worshipped under the form of a calf and as Yahweh himself was at times called “Baal” (^{<2515>}Isaiah 54:5; ^{<2512>}Jeremiah 31:32; ^{<3816>}Hosea 2:16 Hebrew) this unethical tendency would be accelerated, as also by the political antagonism between Judah and Ephraim and the bitter hatred between the two rival priesthoods (compare ^{<4415>}2 Chronicles 11:15; 13:9). Certain it is that by the middle of the 8th century the worship at Daniel and Bethel had extended itself to many other points and had become so closely affiliated with the heathen worship as to be practically indistinguishable — at least when viewed from the later prophetic standpoint. But

(2) it cannot be doubted that the prophetic standpoint had changed in 200 years. As the influence of the northern worship had tended toward heathenism, so the influence of the southern worship of an imageless god had tended toward higher spiritual ideals. Elijah could not have recognized the epoch-making importance of an imageless temple. The constant pressure of this idea — God is Spirit — had developed a new spiritual conscience, which by the 8th century was so keen that the worship of Yahweh under the form of an image was not improperly considered as almost if not quite as bad as out-and-out heathenism, just as the Reformers of the 16th century regarded the Roman Catholic images as little better than idols (^{<3885>}Hosea 8:5,6; 11:2; 13:2; compare ^{<2716>}2 Kings 17:16,17). The influence of this new conscience is also seen

in the fact that it is not simply or perhaps chiefly the “calves” which are condemned, but the spirit of ungodliness and unkindness which also made the orthodox worship in Jerusalem little if any better than that at Bethel (~~2004~~ Hosea 6:4; 5:12,14). The influence of this theology — God is Spirit — had so filled the souls of these prophets that even the sacrifices had lost their importance when unaccompanied by kindness and spiritual knowledge (~~2006~~ Hosea 6:6; 7:1), and it is the absence of this essential spirit, rather than the form of worship, which Amos and Hosea condemn in the Northern Kingdom (~~2006~~ Amos 2:6-8; 3:10; 4:1; 5:7,12-15,21-24; 6:12; 8:4-6; ~~2002~~ Hosea 4:2,3; 9:1; 10:12-14). These later prophets could also see, as Elijah could not possibly have seen, that unity of worship was imperatively needed, and that sacrifices in the old sacred “high places” must be discontinued. Only thus could superstitious fanaticism and religious disintegration be avoided. A miscellaneous and unregulated Yahweh cult might become almost as bad as heathenism. Indeed it might be worse if it gave the Baal spirit and interpretation to Yahweh worship.

See also ASTROLOGY, II, 2.

LITERATURE.

Besides references above, see especially commentaries of Dillmann and Driver on Exodus; Kuenen, Religion of Israel; W. R. Smith, Religion of Semites, 93-113 and index; Konig, Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte; Baeth gen, Beitr. zur semit. Religionsgeschichte; Kittel, History of Hebrews; “Baal” and “Ashtoreth” in Encyclopedia of Rel. and Ethics (full lit.); “Golden Calf” in Jewish Encyclopedia for Rabbinical and Mohammedan lit.

Camden M. Cobern

CALF IMAGE

See IMAGES.

CALITAS

<kal'-i-tas> ([αλιτάς, Kalitas], or [αλειταίς, Kaleitais]): One of the Levites who put away their foreign wives at the request of Esdras (Ezra), 1 Esdras 9:23, “Colius, who was called Calitas.” It is the Greek form of

Hebrew Kelita (compare parallel passage, ^{<1502>}Ezra 10:23, elaiiah, the same is Kelita”). He is also named with those who explained the law when read to the people by Esdras (1 Esdras 9:48; compare ^{<1607>}Nehemiah 8:7). It is not certain whether he is to be identified with the Kelita of ^{<1600>}Nehemiah 10:10 (one of the Levites who signed the covenant made by Nehemiah). The word probably means “dwarf.”

D. Miall Edwards

CALKER

^{<kok'-er>}.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

CALLING

^{<kol'-ing>} ([^{λῆσις}, klesis], from [kaleo], “I call”): Is a New Testament expression. The word is used chiefly by Paul, though the idea and term are found also elsewhere. It has a definite, technical sense, the invitation given to men by God to accept salvation in His kingdom through Jesus Christ. This invitation is given outwardly by the preaching of the gospel, inwardly by the work of the Holy Spirit. With reference to Israel, it is on the part of God irrevocable, not repented of. Having in His eternal counsel called this people, He entrusted them with great gifts, and because He did thus enrich them, He also, in the course of time, summoned them to fulfill the task of initiating the world into the way of salvation, and of preparing salvation for the world. Therefore, He will not desert His people, for He Will not revoke that call (^{<1612>}Romans 11:29). This calling is high or upward, in Christ, that is, made in heaven by God on account of Christ and calling man to heaven (^{<1614>}Philippians 3:14). Similarly it is a heavenly calling (^{<1606>}Hebrews 3:1); also a holy calling, holy in aim, means, and end (2 Tim 1:9). Christians are urged to walk worthy of this calling (^{<1600>}Ephesians 4:1) (the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but the King James Version has “vocation”). In it there is hope; it is the inspirer of hope, and furnishes for hope its supreme object (^{<1604>}Ephesians 4:4). Men are exhorted so to live that God will count them worthy of their calling (2 Thess 1:11). They are also urged to make their calling and election sure (2 Pet 1:10). *See ELECTION.* There is a somewhat peculiar use of the word in ^{<1612>}1 Corinthians 1:26 and 7:20, namely, that condition of life in which men were when God called them, not many of them wise

after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, some circumcised, some uncircumcised, some bond, some free, some male, some female, some married, some unmarried.

George Henry Trever

CALLISTHENES

<ka-lis'-the-nez> ([αλλισθένης, Kallisthenes]): An officer of Nicanor who was charged with the burning of the sacred portals of the temple at the time of the desecration under Antiochus Epiphanes (168 BC). After the decisive defeat of Nicanor's army at Emmaus (165 BC) the Jews celebrated the victory in the city of their fathers and burned C. who had fled into an outhouse with others who had set the sacred gates on fire, "the meet reward of their impiety" (2 Macc 8:33).

CALNEH

<kal'-ne> (hneK" [kalneh]; [αλαννή, Chalanne): The name of the fourth city of Nimrod's kingdom (<0100>Genesis 10:10), the three preceding it being Babel, Erech, and Accad, i.e. the capital of the realm of Babylonia and the chief cities of three of the principal states. The meaning of the name is unknown, and many regard the identification as uncertain.

1. IDENTIFIED WITH NIPPUR:

G. Rawlinson thought it to be the modern Niffer (or Noufar), comparing the Talmudic (compare Yoma') Nopher, which is said to be the same as Calneh. What place-name Calneh corresponds with in cuneiform is doubtful. Fried. Delitzsch (Wo lag das Paradies?) compared it with Kulunu, but as we are told to pronounce this group as Kullaba, it seems unlikely that there is any connection between the two. The identification proposed by G. Rawlinson, however, may be regarded as being supported by the bilingual Creation-legend, in which Merodach (= Nimrod) is made the founder of Babylon, Erech and Nippur, which would in that case be three of the four cities mentioned in <0100>Genesis 10:10.

2. NIPPUR'S IMPORTANCE:

The inscriptions reveal to us Nippur as a city with a glorious past. Sargon of Agade, Sur-Engur, Dungi and all the more prominent kings of Babylonia

in its larger sense interested themselves in the rebuilding and restoration of its renowned temples, so as to gain the favor of their great divinities.

3. ITS DEITIES AND THEIR LEGENDS:

The city's earlier divine patrons were Enlil and Ninlil, the older Bel and Beltis, whose shrines were at the great temple-tower called E-kura, "the house of the land," and a poetical legend in Sumerian (dialectal) recording their visit to the city, and enumerating its sacred places, still exists (PSBA, March, 1911, 85 ff). Later, the chief deities of the city seem to have been Ninip, the son of Enlil, and his spouse Nin-Nipri, "the lady of Nippur." These two divine beings likewise evoked the muse of the city-scribes, who dealt with the glories of the god in a composition extending over several tablets, in which his favor to his spouse Nin-Nipri is extolled; and to whom a career very similar to that of Merodach, the head of the Babylonian pantheon, is attributed (PSBA, December, 1906, 270 ff).

4. ITS RUINS TODAY:

The great temple-tower of Niffer, which was dedicated to the god Enlil, was a very striking object among the buildings and temples of the city, and the lower stages are still in an extremely perfect condition. Most interesting, also, are the remains of streets and houses which enable the general conditions of life in ancient Babylonia to be estimated, and suggest that they are similar to those subsisting even at the present day. Our knowledge of the city is almost entirely due to the American excavations at Niffer, inaugurated by J. P. Peters, which have been most fruitful and have shed quite a new light on the city's history. See Peters' Nippur (2 volumes, 1887); the many volumes written or edited by Professor H. V. Hilprecht under the general title The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania; and Professor A. T. Clay's Light on the Old Testament from Babel (Philadelphia, 1907).

T. G. Pinches

CALNEH; CALNO

<kal'-ne>, <kal'-no> **hl p" K"** (kalneh] (<3000>Amos 6:2), **wQ K"** [kalno] (<2300>Isaiah 10:9)): "Probably the Kulnia (Kullani) associated with Arpad and Hadrach, Syrian cities, in the Assyrian 'tribute' list (Western

Asiatic Inscriptions, II, 53, number 3); Kullanhu about six miles from Arpad” (HDB, I, 344, and 1-vol HDB, 109).

CALPHI

<kal’-fi>

See CHALPHI.

CALVARY

<kal’-va-ri>.

See GOLGOTHA.

CALVES, OF THE LIPS

<kavz>, (Septuagint: [καρπὸν χειλέων, karpon cheileon]): This is the King James Version rendering of a dubious Hebrew text in ^{<384D>}Hosea 14:2 (Wnytp̄c]myrP;[parim sephathenu]). The Revised Version (British and American) runs “So will we render as bullocks the offering of our lips.” Strange as the text is, it may be retained, and it admits of at least a possible explanation. The prophet calls on his contemporaries to return in penitence to Yahweh. Their worship should consist not of meaningless dumb ritual, but of “words” — hymns and prayers, expressive of real gratitude and of actual needs — or perhaps pledges of repentance and reform. The people respond and undertake that their worship shall consist of “calves or bullocks of lips,” i.e. not of animal offerings, but of promises of reform or vows of obedience. But this explanation is forced and most modern commentators follow the Septuagint, which presupposes a slightly different Hebrew text, and renders Wnytp̄c]yrP;[peri sephathenu], “fruit of our lips,” i.e. adoring gratitude or, as the author of the Epistle to the He, who quotes this verse from the Septuagint, explains it, “sacrifice of praise” (^{<38315>}Hebrews 13:15). The same phrase occurs in ^{<25719>}Isaiah 57:19, where it signifies gladsome gratitude.

T. Lewis

CAMBYSES

<*kam-bi'-sez*> (Aram., *yznbnk* [c-n-b-n-z-y]; Persian, Kambujiya; Assyrian, Kambuzia; Egyptian, Kambythet; Susian, Kanpuziya): The older son of Cyrus, king of Persia. Some have thought that he is the Ahasuerus of ¹⁵⁹¹⁶Ezra 4:6. This seems to be most improbable, inasmuch as the Hebrew form of Ahasuerus is the exact equivalent of the Old Persian form of Xerxes, and we have no evidence that Cambyses was ever called Xerxes.

Ancient authorities differ as to who was the mother of Cambyses. It is variously said that she was Cassandane, a Persian princess, Amytis, a Median princess, or Nititis, a daughter of Apries king of Egypt. He had one brother, Bardes or Smerdes, whom he put to death secretly shortly after his accession, probably because of an attempted rebellion. Cambyses organized an expedition for the conquest of Egypt, which was rendered successful by internal treachery and by the aid of the Phoenician, Cyprian and Greek fleets. During this campaign Cambyses seems to have acted with good generalship and with clemency toward the conquered. After the subjugation of Egypt, Cyrene and Barca, the modern Tripoli, submitted to his sway. He then desired to undertake the conquest of Carthage, but was compelled to give it up, because his Phoenician allies, without whose ships it was impossible for him to conduct his army in safety, refused to join in an attack upon a country that had been colonized by them. He is said to have sent an army of 50,000 men against the oasis of Jupiter Ammon. This army is said to have perished in the sands. A little less unsuccessful expedition was made against Ethiopia. After some initial successes, Cambyses was forced to return to Egypt with the shattered remains of his army. He found that the Egyptians were in revolt, led by their king Psammetichus III, whose life he had formerly spared. This revolt was put down with great harshness, the Egyptian king being taken and executed, and many of the temples being destroyed. Shortly after this, Cambyses heard that a certain Magian, who claimed to be his brother Smerdes whom he had secretly put to death, had set himself up as king of Persia, and that almost the whole of his Asiatic dominions had acknowledged him as king. With the fragments of his army he started toward Persia to attack the usurper, but on the way was killed by a wound inflicted by himself, it is uncertain whether by accident or with intention. His general and cousin, Darius Hystaspis, soon put down the false Smerdis and reigned in his stead.

For two or more years Cambyses was king of Babylon, while his father was king of the lands. The son was a drunkard and subject to fits of unbridled passion, but seems to have been of good capacity as a general and as an administrator. Many of the tales that have been told against him were doubtless invented by his enemies, and he has left us no records of his own. That he married his own sisters is probable; but it must be remembered that this was the custom of the Egyptian kings of that time and may have been of the Persian kings as well. As to his conduct in Egypt, the only contemporary Egyptian authority says that he worshipped before the holiness of Neit as all the pious kings had done, that he ordered that the temple of Neit should be purified, and that its revenues should be restored as they had been before they had been confiscated by Akhmes for his Greek troops. He adds also that not merely were the strangers who had taken up their abode in the temple of Neit ejected from her sanctuary, but that their goods were taken away and their houses destroyed. Darius Hystaspis, the only other contemporary source of information, says of him simply that he was the son of Cyrus, of the same father and mother as Bardes, whom he slew secretly at some time before he set out on his Egyptian campaign; and that he died by suicide shortly after he had heard of the rebellion of Persia, Media and the other provinces against him, and of the establishment of Gaumata the Magian as king under the claim that he was "Barzia, the son of Cyrus and brother of Cambyses."

The name of Cambyses is found in three of the Elephantine papyri recently published (September, 1911) by Professor Sachau of Berlin. The fragment numbered 59 1 is so broken that it is impossible to make out the connection or the sense. In papyrus I, we are told that when Cambyses came to Egypt he found in the fortress of Yeb (Elephantine) a temple or synagogue (['agora']), which had been built in the days of the Egyptian kings; and that although he had torn down the temples of the Egyptian gods, he had allowed no harm to be done to that of Yahweh. The third papyrus is so interesting, because of its mention of Bagoas, the Persian governor of Jerusalem in 407 BC, who had hitherto been known only from Josephus, and of Dalayah the son of the Sanballat who opposed the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem in the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, that we shall now give a translation of it in full: "A memorial of that which Bagoas and Dalayah said to me: Thou shalt say in Egypt unto Arsames with regard to the house of the altar of the God of heaven that was built in the fortress of Yeb before the time of Cambyses and which the accursed(?) Waidrang

destroyed in the 14th year of Darius the king, that it shall be built again upon its place as it was before, and that meal-offerings and incense-offerings shall be offered upon that altar as they used to be.”

LITERATURE.

For further information as to the history of Cambyes see Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*; Prasek, *Geschichte der Meder und Perser*; the Behistun inscription in the editions of the various recensions by Bezold, Spiegel, Weisbach, Thomson, and King; Herodotus; Josephus; the Sachau papyri; and Petrie, *History of Egypt*, III.

R. Dick Wilson

CAMEL

<kam'-el> (| mḡ:[gamal]; [κάμηλος, kamelos]; rkB,[bekher], and hrkBi[bikhrāh] (^{<3116>}Isaiah 60:6; ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 2:23 “dromedary,” the American Revised Version, margin “young camel”), vkr {rekhes} (^{<1028>}1 Kings 4:28; *see HORSE*), twΘKr” Ki[kirkaroth] (^{<2761>}Isaiah 66:20, “swift beasts,” the American Standard Revised version. “dromedaries”); μykMrh; ynB] [bene ha-rammakhim] (Est 8:10, “young dromedaries,” the American Standard Revised Version “bred of the stud”); μynh:TV] ” a] [achashteranim] (Est 8:10,14, the King James Version “camels,” the American Standard Revised Version “that were used in the king’s service”)): There are two species of camel, the Arabian or one-humped camel or dromedary, [*Camelus dromedarius*], and the Bactrian or two-humped camel, [*Camelus bactrianus*]. The latter inhabits the temperate and cold parts of central Asia and is not likely to have been known to Biblical writers. The Arabian camel inhabits southwestern Asia and northern Africa and has recently been introduced into parts of America and Australia. Its hoofs are not typical of ungulates but are rather like great claws. The toes are not completely separated and the main part of the foot which is applied to the ground is a large pad which underlies the proximal joints of the digits. It may be that this incomplete separation of the two toes is a sufficient explanation of the words “parteth not the hoof,” in ^{<8114>}Leviticus 11:4 and ^{<8147>}Deuteronomy 14:7. Otherwise these words present a difficulty, because the hoofs are completely separated though the

toes are not. The camel is a ruminant and chews the cud like a sheep or ox, but the stomach possesses only three compartments instead of four, as in other ruminants. The first two compartments contain in their walls small pouches, each of which can be closed by a sphincter muscle. The fluid retained in these pouches may account in part for the power of the camel to go for a relatively long time without drinking.

The Arabian camel is often compared with justice to the reindeer of the Esquimaux. It furnishes hair for spinning and weaving, milk, flesh and leather, as well as being an invaluable means of transportation in the arid desert. There are many Arabic names for the camel, the commonest of which is *jamal* (in Egypt *gamal*), the root being common to Arabic, Hebrew and other Semitic languages. From it the names in Latin, Greek, English and various European languages are derived. There are various breeds of camels, as there are of horses. The riding camels or dromedaries, commonly called [*hajin*], can go, even at a walk, much faster than the pack camels. The males are mostly used for carrying burdens, the females being kept with the herds. Camels are used to a surprising extent on the rough roads of the mountains, and one finds in the possession of [*fellachin*] in the mountains and on the littoral plain larger and stronger pack camels than are often found among the Bedouin. Camels were apparently not much used by the Israelites after the time of the patriarchs. They were taken as spoil of war from the Amalekites and other tribes, but nearly the only reference to their use by the later Israelites was when David was made king over all Israel at Hebron, when camels are mentioned among the animals used for bringing food for the celebration (^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 12:40). David had a herd of camels, but the herdsman was Obil, an Ishmaelite (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:30). Nearly all the other Biblical references to camels are to those possessed by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Ishmaelites, Amalekites, Midianites, Hagrites and the “children of the East” (*see* EAST). Two references to camels (^{<1126>}Genesis 12:16; ^{<1193>}Exodus 9:3) are regarded as puzzling because the testimony of the Egyptian monuments is said to be against the presence of camels in ancient Egypt. For this reason, Genesis 12 through 16, in connection with Abram’s visit to Egypt, is turned to account by Canon Cheyne to substantiate his theory that the Israelites were not in Egypt but in a north Arabian land of Mucri (*Encyclopaedia Biblica* under the word “Camel,” 4). While the flesh of the camel was forbidden to the Israelites, it is freely eaten by the Arabs.

There are three references to the camel in New Testament:

(1) to John's raiment of camel's hair (^{<1004>}Matthew 3:4; ^{<1006>}Mark 1:6);

(2) the words of Jesus that "it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (^{<1004>}Matthew 19:24; ^{<1005>}Mark 10:25; ^{<1005>}Luke 18:25);

(3) the proverb applied to the Pharisees as blind guides, "that strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel" (^{<1004>}Matthew 23:24). Some manuscripts read [ho kamilos], "a cable," in ^{<1004>}Matthew 19:24 and ^{<1005>}Luke 18:25.

There are a few unusual words which have been translated "camel" in text or margin of one or the other version. (See list of words at beginning of the article) [Bekher] and [bikhrah] clearly mean a young animal, and the Arabic root word and derivatives are used similarly to the Hebrew.

[Rakhash], the root of [rekhash], is compared with the Arabic rakad, "to run," and, in the Revised Version (British and American), [rekhash] is translated "swift steeds." [Kirkaroth, rammakhim] and [’achashteranim] must be admitted to be of doubtful etymology and uncertain meaning.

Alfred Ely Day

CAMEL'S HAIR

([τρίχες καμήλου, triches kamelou]): In ^{<1004>}Matthew 3:4 and ^{<1006>}Mark 1:6 the description of John's raiment is explicit to the extent of telling the kind of hair of which his raiment was made. It is probable that his garment was made of a tawed camel skin, for the more expensive woven camel's hair garment would not be in keeping with the rest of the description. It is still common among the poor in some parts of Syria, when a camel or other animal dies, to remove its skin and, after treating the inner surface to stop decomposition, to make it up into various domestic articles. The writer once saw a peasant dragging a skin along the road which proved to be that of a donkey which had just died on the route. His intention was probably to make it up into a cloak. Some believe that Elijah's mantle was of camel's hair (^{<1008>}2 Kings 1:8; compare ^{<1004>}Zechariah 13:4). Of that we cannot be sure, for in the East today the hairy garment is usually goat's hair or wool either woven or still clinging to the skin. It was much more likely to have been one of these latter. *See SHEEP RAISING*. Camel's hair, when woven into fabrics, as in rugs, makes an article of even softer and more glossy texture than wool.

See WEAVING.

CAMON

<ka'-mon> (ⲙⲟⲛⲓ[qamon], “standing-place,” ⲙⲟⲛⲓ Judges 10:5 the King James Version).

See *KAMON*.

CAMP

See *WAR*.

CAMPHIRE

<kam'-fir>.

See *HENNA*.

CANA, OF GALILEE

<ka'-na>, ([ⲁⲛⲁ ⲧⲉⲥ ⲁⲗⲓⲗⲁⲓⲁⲥ, Kana tes Galilaias]): This was the scene of Christ's earliest miracle, when, at the marriage feast, He turned water into wine (ⲁⲛⲁ John 2:1 ff). It was the home of Nathaniel (ⲁⲛⲁ John 21:2). From Cana, after the marriage, Jesus “went down” to Capernaum (ⲁⲛⲁ John 2:12), and returned at the request of the centurion (ⲁⲛⲁ John 4:46,51). These are the only notices of Cana in Scripture, and from them we learn merely that it was in Galilee, and in the uplands West of the lake. Other villages of the same name are mentioned by Josephus, but probably this one is intended by the Cana where for a time he dwelt (Vita, 16) which he locates in the plain of Asochis (ibid., 41). The Greek [kana] probably transliterates an old Hebrew [qanah], “place of reeds.” This ancient name survives in Khirbet Qana, a ruined site with rockhewn tombs, cisterns and a pool, on the northern edge of Sahl el-Battauf, the plain of Asochis. Near by are marshy stretches where reeds still abound: the name therefore is entirely appropriate. The name [Qana el-Jelil] , the exact Arabic equivalent of Kana tes Galilaias, is also heard among the natives. This, however, may have arisen from the suggested identification with Cana of the Gospel. The position agrees well enough with the Gospel data. Kefr Kennah, a thriving village about 3 3/4 miles from Nazareth, on the southern edge of Sahl Tor`an, the plain South of the range of that name,

through which the road from Nazareth to Tiberias passes, has also many advocates. This identification is accepted by the Greek and Latin churches, which have both built extensively in the village; the Greeks showing stone jars said to have been used in the miracle, and the traditional house of Nathaniel being pointed out. A copious spring of excellent water rises West of the village; and the pomegranates grown here are greatly prized. The change of name, however, from [Qana] to [Kennah] — (note the doubled n), is not easy; and there are no reeds in the neighborhood to give the name any appropriateness.

Onom locates Cana in the tribe of Asher toward Great Sidon, probably thinking of Kana, a village about 8 miles South of Tyre. The pilgrims of the Middle Ages seem to be fairly divided as to the two sites. Saewulf (1102), Brocardius (1183), Marinus Sanutus (1321), Breydenbach (1483) and Anselm (1507) favor the northern site; while on the side of [Kefr Kennah] may be reckoned Paula (383), Willibald (720), Isaac Chelo (1334) and Quaresimus (1616). It seems pretty certain that the Crusaders adopted the identification with Khirbet Kana (Conder, Tent Work, 69 f). While no absolute decision is possible, on the available evidence probability points to the northern site.

Col. Conder puts in a claim for a third site, that of `Ain Kana on the road from er-Reineh (a village about 1 1/2 mile from Nazareth on the Tiberias road) to Tabor (Tent Work, 81).

W. Ewing

CANAAN; CANAANITES

<ka'-nan>, <ka'-nan-its> (^ [ñK] [kena`an]; [αναάν, Chanaan]):

Canaan is stated in ⁴⁰⁰⁶Genesis 10:6 to have been a son of Ham and brother of Mizraim, or Egypt. This indicates the Mosaic period when the conquerors of the XVIIIth and XIXth Egyptian Dynasties made Canaan for a time a province of the Egyptian empire. Under the Pharaoh Menephtah, at the time of the Exodus, it ceased to be connected with Egypt, and the Egyptian garrisons in the South of the country were expelled by the Philistines, who probably made themselves masters of the larger portion of it, thus causing the name of Philistia or Palestine to become synonymous with that of Canaan (see Zeph 2:5). In the Tell el-Amarna Letters, Canaan is written Kinakhna and Kinakhkhi. The latter form corresponds with the

Greek ([**ϕῶν**, Chna]), a name given to Phoenicia (Hecat. Fragments 254; Eusebius, praep. Ev., i.10; ix.17).

1. GEOGRAPHY:

In ^{<0433>}Numbers 13:29 the Canaanites are described as dwelling “by the sea, and along by the side of the Jordan,” i.e. in the lowlands of Palestine. The name was confined to the country West of the Jordan (^{<0658>}Numbers 33:51; ^{<0629>}Joshua 22:9), and was especially applied to Phoenicia (^{<2331>}Isaiah 23:11; compare ^{<0452>}Matthew 15:22). Hence, Sidon is called the “firstborn” of Canaan (^{<0405>}Genesis 10:15, though compare ^{<0408>}Judges 3:3), and the Septuagint translates “Canaanites” by “Phoenicians” and “Canaan” by the “land of the Phoenicians” (^{<0465>}Exodus 16:35; ^{<0652>}Joshua 5:12). Kinakhkhi is used in the same restricted sense in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, but it is also extended so as to include Palestine generally. On the other hand, on the Egyptian monuments Seti I calls a town in the extreme South of Palestine “the city of Pa-Kana’na” or “the Canaan,” which Conder identifies with the modern Khurbet Kenan near Hebron.

As in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, so in the Old Testament, Canaan is used in an extended sense to denote the whole of Palestine West of the Jordan (^{<0425>}Genesis 12:5; 23:2,19; 28:1; 31:18; 35:6; 36:2; 37:1; 48:7; ^{<0455>}Exodus 15:15; ^{<0432>}Numbers 13:2; ^{<0640>}Joshua 14:1; 21:2; ^{<0451>}Psalms 135:11). Thus, Jerusalem which had Amorite and Hittite founders is stated to be of “the land of the Canaanite” (^{<0468>}Ezekiel 16:3), and Isaiah (19:18) terms Hebrew, which was shared by the Israelites with the Phoenicians and, apparently, also the Amorites, “the language of Caaan.” Jabin is called “the king of Canaan” in ^{<0400>}Judges 4:2,23,24; but whether the name is employed here in a restricted or extended sense is uncertain.

2. MEANING OF THE NAME:

As the Phoenicians were famous as traders, it has been supposed that the name “Canaanite” is a synonym of “merchant” in certain passages of the Old Testament. The pursuit of trade, however, was characteristic only of the maritime cities of Phoenicia, not of the Canaanitish towns conquered the Israelites. In ^{<2331>}Isaiah 23:11 we should translate “Canaan” (as the Septuagint) instead of “merchant city” (the King James Version); in ^{<2407>}Hosea 12:7 (8), “as, for Canaan” (Septuagint), instead of “he is a merchant” (the King James Version); in Zeph 1:11, “people of Canaan” (Septuagint), instead of “merchant people” (the King James Version); on

the other hand, "Canaanite" seems to have acquired the sense of "merchant," as "Chaldean" did of "astrologer," in ^{<2218>}Isaiah 23:8, and ^{<2081>}Proverbs 3:1:24, though probably not in ^{<342>}Zechariah 14:21, and ^{<3406>}Job 41:6 (Hebrew 40:30).

3. THE RESULTS OF RECENT EXCAVATION:

Much light has been thrown upon the history of Canaan prior to the Israelite occupation by recent excavation, supplemented by the monuments of Babylonia and Egypt. The Palestine Exploration led the way by its excavations in 1890-92 at Tell el-Hesi, which turned out to be the site of Lachish, first under Professor Flinders Petrie and then under Dr. Bliss. Professor Petrie laid the foundations of Palestine archaeology by fixing the chronological sequence of the Lachish pottery, and tracing the remains of six successive cities, the fourth of which was that founded by the Israelites. Between it and the preceding city was a layer of ashes, marking the period when the town lay desolate and uninhabited. The excavations at Lachish were followed by others at Tell es-Safi, the supposed site of Gath; at Tell Sandahanna, the ancient Marissa, a mile South of Bet Jibrin, where interesting relics of the Greek period were found, and at Jerusalem, where an attempt was made to trace the city walls. Next to Lachish, the most fruitful excavations have been at Gezer, which has been explored by Mr. Macalister with scientific thoroughness and skill, and where a large necropolis has been discovered as well as the remains of seven successive settlements, the last of which comes down to the Seleucid era, the third corresponding with the first settlement at Lachish. The two first settlements go back to the neolithic age. With the third the Semitic or "Amorite" period of Canaan begins; bronze makes its appearance; high-places formed of monoliths are erected, and inhumation of the dead is introduced, while the cities are surrounded with great walls of stone. While Mr. Macalister has been working at Gezer, German and Austrian expeditions under Dr. Schumacher have been excavating at Tell em-Mutesellim, the site of Megiddo, and under Dr. Sellin first at Tell Taanak, the ancient Taanach, and then at Jericho. At Taanach cuneiform tablets of the Mosaic age were found in the house of the governor of the town; at Samaria and Gezer cuneiform tablets have also been found, but they belong to the late Assyrian and Babylonian periods. At Jericho, on the fiat roof of a house adjoining the wall of the Canaanitish city, destroyed by the Israelites, a number of clay tablets were discovered laid out to dry before being inscribed with cuneiform characters. Before the letters were written

and dispatched, however, the town, it seems, was captured and burnt. An American expedition, under Dr. Reisner, is now exploring Sebastiyeh (Samaria), where the ruins of Ahab's palace, with early Hebrew inscriptions, have been brought to light, as well as a great city wall built in the age of Nebuchadrezzar.

4. HISTORY:

(1) *Stone Age.*

The history of Canaan begins with the paleolithic age, paleolithic implements having been found in the lowlands. Our first knowledge of its population dates from the neolithic period. The neolithic inhabitants of Gezer were of short stature (about 5 ft. 4 inches in height), and lived in caves — at least in the time of the first prehistoric settlement — and burned their dead. Their sacred place was a double cave with which cup-marks in the rock were connected, and their pottery was rude; some of it was ornamented with streaks of red or black on a yellow or red wash. In the time of the second settlement a rude stone wall was built around the town. The debris of the two neolithic settlements is as much as 12 ft. in depth, implying a long period of accumulation.

(2) *Bronze Age.*

The neolithic population was succeeded by one of Semitic type, which introduced the use of metal, and buried its dead. The name of Amorite has been given to it, this being the name under which the Semitic population of Canaan was known to the Babylonians. Gezer was surrounded by a great wall of stone intersected by brick towers; at Lachish the Amorite wall was of crude brick, nearly 29 ft. in thickness (compare ~~1:28~~ Deuteronomy 1:28). A “high-place” was erected at Gezer consisting of 9 monoliths, running from North to South, and surrounded by a platform of large stones. The second monolith has been polished by the kisses of the worshippers; the seventh was brought from a distance. Under the pavement of the sanctuary lay the bones of children, more rarely of adults, who had been sacrificed and sometimes burnt, and the remains deposited in jars. Similar evidences of human sacrifice were met with under the walls of houses both here and at Taanach and Megiddo. In the Israelite strata the food-bowl and lamp for lighting the dead in the other world are retained, but all trace of human sacrifice is gone. At Lachish in Israelite times the bowl and lamp were filled with sand. The second “Amorite” city at Gezer had a long existence. The

high-place was enlarged, and an Egyptian of the age of the XIIth Dynasty was buried within its precincts. Egyptian scarabs of the XIIth and XIIIth Dynasties are now met with; these give place to scarabs of the Hyksos period, and finally to those of the XVIIIth Dynasty (1600 BC). Hittite painted pottery of Cappadocian type is also found in the later debris of the city as well as seal-cylinders of the Babylonian pattern.

(3) *A Babylonian Province.*

Meanwhile Canaan had for a time formed part of the Babylonian empire. Gudea, viceroy of Lagas under the kings of the Dynasty of Ur (2500 BC), had brought "limestone" from the "land of the Amorites," alabaster from Mt. Lebanon, cedar-beams from Amanus, and gold dust from the desert between Palestine and Egypt. A cadastral survey was drawn up about the same time by Uru-malik, "the governor of the land of the Amorites," the name by which Syria and Canaan were known to the Babylonians, and colonies of "Amorites" engaged in trade were settled in the cities of Babylonia. After the fall of the Dynasty of Ur, Babylonia was itself conquered by the Amorites who founded the dynasty to which Khammurabi, the Amraphel of ~~Gen~~ Genesis 14:1, belonged (*see CHAMMURABI*). In an inscription found near Diarbekir the only title given to Khammu-rabi is "king of the land of the Amorites." Babylonian now became the official, literary and commercial language of Canaan, and schools were established there in which the cuneiform script was taught. Canaanitish culture became wholly Babylonian; even its theology and gods were derived from Babylonia. The famous legal code of Khammu-rabi (*see CHAMMURABI, CODE OF*) was enforced in Canaan as in other parts of the empire, and traces of its provisions are found in Gen. Abram's adoption of his slave Eliezer, Sarai's conduct to Hagar, and Rebekah's receipt of a dowry from the father of the bridegroom are examples of this. So, too, the sale of the cave of Machpelah was in accordance with the Babylonian legal forms of the Khammu-rabi age. The petty kings of Canaan paid tribute to their Babylonian suzerain, and Babylonian officials and "commercial travelers" (damgari) frequented the country.

(4) *Jerusalem Founded.*

We must ascribe to this period the foundation of Jerusalem, which bears a Babylonian name (Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim"), and commanded the road to the naphtha springs of the Dead-Sea. Bitumen was one of the most

important articles of Babylonian trade on account of its employment for building and lighting purposes, and seems to have been a government monopoly. Hence, the rebellion of the Canaanitish princes in the naphtha district (Genesis 14) was sufficiently serious to require a considerable force for its suppression.

(5) *The Hyksos.*

The Amorite dynasty in Babylonia was overthrown by a Hittite invasion, and Babylonian authority in Canaan came to an end, though the influence of Babylonian culture continued undiminished. In the North the Hittites were dominant; in the South, where Egyptian influence had been powerful since the age of the XIIth Dynasty, the Hyksos conquest of Egypt united Palestine with the Delta. The Hyksos kings bear Canaanitish names, and their invasion of Egypt probably formed part of that general movement which led to the establishment of an "Amorite" dynasty in Babylonia. Egypt now became an appanage of Canaan, with its capital, accordingly, near its Asiatic frontier. One of the Hyksos kings bears the characteristically Canaanitish name of Jacob-el, written in the same way as on Babylonian tablets of the age of Khammu-rabi, and a place of the same name is mentioned by Thothmes III as existing in southern Palestine

(6) *Egyptian Conquest.*

The Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty expelled the Hyksos and conquered Palestine and Syria. For about 200 years Canaan was an Egyptian province. With the Egyptian conquest the history of the second Amorite city at Gezer comes to an end. The old wall was partially destroyed, doubtless by Thothmes III (about 1480 BC). A third Amorite city now grew up, with a larger and stronger wall, 14 ft. thick. The houses built on the site of the towers of the first wall were filled with scarabs and other relics of the reign of Amon-hotep III (1440 BC). At Lachish the ruins of the third city were full of similar remains, and among them was a cuneiform tablet referring to a governor of Lachish mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. At Taanach cuneiform tablets of the same age have been discovered, written by Canaanites to one another but all in the Babylonian script and language.

(7) *Tell el-Amarna Tablets.*

In the Tell el-Amarna Letters we have a picture of Canaan at the moment when the Asiatic empire of Egypt was breaking up through the religious

and social troubles that marked the reign of Amon-hotep IV. The Hittites were attacking it in the North; in the South of Canaan the Khabiri or “confederate” bands of free-lances were acquiring principalities for themselves. The petty kings and governors had foreign troops in their pay with which they fought one against the other; and their mercenaries readily transferred their allegiance from one paymaster to another, or seized the city they were engaged to defend. Hittites, Mitannians from Mesopotamia, and other foreigners appear as governors of the towns; the Egyptian government was too weak to depose them and was content if they professed themselves loyal. At times the Canaanitish princes intrigued with the Assyrians against their Egyptian masters; at other times with the Mitannians of “Aram-Naharaim” or the Hittites of Cappadocia. The troops sent by the Egyptian Pharaoh were insufficient to suppress the rebellion, and the authority of the Egyptian commissioners grew less and less. Eventually the king of the Amorites was compelled to pass openly over to the Hittite king, and Canaan was lost to the Pharaohs.

5. THE ISRAELITE INVASION:

Gaza and the neighboring towns, however, still remained in their hands, and with the recovery of Egyptian power under the XIXth Dynasty allowed Seti I to march once more into Canaan and reduce it again to subjection. In spite of Hittite attacks the country on both sides of the Jordan acknowledged the rule of Seti and his son Ramses II, and in the 21st year of the latter Pharaoh the long war with the Hittites came to an end, a treaty being made which fixed the Egyptian frontier pretty much where the Israelite frontier afterward ran. A work, known as *The Travels of the Mohar*, which satirizes the misadventures of a tourist in Canaan, gives a picture of Canaan in the days of Ramses II. With the death of Ramses II Egyptian rule in Palestine came finally to an end. The Philistines drove the Egyptian garrisons from the cities which commanded the military road through Canaan, and the long war with the Hittites exhausted the inland towns, so that they made but a feeble resistance to the Israelites who assailed them shortly afterward. The Egyptians, however, never relinquished their claim to be masters of Canaan, and when the Philistines power had been overthrown by David we find the Egyptian king again marching northward and capturing Gezer (~~1096~~ 1 Kings 9:16). Meanwhile the country had become to a large extent Israelite. In the earlier days of the Israelite invasion the Canaanitish towns had been destroyed and the people massacred; later the two peoples intermarried, and a mixed race was the

result. The portraits accompanying the names of the places taken by Shishak in southern Palestine have Amorite features, and the modern fellahin of Palestine are Canaanite rather than Jewish in type.

6. CULTURE:

Canaanitish culture was based on that of Babylonia, and begins with the introduction of the use of copper and bronze. When Canaan became a Babylonian province, it naturally shared in the civilization of the ruling power. The religious beliefs and deities of Babylonia were superimposed upon those of the primitive Canaanite. The local Baal or "lord" of the soil made way for the "lord of heaven," the Sun-god of the Babylonians. The "high-place" gradually became a temple built after a Babylonian fashion. The sacred stone, once the supreme object of Canaanitish worship, was transformed into a Beth-el or shrine of an indwelling god. The gods and goddesses of Babylonia migrated to Canaan; places received their names from Nebo or Nin-ip; Hadad became Amurru "the Amorite god"; Ishtar passed into Ashtoreth, and Asirtu, the female counterpart of Asir, the national god of Assyria, became Asherah, while her sanctuary, which in Assyria was a temple, was identified in Canaan with the old fetish of an upright stone or log. But human sacrifice, and more especially the sacrifice of the firstborn son, of which we find few traces in Babylonia, continued to be practiced with undiminished frequency until, as we learn from the excavations, the Israelite conquest brought about its suppression. The human victim is also absent from the later sacrificial tariffs of Carthage and Marseilles, its place being taken in them by the ram. According to these tariffs the sacrifices and offerings were of two kinds, the *zau`at* or sin offering and the *shelem* or thank-offering. The sin offering was given wholly to the god; part of the thank-offering would be taken by the offerer. Birds which were not allowed as a sin offering might constitute a thank-offering. Besides the sacrifices, there were also offerings of corn, wine, fruit and oil.

7. ART:

What primitive Canaanitish art was like may be seen from the rude sculptures in the Wadi el-Kana near Tyre. Under Babylonian influence it rapidly developed. Among the Canaanite spoil captured by Thothmes III were tables, chairs and staves of cedar and ebony inlaid with gold or simply gilded, richly embroidered robes, chariots chased with silver, iron tent

poles studded with precious stones, “bowls with goats’ heads on them, and one with a lion’s head, the workmanship of the land of Zahi” (the Phoenician coast), iron armor with gold inlay, and rings of gold and silver that were used as money. At Taanach, gold and silver ornaments have been found of high artistic merit. To the Israelites, fresh from the desert, the life of the wealthy Canaanite would have appeared luxurious in the extreme.

8. COMMERCE:

The position of Canaan made it the meeting-place of the commercial routes of the ancient world. The fleets of the Phoenician cities are celebrated in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, and it is probable that they were already engaged in the purple trade. The inland towns of Canaan depended not only on agriculture but also on a carrying trade: caravans as well as “commercial travelers” (damgari) came to them from Cappadocia, Babylonia and Egypt. Bronze, silver, lead, and painted ware were brought from Asia Minor, together with horses; naphtha was exported to Babylonia in return for embroidered stuffs; copper came from Cyprus, richly chased vessels of the precious metals from Crete and corn from Egypt. Baltic amber has been found at Lachish, where a furnace with iron slag, discovered in the third Amorite city, shows that the native iron was worked before the age of the Israelite conquest. The manufacture of glass goes back to the same epoch. As far back as 2500 BC, alabaster and limestone had been sent to Babylonia from the quarries of the Lebanon.

9. ART OF WRITING:

Long before the age of Abraham the Babylonian seal-cylinder had become known and been imitated in Syria and Canaan. But it was not until Canaan had been made a Babylonian province under the Khammu-rabi dynasty that the cuneiform system of writing was introduced together with the Babylonian language and literature. Henceforward, schools were established and libraries or archive-chambers formed where the foreign language and its complicated syllabary could be taught and stored. In the Mosaic age the Taanach tablets show that the inhabitants of a small country town could correspond with one another on local matters in the foreign language and script, and two of the Tell el-Amarna letters are from a Canaanitish lady. The official notices of the name by which each year was known in Babylonia were sent to Canaan as to other provinces of the

Babylonian empire in the cuneiform script; one of these, dated in the reign of Khammurabi's successor, has been found in the Lebanon.

LITERATURE.

H. Vincent, Canaan d'après l'exploration recente, 1907; G. A. Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 1894; Publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund; E. Sellin, Tell Ta'anek and Eine Nachlese auf dem Tell Ta'anek, 1904-5; Schumacher, Tell Mutesellim, 1909; Thiersch, Die neueren Ausgrabungen in Palestina, 1908.

See, further, *ARKITE*; *ARVADITE*; *BAAL*; *GIRGASHITE*; *HITTITE*; *HIVITE*; *JEBUSITE*; *KADMONITE*; *KENIZZITE*; *PALESTINE*; *PERIZZITE*; *REPHAIM*; *SINITE*; *TEMANITE*.

A. H. Sayce

CANAANITESS

<ka'-nan-it-es>.

See *SHUA*; *BATHSHUA*.

CANALS

<ka-nalz'> (*pyrbaṣ'* [ye'orim]): The word "canals" occurs in several places in the Revised Version, margin (^{<1179>}Exodus 7:19; 8:5; ^{<2896>}Isaiah 19:6; Nah 3:8). [ye'or] is an Egyptian word, the designation of the Nile (Brugsch, Geogr, I, 8, 78). The proper name of the Nile as a god was Hapi. There were several common designations of the Nile, but the usual one was [ye'or], Hebrew plural [ye'orim]. The primary meaning of [ye'or] in Egyptian is not certain, but its significance in use for the Nile is plain enough. All the waters in Egypt were of the Nile and this word [ye'or] was used to denote all of them, the Nile and all its ramifications through the whole irrigating system. Thus [ye'orim], Niles, came to be used. As only the main channels of the Nile had much current, the [ye'orim] came naturally to convey the idea of sluggishness. In the account of the plagues (^{<1179>}Exodus 7:19), names are used descriptively to designate the different waters of Egypt: [neharoth], "flowing streams," for the main channels of the river, and [ye'orim] for other streams, which by contrast must mean, as it should according to its use by the Egyptians, "the sluggish streams," i.e.

“canals,” as it is rendered by the Revisers. This meaning of the word being thus clearly established, it is appropriately used in the Revised Version, margin in the other instances of its occurrence in like circumstances.

M. G. Kyle

CANANAEAN; CANAANITE

<ka-na-ne'-an>, <ka'-nan-it>.

See SIMON (CANANAEAN).

CANDACE

<kan'-da-se> ([ανδάκη, Kandake]): Queen of the Ethiopians (^{<4827>}Acts 8:27). Pliny states that the name Candace had already been borne for many years by the queens of Ethiopia (vi,29). *See ETHIOPIA*. Her treasurer, “a eunuch of great authority,” was baptized by Philip the Evangelist on his return from worshipping in Jerusalem.

CANDLE; CANDLESTICK

<kan'-d'-l>, <kan'-d'-l-stik> (rnc[ner]; [λύχνος, luchnos]; hrwn[menorah]; [λυχνία, luchnia]):

(1) “Candle” is found in the Old Testament, the King James Version, as the rendering of [ner], and in the New Testament for [luchnos]. In all places except ^{<2530>}Jeremiah 25:10 and Zeph 1:12 (see margin) the Revised Version (British and American) gives the more exact rendering “lamp.” *See LAMP*. Candle, in our sense of the term, was unknown to antiquity.

(2) “Candlestick” stands for what was a common and indispensable article of ancient house furniture, a lamp-stand ([menorah]). Accordingly we find it mentioned in a case thoroughly representative of the furnishings of an oriental room of the plainer sort, in the account of “the prophet’s chamber” given in ^{<12440>}2 Kings 4:10. Here we find that the furniture consisted of a “bed,” a “table,” a “seat,” and a “candlestick,” or lamp-stand. The excavations of Petrie and Bliss at Lachish (Tell el-Hesi, 104), not to mention others, help to make it clear that a lamp-stand is meant in passages where the Hebrew word, [menorah], or its Greek equivalent [luchnia], is used. Accordingly throughout the New Testament, the Revised Version (British and American) has consistently rendered [luchnia] by “stand”

(^{<015>}Matthew 5:15; ^{<001>}Mark 4:21; ^{<0816>}Luke 8:16; 11:33).

(3) The “candlestick” of ^{<0785>}Daniel 5:5 is rather the candelabrum (nebhrashta’) of Belshazzar’s banqueting-hall. The “golden candlestick” of the tabernacle and the temple requires special treatment.

See CANDLESTICK (GOLDEN); TABERNACLE.

(4) Certain figurative uses of “candle” and “candlestick” in the Bible demand attention. The ancient and still common custom of the East of keeping a house lamp burning night and day gave rise to the figure of speech so universally found in oriental languages by which the continued prosperity of the individual or the family is set forth by the perennially burning lamp (see ^{<0908>}Job 29:3; “when his lamp shined upon my head”; ^{<0908>}Psalms 18:28 “Thou wilt light my lamp”). The converse in usage is seen in many passages — (see ^{<0816>}Job 18:6; “His lamp above him shall be put out”; 21:17: “How oft is it that the lamp of the wicked is put out”; ^{<0101>}Proverbs 24:20; “The lamp of the wicked shall be put out”; ^{<0250>}Jeremiah 25:10; “Take from them the light of the lamp”). The same metaphor is used in ^{<0115>}Revelation 2:5 to indicate the judgment with which the church of Ephesus was threatened: “I will move thy candlestick out of its place.” “The seven golden candlesticks” (^{<0012>}Revelation 1:20) which John saw were “the seven churches,” the appointed light-bearers and dispensers of the religion of the risen Christ. Hence, the significance of such a threat.

George B. Eager

CANDLESTICK, THE GOLDEN

^{<kan'-d'-l-stik>}, ^{<gold'-'-n>} (^{<hrwn>}][menorah], literally “lamp-stand”): An important part of the furniture of the tabernacle and temples.

See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE; LAMP.

1. THE TABERNACLE:

The candlestick is first met with in the descriptions of the tabernacle (^{<0253>}Exodus 25:31-39; 37:17-24). It was, with the utensils connected with it (snuffers, snuff dishes), to be made of pure beaten gold, of one piece, a talent in weight (^{<0253>}Exodus 25:39). It consisted of a pedestal or base, of a central stem (the name “candlestick” is specially given to this), of six curving branches — three on each side — and of seven lamps resting on

the tops of the branches and stem. Stem and branches were ornamented with cups like almond-blossoms, knops and flowers — four of this series on the stem, and three on each of the branches. Some, however, understand the “cup” to embrace the “knop” and “flower” (calyx and corolla). The shape of the pedestal is uncertain. Jewish tradition suggests three small feet; the representation of the candlestick on the Arch of Titus has a solid, hexagonal base. The position of the candlestick was on the South side of the holy place (~~<107>~~ Exodus 40:24).

2. TEMPLE OF SOLOMON:

In Solomon’s temple the single golden candlestick was multiplied to ten, and the position was altered. The candlesticks were now placed in front of the Holy of Holies, five on one side, five on the other (~~<107>~~ 1 Kings 7:49; ~~<107>~~ 2 Chronicles 4:7). Further details are not given in the texts, from which it may be presumed that the model of the tabernacle candlestick was followed.

3. TEMPLE OF ZERUBBABEL:

The second temple reverted to the single golden candlestick. When the temple was plundered by Antiochus Epiphanes, the candlestick was taken away (1 Macc 1:21); after the cleansing, a new one was made by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:49,50).

4. TEMPLE OF HEROD:

The same arrangement of a single golden candlestick, placed on the South side of the holy place, was continued in Herod’s Temple (Josephus, BJ, V, v, 5). It was this which, carried away by Titus, was represented on his Arch at Rome.

5. USE AND SYMBOLISM:

The immediate object of the candlestick was to give light in the holy place. The lamps were lighted in the evening and burned till the morning (~~<107>~~ Exodus 30:7,8; ~~<107>~~ Leviticus 24:3; ~~<107>~~ 1 Samuel 3:3; ~~<107>~~ 2 Chronicles 13:11), light being admitted into the temple during the day by the upper windows. Josephus in his Cosmical speculations (BJ, V, v, 5) takes the seven lamps to signify the seven planets. In Zechariah’s vision of the golden candlestick (4:2 ff), the seven lamps are fed by two olive trees

which are interpreted to be “the two anointed ones,” Zerubbabel and Joshua — the civil and spiritual representatives of theocracy. The candlestick here, like the seven candlesticks in ^{<6020>}Revelation 1:20,21, symbolizes the church of God, then in its Old Testament form, the idea conveyed being that God’s church is set to be a lightgiver in the world. Compare Christ’s words (^{<4154>}Matthew 5:14,16; ^{<4175>}Luke 12:35), and Paul’s (^{<3045>}Philippians 2:15).

The oldest known representation of the seven-branched candlestick is on a coin of Antigonus, circa 40 BC (see Madden’s Coins of the Jews, 102). For literature *see* TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

James Orr

CANE

^{<kan>}.

See REED.

CANKER

^{<kan'-ker>}.

See GANGRENE.

CANKERED

^{<kan'-kerd>} (^{<3013>}James 5:3 the Revised Version (British and American), “rusted”).

CANKER-WORM

^{<kan'-ker-wurm>} (^{qly} ^{<eyeleq>}, (^{<2004>}Joel 1:4; 2:25; Nah 3:15,16)): The name given to a larval stage of the LOCUST (which see).

See also CATERPILLAR.

CANNEH

^{<kan'-e>} (^{hnek} [kanneh]; [^{ανάα}, Chanaa]): Mentioned in ^{<3273>}Ezekiel 27:23 in connection with Haran and Eden as one of the places with which Tyre had commercial relations. This is the only reference to the place and

the site is unknown. Gesenius and others think it is probably the same as Calneh of ^{<3062>}Amos 6:2 or of ^{<01010>}Genesis 10:10, and Calno of ^{<3109>}Isaiah 10:9. According to the Targums, Eusebius, and Jerome, this place is identical with Ctesiphon, which was situated on the Tigris. One codex of Deuteronomy Rossi has made this identification in the passage in ^{<5723>}Ezekiel 27:23. Cornill thinks Canneh is the Calneh of ^{<3062>}Amos 6:2, but Cheyne thinks the name is really non-existent. He says the words rendered “and Canneh and Eden” should rather be “and the sons of Eden.”

A. W. Fortune

CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

^{<kan'-un>}:

I. INTRODUCTORY.

The problem of how we came by 39 books known as Old Testament “Scripture” is a purely historical investigation. The question involved is, not who wrote the several books, but who made them into a collection, not their origin or contents, but their history; not God’s part, but man’s. Our present aim, accordingly, must be to trace the process by which the various writings became “Scripture.”

1. The Christian Term “Canon”:

The word “canon” is of Christian origin, from the Greek word [^{<kanón>}, kanon], which in turn is probably borrowed from the Hebrew word, [qaneh], meaning a reed or measuring rod, hence, norm or rule. Later it came to mean a rule of faith, and eventually a catalogue or list. In present usage it signifies a collection of religious writings Divinely inspired and hence, authoritative, normative, sacred and binding. The term occurs in ^{<8866>}Galatians 6:16; ^{<7003>}2 Corinthians 10:13-16; but it is first employed of the books of Scripture in the technical sense of a standard collection or body of sacred writings, by the church Fathers of the 4th century; e.g. in the 59th canon of the Council of Laodicea (363 AD); in the Festal Epistle of Athanasius (365 AD); and by Amphilochius, archbishop of Iconium (395 AD).

2. The Corresponding Hebrew Expression:

How the ancient Hebrews expressed the conception of canonicity is not known; but it is safe to say that the idea, as an idea, existed long before

there was any special phrase invented to express it. In the New Testament the word “Scriptures” conveys unquestionably the notion of sacredness (~~24:2~~ Matthew 21:42; ~~4:53~~ John 5:39; ~~4:24~~ Acts 18:24). From the 1st century AD and following, however, according to the Talmud, the Jews employed the phrase “defile the hands.” Writings which were suitable to be read in the synagogue were designated as books which “defile the hands.” What this very peculiar oriental expression may have originally signified no one definitely knows. Probably ~~16:24~~ Leviticus 16:24 gives a hint of the true interpretation. According to this passage the high priest on the great Day of Atonement washed not only when he put on the holy garments of his office, but also when he put them off. Quite possibly, therefore, the expression “defile the hands” signified that the hands which had touched the sacred writings must first be washed before touching aught else. The idea expressed, accordingly, was one akin to that of taboo. That is to say, just as certain garments worn by worshippers in encircling the sacred Kaaba at Mecca are taboo to the Mohammedans of today, i.e. cannot be worn outside the mosque, but must be left at the door as the worshippers quit the sanctuary, so the Hebrew writings which were fit to be read in the synagogue rendered the hands of those who touched them taboo, defiling their hands, as they were wont to say, so that they must first be washed before engaging in any secular business. This seems to be the best explanation of this enigmatical phrase. Various other and somewhat fanciful explanations of it, however, have been given: for example, to prevent profane uses of worn-out synagogue rolls (Buhl); or to prevent placing consecrated grain alongside of the sacred rolls in the synagogues that it might become holy, as the grain would attract the mice and the mice would gnaw the rolls (Strack, Wildeboer and others); or to prevent the sacred, worn-out parchments from being used as coverings for animals (Graetz); or to “declare the hands to be unclean unless previously washed” (Furst, Green). But no one of these explanations satisfies. The idea of taboo is more likely imbedded in the phrase.

3. The “Hidden Books” of the Jews:

The rabbins invented a special phrase to designate rolls that were worn-out or disputed. These they called [genuzim], meaning “hidden away.” Cemeteries filled with Hebrew manuscripts which have long been buried are frequently found today in Egypt in connection with Jewish synagogues. Such rolls might first be placed in the [genizah] or rubbish chamber of the sanctuary. They were not, however, apocryphal or uncanonical in the sense

of being extraneous or outside the regular collection. For such the Jews had a special term [cepharim chitsonim], “books that are outside.” These could not be read in the synagogues. “Hidden books” were rather worn-out parchments, or canonical rolls which might by some be temporarily disputed.

See APOCRYPHA.

4. The Determining Principle in the Formation of the Canon:

Who had the right to declare a writing canonical? To this question widely divergent answers have been given. According to a certain class of theologians the several books of the Old Testament were composed by authors who were conscious not only of their inspiration but also that their writings were destined to be handed down to the church of future generations as sacred. In other words each writer canonized, as it were, his own writings. For example, Dr. W. H. Green (Canon, 35 f, 106, 110) says: “No formal declaration of their canonicity was needed to give them sanction. They were from the first not only eagerly read by the devout but believed to be Divinely obligatory Each individual book of an acknowledged prophet of Yahweh, or of anyone accredited as inspired by Him to make known His will, was accepted as the word of God immediately upon its appearance. Those books and those only were accepted as the Divine standards of their faith and regulative of their conduct which were written for this definite purpose by those whom they believed to be inspired of God. It was this which made them canonical. The spiritual profit found in them corresponded with and confirmed the belief in their heavenly origin. And the public official action which further attested, though it did not initiate, their canonicity, followed in the wake of the popular recognition of their Divine authority. The writings of the prophets, delivered to the people as a declaration of the Divine will, possessed canonical authority from the moment of their appearance. The canon does not derive its authority from the church, whether Jewish or Christian; the office of the church is merely that of a custodian and a witness.” So likewise Dr. J. D. Davis (Pres. and Ref. Review, April, 1902, 182).

On the contrary, Dillmann (Jahrb. fur deutsche Theol., III, 420) more scientifically claims that “history knows nothing of the individual books having been designed to be sacred from their origin. These books bore indeed in themselves from the first those characteristics on account of

which they were subsequently admitted into the sacred collection, but yet always had first to pass through a shorter or longer period of verification, and make trial of the Divine power resident within them upon the hearts of the church before they were outwardly and formally acknowledged by it as Divine books.” As a matter of fact, the books of the Old Testament are still on trial, and ever will be. So far as is known, the great majority of the writers of Holy Scripture did not arbitrarily hand over their productions to the church and expect them to be regarded as canon Scripture. Two parties are involved in the making of canonical Scripture — the original authors and the church — both of whom were inspired by the same Spirit. The authors wrote inspired by the Divine Spirit, and the church ever since — Jewish and Christian alike — has been inspired to recognize the authoritative character of their writings. And so it will be to the end of time. “We cannot be certain that anything comes from God unless it bring us personally something evidently Divine” (Briggs, *The Study of Holy Scripture*, 162).

5. The Tripartite Division of the Old Testament:

The Jews early divided the Old Testament writings into three classes:

- (1)** the Torah, or Law;
- (2)** the [Nebhi'im], or Prophets; and
- (3)** the [Kethubhim], or Writings, called in Greek the Hagiographa. The Torah included the 5 books of the Pentateuch (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), which were called “the Five-fifths of the Law.” The [Nebhi'im] embraced
 - (a)** the four so-called Former Prophets, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, counted as one book, 1 and 2 Kings, also counted as one book; and
 - (b)** the four so-called Latter Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets, counted as one book; a total of 8 books. The [Kethubhim], or Writings, were 11 in all, including Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, the five [Meghilloth] or Rolls (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, counted as one book, and 1 and 2 Chronicles, also counted as one book; in all 24 books, exactly the same as those of the Protestant canon. This was the original count of the Jews as far as we can trace it back. Later

certain Jewish authorities appended Ruth to Judges, and Lamentations to Jer, and thereby obtained the number 22, which corresponded to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet; but this manner of counting was secondary and fanciful. Still later others divided Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah and Jeremiah-Lamentations into two books each respectively and thereby obtained 27, which they fancifully regarded as equivalent to the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet plus 5, the number of letters having a peculiar final form when standing at the end of a word. Jerome states that 22 is the correct reckoning, but he adds, “Some count both Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa, and so get 24.” 4 Esdras, which is the oldest (85-96 AD) witness to the number of books in the Old Testament, gives 24.

6. How Account for the Tripartite Division?:

The answer to the question of how to account for the tripartite division involves the most careful investigation of the whole process by which the canon actually took shape. If the entire canon of the Old Testament were formed, as some allege, by one man, or by one set of men, in a single age, then it is obvious that the books must have been separated into three groups on the basis of some material differences in their contents. If, on the other hand; the process of canonization was gradual and extended over several generations, then the various books were separated from one another probably because one section of the canon was closed before certain other books of similar character were written. At any rate it is difficult to see why Kings and Chronicles are not included in the same division, and especially strange that Daniel does not stand among the prophets. To explain this mystery, medieval Jews were wont to say that “the Prophets were inspired by the spirit of prophecy, whereas the Writings by the Holy Spirit,” implying different degrees of inspiration. But this is a distinction without a difference, the Holy Spirit and the spirit of prophecy are one and the same. Modern Protestants distinguish between the *donum propheticum* and the *munus propheticum*, i.e. between the gift and the office of prophecy. They allow that Daniel possessed the gift of prophecy, but they deny that he was Divinely appointed to the office of prophet. But compare ^{<4245>}Matthew 24:15, which speaks of “Daniel the prophet,” and on the other hand, ^{<3074>}Amos 7:14, in which Amos resents being considered a prophet. Oehler modifies this explanation, claiming that the threefold division of the canon corresponds to the three stages of development in the religion of Israel, namely, Mosaism, Prophetism, and Hebraism. According

to Oehler, the Law was the foundation of the entire canon. From it there were two lines of development, one objective, the Prophets, the other subjective, the Writings. But Oehler's theory does not satisfactorily account for Ezra and Nehemiah and Chronicles, being in the third division; for in what sense can they be said to be more subjective than Judges, Samuel, and Kings? The Septuagint version (250-150 BC) takes no notice of the tripartite division. The true solution probably is that the process was gradual. When all the witnesses have been examined, we shall probably discover that the Law was canonized first, the Prophets considerably later, and the Writings last of all. And it may further become evident that the two last divisions were collected synchronously, and hence, that the tripartite divisions of the canon are due to material differences in their contents as well as to chronology.

II. EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES.

1. The Old Testament's Witness to Itself (circa 1450-444 BC):

Though the Old Testament does not tell us anything about the processes of its own canonization, it does furnish valuable hints as to how the ancient Hebrews preserved their writings. Thus in ^{<12410>}Exodus 40:20 it is stated that the "testimony," by which is meant the two tables of the Law containing the Ten Commandments, was put into the Ark of the Covenant for safe-keeping. In ^{<12509>}Deuteronomy 31:9,24-26, the laws of Deuteronomy are said to have been delivered to the sons of Levi, and by them deposited "by the side of the ark that it may be there for a witness against thee." Such language indicates that the new lawbook is regarded "as a standard of faith and action" (Driver, Deuteronomy, 343). According to ^{<1189>}1 Kings 8:9, when Solomon brought the Ark up from the city of David to the Temple, the two tables were still its only contents, which continued to be carefully preserved. According to ^{<12112>}2 Kings 11:12, when Joash was crowned king, Jehoiada the high priest is said to have given (literally "put upon") him "the testimony," which doubtless contained "the substance of the fundamental laws of the covenant," and was regarded as "the fundamental charter of the constitution" (compare H. E. Ryle, Canon of the Old Testament 45). Likewise in ^{<12501>}Proverbs 25:1, it is stated that a large number of proverbs were copied out by Hezekiah's men. Now all these, and still other passages which might be summoned, witness to the preservation of certain portions of the Old Testament. But preservation is not synonymous with canonization. A writing might easily be preserved

without being made a standard of faith and conduct. Nevertheless the two ideas are closely related; for, when religious writings are sedulously preserved it is but natural to infer that their intrinsic value was regarded as correspondingly precious.

Two other passages of paramount importance remain to be considered. The first is ^{<12718>}2 Kings 22:8 ff, describing the finding of the “Book of the Law,” and how Josiah the king on the basis of it instituted a religious reformation and bound the people to obey its precepts. Here is an instance in which the Law, or some portion of it (how much no one can say), is regarded as of normative and authoritative character. The king and his coadjutors recognize at once that it is ancient and that it contains the words of Yahweh (^{<12713>}2 Kings 22:13,18,19). Its authority is undisputed. Yet nothing is said of its “canonicity,” or that it would “defile the hands”; consequently there is no real ground for speaking of it as “the beginnings of the canon,” for in the same historic sense the beginnings of the canon are to be found in ^{<12417>}Exodus 24:7. The other passage of paramount importance is ^{<16188>}Nehemiah 8:8 f, according to which Ezra is said to have “read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly.” Not only did Ezra read the Law; he accompanied it with an interpretation. This seems to imply, almost beyond question, that in Ezra’s time (444 BC) the Law, i.e. the Pentateuch, was regarded as canonical Scripture. This is practically all that the Old Testament says about itself, though other passages, such as ^{<8972>}Zechariah 7:12 and ^{<27002>}Daniel 9:2 might be brought forward to show the deep regard which the later prophets had for the writings of their predecessors. The former of these is the locus classicus in the Old Testament, teaching the inspiration of the Prophets; it is the Old Testament parallel to ^{<91816>}2 Timothy 3:16.

2. The Samaritan Pentateuch (circa 432 BC):

Chronologically the Old Testament is of course our most ancient witness. It brings us down to 444 BC. The next in order is the Samaritan Pentateuch, the history of which is as follows: About 432 BC, as we know from ^{<16138>}Nehemiah 13:28 and Josephus (Ant., XI, vii, 2 through viii, 4), Nehemiah expelled from the Jewish colony in Jerusalem Manasseh, the polygamous grandson of Eliashib the high priest and son-in-law of Sanballat. Manasseh founded the schismatic community of the Samaritans, and instituted on Mt. Gerizim a rival temple worship to that at Jerusalem. Of the Samaritans there still survive today some 170 souls; they reside in

Shechem and are known as “the smallest religious sect in the world.” It is true that Josephus, speaking of this event, confuses chronology somewhat, making Nehemiah and Alexander the Great contemporaries, whereas a century separated them, but the time element is of little moment. The bearing of the whole matter upon the history of the formation of the canon is this: the Samaritans possess the Pentateuch only; hence, it is inferred that at the time of Manasseh’s expulsion the Jewish canon included the Pentateuch and the Pentateuch only. Budde (*Encyclopaedia Biblica* col. 659) says: “If alongside of the Law there had been other sacred writings, it would be inexplicable why these last also did not pass into currency with the Samaritans.” Such a conclusion, however, is not fully warranted. It is an argument from silence. There are patent reasons on the other hand why the Samaritans should have rejected the Prophets, even though they were already canonized. For the Samaritans would hardly adopt into their canon books that glorified the temple at Jerusalem. It cannot, accordingly, be inferred with certainty from the fact that the Samaritans accept the Pentateuch only, that therefore the Pentateuch at the time of Manasseh’s expulsion was alone canonical, though it may be considered a reasonable presumption.

3. The Septuagint Version (circa 250-150 BC):

The Septuagint version in Greek is the first translation of the Old Testament ever made; indeed the Old Testament is the first book of any note in all literature to receive the honor of being translated into another tongue. This fact in itself is indicative of the esteem in which it was held at the time. The work of translation was inaugurated by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 BC) and probably continued for well-nigh a century (circa 250-150 BC). Aristeas, a distinguished officer of Ptolemy, records how it came about. It appears that Ptolemy was exceedingly fond of books, and set his heart on adding to his famous collection in Alexandria a translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch. In order to obtain it, so the story goes, the king set free 198,000 Jewish slaves, and sent them with presents to Jerusalem to ask Eleazar the high priest for their Law and Jewish scholars capable of translating it. Six learned rabbis from each tribe ($6 \times 12 = 72$) were sent. They were royally feasted; 70 questions were asked them to test their wisdom, and after 72 days of cooperation and conference they gave the world the Old Testament in the Greek language, which is known as the Septuagint version. To this fabulous story, Christian tradition adds that the rabbis did the work of translating in 72 (some say 36) separate cells on the

island of Pharos, all working independently of each other, and that it was found at the expiration of their seclusion that each had produced a translation exactly word for word alike, hence, supernaturally inspired. Justin Martyr of the 2nd century AD says that he was actually shown by his Alexandrian guide the ruins of these Septuagint cells. The story is obviously a fable. The kernel of real truth at the bottom of it is probably that Ptolemy Philadelphus about the middle of the 3rd century BC succeeded in obtaining a translation of the Law. The other books were translated subsequently, perhaps for private use. The lack of unity of plan in the books outside the Law indicates that probably many different hands at different times were engaged upon them. There is a subscription, moreover, at the close of the translation of Est which states that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy in Jerusalem, translated it. But the whole was apparently completed before Jesus ben Sirach the younger wrote his Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (circa 132 BC).

Now the Septuagint version, which was the Bible of our Lord and His apostles, is supposed to have included originally many of the Apocryphal books. Furthermore, in our present Septuagint, the canonical and Apocryphal books stand intermingled and in an order which shows that the translators knew nothing of the tripartite division of later Judaism, or if they did they quite ignored it. The order of the books in our English Old Testament is of course derived from the Septuagint through the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) of Jerome. The books in the Septuagint are arranged as follows: Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 1 and 2 Esdras, Nehemiah, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Ep. Jer., Ezekiel, Daniel, 1, 2 and 3 Maccabees. On the basis of the Septuagint, Catholics advocate what is known as the "larger" canon of the Jews in Alexandria; Protestants, on the other hand, deny the existence of an independent canon in Alexandria in view of the "smaller" canon of the Jews in Palestine. The actual difference between the Catholic and Protestant Old Testaments is a matter of 7 complete books and portions of two others: namely, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Maccabees, together with certain additions to Esther (Est 10:4 through 16:24) and to Daniel (~~24~~ Daniel 3:24-90; The Song of the Three Holy Children (Azariah); Susanna verse 13

and Bel and the Dragon verse 14). These Protestants reject as apocryphal because there is no sufficient evidence that they were ever reckoned as canonical by the Jews anywhere. The fact that the present Septuagint includes them is far from conclusive that the original Septuagint did, for the following reasons:

- (1) The design of the Septuagint was purely literary; Ptolemy and the Alexandrians were interested in building up a library.
- (2) All the extant manuscripts of the Septuagint are of Christian not Jewish origin. Between the actual translation of the Septuagint (circa 250-150 BC) and the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint extant (circa 350 AD) there is a chasm of fully 500 years, during which it is highly possible that the so-called Apocryphal books crept in.
- (3) In the various extant manuscripts of the Septuagint, the Apocryphal books vary in number and name. For example, the great Vatican MS, which is probably “the truest representative which remains of the Alexandrian Bible,” and which comes down to us from the 4th century AD, contains no Book of Maccabees whatever, but does include 1 Esdras, which Jerome and Catholics generally treat as apocryphal. On the other hand, the Alexandrian MS, another of the great manuscripts of the Septuagint, dating from the 5th century AD, contains not only the extra-canonical book of 1 Esdras, but 3 and 4 Maccabees, and in the New Testament the 1st and 2nd Epistles of Clement, none of which, however, is considered canonical by Rome. Likewise the great Sinaiticus MS, hardly less important than the Vatican as a witness to the Septuagint and like it dating from the 4th century AD, omits Baruch (which Catholics consider canonical), but includes 4 Macc, and in the New Testament the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas; all of which are excluded from the canon by Catholics. In other manuscripts, 3 Maccabees, 3 Esdras and The Prayer of Manasseh are occasionally included. The problem as to how many books the original Septuagint version actually included is a very complicated one. The probability is that it included no one of these variants.
- (4) Still another reason for thinking that there never existed in Egypt a separate or “larger” canon is the fact that during the 2nd century AD, the Alexandrian Jews adopted Aquila’s Greek version of the Old Testament in lieu of their own, and it is known that Aquila’s text excluded all Apocryphal books. Add to all this the fact that Philo, who

lived in Alexandria from circa 20 BC till 50 AD, never quotes from One of these Apocryphal books though he often does from the canonical, and that Origen, who also resided in Alexandria (circa 200 AD), never set his imprimatur upon them, and it becomes reasonably convincing that there was no “larger” canon in Alexandria. The value of the evidence derived from the Septuagint, accordingly, is largely negative. It only indicates that when the translation of the Old Testament into Greek was made in Alexandria, the process of canonization was still incomplete. For had it been actually complete, it is reasonable to suppose that the work of translation would have proceeded according to some well-defined plan, and would have been executed with greater accuracy. As it is, the translators seem to have taken all sorts of liberties with the text, adding to the books of Est and Daniel and omitting fully one-eighth of the text of Jer. Such work also indicates that they were not executing a public or ecclesiastical trust, but rather a private enterprise. Our necessary conclusion, therefore, is that the work of canonization was probably going on in Palestine while the work of translation was proceeding in Alexandria.

4. Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach (circa 170 BC):

Our next witness is Jesus ben Sirach who (circa 170 BC) wrote a formidable work entitled Ecclesiasticus, otherwise known as Sir. The author lived in Jerusalem and wrote in Hebrew. His book is a book of Wisdom resembling Proverbs; some of his precepts approach the high level of the Gospel. In many respects Ecclesiasticus is the most important of all the Apocryphal books; theologically it is the chief monument of primitive Sadduceeism. In chapters 44 through 50, the author sings a “hymn to the Fathers,” eulogizing the mighty heroes of Israel from Enoch to Nehemiah, in fact from Adam to Simon, including the most famous men described in the Old Testament, and making explicit mention of the Twelve Prophets. These facts would indicate that the whole or, at least, the most of the Old Testament was known to him, and that already in his day (180 BC) the so-called Minor Prophets were regarded as a special group of writings by themselves. What the value of Ecclesiasticus is as a witness, however, depends upon the interpretation one places on 24:33, which reads: “I will yet pour out doctrine as prophecy and leave it unto generations of ages.” From this it is inferred by some that he feels himself inspired and capable of adding to the canon already in existence, and that, though he knew the full prophetic canon, he did not draw any very definite line of demarcation

between his own work and the inspired writings of the prophets. For example, he passes over from the patriarchs and prophets of Israel to Simon the son of Onias, who was probably the high priest in his own time, making no distinction between them. But this may have been partly due to personal conceit; compare 39:12, "Yet more will I utter, which I have thought upon; and I am filled as the moon at the full." Yet, perhaps, in his day still only the Law and the Prophets were actually canonized, but alongside of these a body of literature was being gathered and gradually augmented of a nature not foreign to his own writings, and therefore not clearly marked off from literary compositions like his own. Yet to Sirach the Law is everything. He identifies it with the highest Wisdom; indeed, all wisdom in his judgment is derived from a study of the Law (compare Sirach 19:20-24; 15:1-18; 24:23; 2:16; 39:1).

5. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (circa 132 BC):

The Prologue or Preface to Ecclesiasticus is our next witness to the formation of the canon. It was written by the grandson of Jesus ben Sirach, who bore his grandfather's name (circa 132 BC). Jesus ben Sirach the younger translated in Egypt his grandfather's proverbs into Greek, and in doing so added a Preface or Prologue of his own. In this Prologue, he thrice refers to the tripartite division of the Old Testament. In fact the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus is the oldest witness we have to the threefold division of the Old Testament books. He says: "Whereas many and great things have been delivered unto us by the Law and the Prophets, and by others, my grandfather, Jesus, when he had given himself to the reading of the Law, and the Prophets, and other books of our Fathers, and had gotten therein good judgment (the Revised Version (British and American) "having gained great familiarity therein"), was drawn on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom. For the same things uttered in Hebrew and translated into another tongue, have not the same force in them; and not only these things, but the Law itself, and the Prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their own language." These are explicit and definite allusions to the threefold division of the Old Testament writings, yet only the titles of the first and second divisions are the technical names usually employed; the third is especially vague because of his use of the terms, "the other books of the Fathers," and "the rest of the books." However, he evidently refers to writings with religious contents; and, by "the other books of the Fathers," he can hardly be supposed to have meant an indefinite number,

though he has not told us which they were or what was their number. From his further statement that his grandfather, having immersed himself in the Law and the Prophets, and other books of the Fathers, felt drawn on also himself to write something for the profit of others, it may be inferred that in his time there was as yet no definite gulf fixed between canonical writings and those of other men, and that the sifting process was still going on (compare W. R. Smith, OTJC2, 178-79).

6. 1 and 2 Maccabee (between 125 and 70 BC):

1 Maccabee was written originally in Hebrew; 2 Maccabee in Greek, somewhere between 125 and 70 BC. The author of 1 Maccabee is acquainted, on the one hand, with the deeds of John Hyrcanus (135 to 105 BC), and knows nothing on the other of the conquest of Palestine by Pompey (63 BC). The value of this book as a witness to the history of the canon centers about his allusions to Daniel and the Psalms. In 1 Macc 1:54, he tells how Antiochus Epiphanes “set up the abomination of desolation” upon the altar at Jerusalem, referring most likely to ~~2004~~ Daniel 9:24-27; and in 1 Macc 2:59,60 he speaks of Ananias, Azarias and Misael, who by believing were saved from the fiery furnace, and of Daniel, who was delivered from the mouths of the lions (compare ~~2005~~ Daniel 1:7; 3:26; 6:23). From these allusions, it would seem as though the Book of Daniel was at that time regarded as normative or canonical. This is confirmed by 1 Macc 7:16,17, which introduces a quotation from ~~1998~~ Psalm 79:2, with the solemn formula, “According to the words which he wrote”; which would suggest that the Psalm also were already canonical.

2 Maccabee, written circa 124 BC, also contains a couple of passages of considerable importance to us in this investigation. Both, however, are found in a spurious letter purporting to have been sent by the inhabitants of Judea to their fellow-countrymen residing in Egypt. The first passage (2 Macc 2:13) tells how Nehemiah, “founding a library, gathered together the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings concerning holy gifts.” These words throw no special light upon the formation of the canon, but they do connect with the name of Nehemiah the preservation of public documents and historical records of national interest, and how he, as a lover of books, founded a library. This is in perfect agreement with what we know of Nehemiah’s character, for he compiled the genealogy of Nehemiah 7; besides, collection precedes selection. The other passage (2 Macc 2:14) reads: “In like manner also

Judas gathered together all things that were lost by reason of the war we had, and they remain with us.” Though found in a letter, supposed to be spurious, there is every reason for believing this statement to be true. For when Antiochus, the arch enemy of the nation, sought to stamp out the religion of the Jews by destroying their books (compare 1 Macc 1:56,57), what would have been more natural for a true patriot like Judas than to attempt to re-collect their sacred writings? “This statement, therefore,” as Wildeboer says, “may well be worthy of credence” (*The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*, 40). Though it yields nothing definite as to the number of the books recovered, it is obvious that the books collected were the most precious documents which the nation possessed. They were doubtless religious, as was the age.

7. Philo (circa 20 BC-50 AD):

Philo is our next witness. He flourished in Alexandria between circa 20 BC and 50 AD, leaving behind him a voluminous literature. Unfortunately, he does not yield us much of positive value for our present purpose. His evidence is largely negative. True, he nowhere mentions the tripartite division of the Old Testament, which is known to have existed in his day. Nor does he quote from Ezekiel, the Five Megilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Chronicles, or from the Twelve Minor Prophets, except Hosea, Jonah, and Zechariah. Moreover he held a loose view of inspiration. According to Philo, inspiration was by no means confined to the sacred Scriptures; all truly wise and virtuous men are inspired and capable of expressing the hidden things of God. But as Dr. Green (*Canon*, 130) right fully contends, “Philo’s loose views of inspiration cannot be declared irreconcilable with the acceptance of a fixed canon, unless it is first shown that he places others whom he thinks inspired on a level with the writers of Scripture. This he never does.” Philo’s reverence for the “Law” was unbounded. In this respect he is the type of other Alexandrians. He quotes predominatingly from the Law. Moses was to him the source of all wisdom, even the wisdom of the Gentiles. Concerning the laws of Moses, he is reported by Eusebius as saying: “They have not changed so much as a single word in them. They would rather die a thousand deaths than detract anything from these laws and statutes.” On the other hand, Philo never quotes any of the Apocryphal books. Hence, it may safely be assumed that his canon was essentially ours.

8. The New Testament as a Witness (circa 50-100 AD):

The evidence furnished by the New Testament is of the highest importance. When summed up, it gives the unmistakable impression that when the New Testament was written (circa 50-100 AD) there was a definite and fixed canon of Old Testament Scripture, to which authoritative appeal could be made. And first, too much importance can scarcely be attached to the names or titles ascribed to the Old Testament writings by the authors of the New Testament: thus, “the scripture” (~~6105~~ John 10:35; 19:36; ~~6102~~ 2 Peter 1:20), “the scripture s” (~~4129~~ Matthew 22:29; ~~4184~~ Acts 18:24), “holy scriptures” (~~6102~~ Romans 1:2), “sacred writings” (2 Tim 3:15), “the law” (~~6108~~ John 10:34; 12:34; 15:25; ~~4142~~ 1 Corinthians 14:21), “law and prophets” (~~4157~~ Matthew 5:17; 7:12; 22:40; ~~2166~~ Luke 16:16; 24:44; ~~4135~~ Acts 13:15; 28:23). Such names or titles, though they do not define the limits of the canon, certainly assume the existence of a complete and sacred collection of Jewish writings which are already marked off from all other literature as separate and fixed. One passage (~~6105~~ John 10:35) in which the term “scripture,” is employed seems to refer to the Old Testament canon as a whole; “and the scripture cannot be broken.” In like manner the expression “law and prophets” is often used in a generic sense, referring to much more than merely the 1st and 2nd divisions of the Old Testament; it seems rather to refer to the old dispensation as a whole; but the term “the law” is the most general of all. It is frequently applied to the entire Old Testament, and apparently held in Christ’s time among the Jews a place akin to that which the term “the Bible” does with us. For example, in ~~6104~~ John 10:34; 11:34; 15:25, texts from the prophets or even from the Psalm are quoted as part of “the Law”; in ~~4142~~ 1 Corinthians 14:21 also, Paul speaks of ~~2381~~ Isaiah 28:11 as a part of “the law.” These names and titles, accordingly, are exceedingly important; they are never applied by New Testament writers to the Apocrypha.

One passage (~~2244~~ Luke 24:44) furnishes clear evidence of the threefold division of the canon. But here again, as in the Prologue of Sirach, there is great uncertainty as to the limits of the 3rd division. Instead of saying “the law, the prophets and the writings,” Luke says, “the law, the prophets and the psalms.” But it is obvious enough why the Psalms should have been adduced by Jesus in support of His resurrection. It is because they especially testify of Christ: they were, therefore, the most important part of the 3rd division for His immediate purpose, and it may be that they are meant to stand a potiori for the whole of the 3rd division (compare Budde,

Encyclopedia Biblica, col. 669).

Another passage (⁴²³⁵Matthew 23:35; compare ⁴¹⁵¹Luke 11:51) seems to point to the final order and arrangement of the books in the Old Testament canon. It reads: "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar."

Now, in order to grasp the bearing of this verse upon the matter in hand, it must be remembered that in the modern arrangement of the Old Testament books in Hebrew, Chronicles stands last; and that the murder of Zachariah is the last recorded instance in this arrangement, being found in ⁴²⁰⁰2 Chronicles 24:20,21. But this murder took place under Joash king of Judah, in the 9th century BC. There is another which is chronologically later, namely, that of Uriah son of Shemaiah who was murdered in Jehoiakim's reign in the 7th century BC (⁴²⁶³Jeremiah 26:23). Accordingly, the argument is this, unless Ch already stood last in Christ's Old Testament, why did He not say, "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Uriah"? He would then have been speaking chronologically and would have included all the martyrs whose martyrdom is recorded in the Old Testament. But He rather says, "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah," as though He were including the whole range of Old Testament Scripture, just as we would say "from Genesis to Malachi."

Hence, it is inferred, with some degree of justification also, that Chronicles stood in Christ's time, as it does today in the Hebrew Bible of the Massorets, the last book of an already closed canon. Of course, in answer to this, there is the possible objection that in those early days the Scriptures were still written by the Jews on separate rolls.

Another ground for thinking that the Old Testament canon was closed before the New Testament was written is the numerous citations made in the New Testament from the Old Testament. Every book is quoted except Esther, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah. But these exceptions are not serious. The Twelve Minor Prophets were always treated by the Jews en bloc as one canonical work; hence, if one of the twelve were quoted all were recognized. And the fact that ⁴²⁰⁰2 Chronicles 24:20,21 is quoted in ⁴²³⁵Matthew 23:35 and ⁴¹⁵¹Luke 11:51 presupposes also the canonicity of Ezra-Nehemiah, as originally these books were one with Chronicles, though they may possibly have already been divided in Jesus' day. As for Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, it is easy to see why they are not quoted: they probably failed to furnish New Testament writers material for quotation. The New Testament

writers simply had no occasion to make citations from them. What is much more noteworthy, they never quote from the Apocryphal books, though they show an acquaintance with them. Professor Gigot, one of the greatest of Roman Catholic authorities, frankly admits this. In his *General Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*, 43, he says: "They never quote them explicitly, it is true, but time and again they borrow expressions and ideas from them." As a matter of fact, New Testament writers felt free to quote from any source; for example, Paul on Mars' Hill cites to the learned Athenians an astronomical work of the Stoic Aratus of Cilicia, or perhaps from a Hymn to Jupiter by Cleanthes of Lycia, when he says, "For we are also his off-spring" (~~41728~~ Acts 17:28). And ~~60114~~ Jude 1:14,15 almost undeniably quotes from Enoch (1:9; 60:8) — a work which is not recognized as canonical by any except the church of Abyssinia. But in any case, the mere quoting of a book does not canonize it; nor, on the other hand, does failure to quote a book exclude it. Quotation does not necessarily imply sanction; no more than reference to contemporary literature is incompatible with strict views of the canon. Everything depends upon the manner in which the quotation is made. In no case is an Apocryphal book cited by New Testament authors as "Scripture," or as the work of the Holy Spirit. And the force of this statement is not weakened by the fact that the authors of New Testament writings cited the Septuagint instead of the original Hebrew; for, "they are responsible only for the inherent truthfulness of each passage in the form which they actually adopt" (Green, Canon, 145). As a witness, therefore, the New Testament is of paramount importance. For, though it nowhere tells us the exact number of books contained in the Old Testament canon, it gives abundant evidence of the existence already in the 1st century AD of a definite and fixed canon.

9. 4 Esdras (circa 81-96 AD):

4 Esdras in Latin (2 Esdras in English) is a Jewish apocalypse which was written originally in Greek toward the close of the 1st century (circa 81-96 AD). The passage of special interest to us is 2 Esdras 14:19-48 which relates in most fabulous style how Ezra is given spiritual illumination to reproduce the Law which had been burned, and how, at the Divine command, he secludes himself for a period of 40 days, after which he betakes himself with five skilled scribes to the open country. There, a cup of water is offered him; he drinks, and then dictates to his five amanuenses continuously for 40 days and nights, producing 94 books of which 70 are

kept secret and 24 published. The section of supreme importance reads as follows: “And it came to pass, when the forty days were fulfilled, that the Most High spake, saying, ‘The first that thou hast written, publish openly, that the worthy may read it; but keep the seventy last, that thou mayest deliver them only to such as be wise among the people; for in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge.’ And I did so” (4 Esdras 14:45-48). The story is obviously pure fiction. No wonder that a new version of it arose in the 16th century, according to which the canon was completed, not by Ezra alone, but by a company of men known as the Great Synagogue. From the legend of 4 Esdras it is commonly inferred that the 24 books which remain after subtracting 70 from 94 are the canonical books of the Old Testament. If so, then this legend is the first witness we have to the number of books contained in the Old Testament canon. This number corresponds exactly with the usual number of sacred books according to Jewish count, as we saw in section 5 above. The legend, accordingly, is not without value. Even as legend it witnesses to a tradition which existed as early as the 1st Christian century, to the effect that the Jews possessed 24 specially sacred books. It also points to Ezra as the chief factor in the making of Scripture and intimates that the Old Testament canon has long since been virtually closed.

10. Josephus’ “Contra Apionem” (circa 100 AD):

Flavius Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born 37 AD. He was a priest and a Pharisee. About 100 AD, he wrote a controversial treatise, known as *Contra Apionem*, in defense of the Jews against their assailants, of whom Apion is taken as a leading representative. Now Apion was a famous grammarian, who in his life had been hostile to the Jews. He had died some 50 years before *Contra Apionem* was written. Josephus wrote in Greek to Greeks. The important passage in his treatise (I, 8) reads as follows: “For it is not the case with us to have vast numbers of books disagreeing and conflicting with one another. We have but twenty-two, containing the history of all time, books that are justly believed in. And of these, five are the books of Moses, which comprise the laws and the earliest traditions from the creation of mankind down to the time of his (Moses’) death. This period falls short but by a little of three thousand years. From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, the successor of Xerxes, the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote the history of the events that occurred in their own time; in thirteen books. The

remaining four documents comprise hymns to God and practical precepts to men. From the days of Artaxerxes to our own time every event has indeed been recorded. But these recent records have not been deemed worthy of equal credit with those which preceded them, because the exact succession of the prophets ceased. But what faith we have placed in our own writings is evident by our conduct; for though so great an interval of time (i.e. since they were written) has now passed, not a soul has ventured either to add, or to remove, or to alter a syllable. But it is instinctive in all Jews at once from their very birth to regard them as commands of God, and to abide by them, and, if need be, willingly to die for them.”

The value of this remarkable passage for our study is obviously very great. In the first place Josephus fixes the number of Jewish writings which are recognized as sacred at 22, joining probably Ruth to Judges and Lamentations to Jer. He also classifies them according to a threefold division, which is quite peculiar to himself: 5 of Moses, 13 of the prophets, and 4 hymns and maxims for human life. The 5 of Moses were of course the Pentateuch; the 13 of the prophets probably included the 8 regular [Nebhi'im] plus Daniel, Job, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther; the “4 hymns and maxims” would most naturally consist of Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles and Ecclesiastes. There is little doubt that his 22 books are those of our present Hebrew canon.

Another very remarkable fact about Josephus' statement is the standard he gives of canonicity, namely, antiquity; because, as he says, since Artaxerxes' age the succession of prophets had ceased. It was the uniform tradition of Josephus' time that prophetic inspiration had ceased with Malachi (circa 445-432 BC). Hence, according to him, the canon was closed in the reign of Artaxerxes (465-425 BC). He does not pause to give any account of the closing of the canon; he simply assumes it, treating it as unnecessary. Prophecy had ceased, and the canon was accordingly closed; the fact did not require to be officially proclaimed. As remarked above, the value of Josephus as a witness is very great. But just here an important question arises: How literally must we interpret his language? Was the Old Testament canon actually closed before 425 BC? Were not there books and parts of books composed and added to the canon subsequent to his reign? Dr. Green seems to take Josephus literally (Canon, 40, 78). But Josephus is not always reliable in his chronology. For example, in his *Antiquities* (XI, vi, 13) he dates the story of Esther as occurring in the reign of Artaxerxes I (whereas it belongs to Xerxes' reign), while in the

same work (XI, v, 1) he puts Ezra and Nehemiah under Xerxes (whereas they belong to the time of Artaxerxes). On the whole, it seems safer on internal grounds to regard Josephus' statements concerning the antiquity of the Jewish canon as the language not of a careful historian, but of a partisan in debate. Instead of expressing absolute fact in this case, he was reflecting the popular belief of his age. Reduced to its lowest terms, the element of real truth in what he says was simply this, that he voiced a tradition which was at that time universal and undisputed; one, however, which had required a long period, perhaps hundreds of years, to develop. Hence, we conclude that the complete Old Testament canon, numbering 22 books, was no new thing 100 AD.

11. The Councils of Jamnia (90 and 118 AD):

According to the traditions preserved in the Mishna, two councils of Jewish rabbis were held (90 and 118 AD respectively) at Jabne, or Jamnia, not far South of Joppa, on the Mediterranean coast, at which the books of the Old Testament, notably Ecclesiastes and Canticles, were discussed and their canonicity ratified. Rabbi Gamaliel II probably presided. Rabbi Akiba was the chief spirit of the council. What was actually determined by these synods has not been preserved to us accurately, but by many authorities it is thought that the great controversy which had been going on for over a century between the rival Jewish schools of Hillel and Shammai was now brought to a close, and that the canon was formally restricted to our 39 books. Perhaps it is within reason to say that at Jamnia the limits of the Hebrew canon were officially and finally determined by Jewish authority. Not that official sanction created public opinion, however, but rather confirmed it.

12. The Talmud (200-500 AD):

The Talmud consists of two parts:

- (1) The Mishna (compiled circa 200 AD), a collection of systematized tradition; and
- (2) the Gemara, [Gemara] (completed about 500 AD), a "vast and desultory commentary on the Mishna" A Baraitha', or unauthorized gloss, known as the Babha' Bathra' 14 b, a Talmudic tractate, relates the "order" of the various books of the Old Testament and who "wrote" or edited them. But it says nothing of the formation of the canon. To write is not the same as to canonize; though to the later

Jews the two ideas were closely akin. As a witness, therefore, this tractate is of little value, except that it confirms the tripartite division and is a good specimen of rabbinic speculation. For the full text of the passage, see Ryle, Canon of the Old Testament, 273 ff.

13. Jewish Doubts in the 2nd Century AD:

During the 2nd century AD, doubts arose in Jewish minds concerning four books, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. In a certain Talmudic tractate it is related that an attempt was made to withdraw (ganaz, “conceal,” “hide”) the Book of Proverbs on account of contradictions which were found in it (compare 26:4,5), but on deeper investigation it was not withdrawn. In another section of the Talmud, Rabbi Akiba is represented as saying concerning Canticles: “God forbid that any man of Israel should deny that the Song of Songs defileth the hands, for the whole world is not equal to the day in which the Song of Songs was given to Israel. For all Scriptures are holy, but the Song of Songs is the holiest of the holy.” Such extravagant language inclines one to feel that real doubt must have existed in the minds of some concerning the book. But the protestations were much stronger against Ecclesiastes. In one tractate it is stated: “The wise men desired to hide it because its language was often self-contradictory (compare ~~2KOR~~ Ecclesiastes 7:3 and 2:2; 4:2 and 9:4), but they did not hide it because the beginning and the end of it consist of words from the Torah (compare ~~2KOR~~ Ecclesiastes 1:3; 12:13,14).” Likewise Est was vigorously disputed by both the Jerusalem and Babylonian Gemaras, because the name of God was not found in it; but a Rabbi Simeon ben Lakkish (circa 300 AD) defended its canonicity, putting Esther on an equality with the Law and above the Prophets and the other Writings. Other books, for example, Ezekiel and Jonah, were discussed in post-Talmudic writings, but no serious objections were ever raised by the Jews against either. Jonah was really never doubted till the 12th century AD. In the case of no one of these disputed books were there serious doubts; nor did scholastic controversies affect public opinion.

14. Summary and Conclusion:

This brings us to the end of our examination of the witnesses. In our survey we have discovered

- (1) that the Old Testament says nothing about its canonization, but does emphasize the manner in which the Law was preserved and recognized as authoritative;
- (2) that to conclude that the Jews possessed the Law only, when the renegade Manasseh was expelled by Nehemiah from Jerusalem, because the Samaritans admit of the Law alone as the true canon, is unwarrantable;
- (3) that the Septuagint version as we know it from the Christian manuscripts extant is by no means a sufficient proof that the Alexandrians possessed a “larger” canon which included the Apocrypha;
- (4) that Jesus ben Sirach is a witness to the fact that the Prophets in his day (180 BC) were not yet acknowledged as canonical;
- (5) that his grandson in his Prologue is the first witness to the customary tripartite division of Old Testament writings, but does not speak of the 3rd division as though it were already closed;
- (6) that the Books of Maccabees seem to indicate that Psalms and Daniel are already included in the canon of the Jews;
- (7) that Philo’s testimony is negative, in that he witnesses against the Apocryphal books as an integral part of Holy Scripture;
- (8) that the New Testament is the most explicit witness of the series, because of the names and titles it ascribes to the Old Testament books which it quotes;
- (9) that 4 Esdras is the first witness to the number of books in the Old Testament canon — 24;
- (10) that Josephus also fixes the number of books, but in arguing for the antiquity of the canon speaks as an advocate, voicing popular tradition, rather than as a scientific historian;
- (11) that the Councils of Jamnia may, with some ground, be considered the official occasion on which the Jews pronounced upon the limits of their canon; but that
- (12) doubts existed in the 2nd century concerning certain books; which books, however, were not seriously questioned.

From all this we conclude, that the Law was canonized, or as we would better say, was recognized as authoritative, first, circa 444 BC; that the Prophets were set on an even footing with the Law considerably later, circa 200 BC; and that the Writings received authoritative sanction still later, circa 100 BC. There probably never were three separate canons, but there were three separate classes of writings, which between 450 and 100 BC doubtless stood on different bases, and only gradually became authoritative. There is, therefore, ground for thinking, as suggested above (section 6), that the tripartite division of the Old Testament canon is due to material differences in the contents as well as to chronology.

III. THE CANON IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

1. In the Eastern or Oriental Church:

In making the transition from the Jewish to the Christian church, we find the same canon cherished by all. Christians of all sects have always been disposed to accept without question the canon of the Jews. For centuries all branches of the Christian church were practically agreed on the limits set by the Jews, but eventually the western church became divided, some alleging that Christ sanctioned the “larger” canon of Alexandria, including the Apocrypha, while others adhered, as the Jews have always done, to the canon of the Jews in Palestine taking the eastern or oriental church first, the evidence they furnish is as follows: The Peshitta, or Syriac version, dating from circa 150 AD, omits Chronicles; Justin Martyr (164 AD) held to a canon identical with that of the Jews; the Canon of Melito, bishop of Sardis, who (circa 170 AD) made a journey to Palestine in order carefully to investigate the matter, omits Est. His list, which is the first Christian list we have, has been preserved to us by Eusebius in his Eccl. Hist., IV, 26; Origen (died 254 AD), who was educated in Alexandria, and was one of the most learned of the Greek Fathers, also set himself the task of knowing the “Hebrew verity” of the Old Testament text, and gives us a list (also preserved to us by Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., VI, 5) in which he reckons the number of books as 22 (thus agreeing with Josephus). Inadvertently he omits the Twelve Minor Prophets, but this is manifestly an oversight on the part of either a scribe or of Eusebius, as he states the number of books is 22 and then names but 21. The so-called Canon of Laodicea (circa 363 AD) included the canonical books only, rejecting the Apocrypha. Athanasius (died 365 AD) gives a list in which Esther is classed as among the non-canonical books, but he elsewhere admits that “Esther is

considered canonical by the Hebrews.” However, he included Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah with Jeremiah. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium (circa 380 AD), speaks of Esther as received by some only. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (died 386 AD), gives a list corresponding with the Hebrew canon, except that he includes Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah. Gregory of Nazianzus in Cappadocia (died 390 AD) omits Esther. But Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch (560 AD), and Leontius of Byzantium (580 AD) both held to the strict Jewish canon of 22 books. The Nestorians generally doubted Esther. This was due doubtless to the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia (circa 390-457 AD) who disputed the authority of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Job. The oriental churches as a whole, however, never canonized the Apocrypha.

2. In the Western Church:

Between 100 and 400 AD, the New Testament writings became canonical, occupying in the Christian church a place of authority and sacredness equal to those of the Old Testament. The tendency of the period was to receive everything which had been traditionally read in the churches. But the transference of this principle to the Old Testament writings produced great confusion. Usage and theory were often in conflict. A church Father might declare that the Apocryphal books were uninspired and yet quote them as “Scripture,” and even introduce them with the accepted formula, “As the Holy Ghost saith.” Theologically, they held to a strict canon, homiletically they used a larger one. But even usage was not uniform. 3 and 4 Esdras and the Book of Enoch are sometimes quoted as “Holy Writ,” yet the western church never received these books as canonical. The criterion of usage, therefore, is too broad. The theory of the Fathers was gradually forgotten, and the prevalent use of the Septuagint and other versions led to the obliteration of the distinction between the undisputed books of the Hebrew canon and the most popular Apocryphal books; and being often publicly read in the churches they finally received a quasi-canonization.

Tertullian of Carthage (circa 150-230 AD) is the first of the Latin Fathers whose writings have been preserved. He gives the number of Old Testament books as 24, the same as in the Talmud Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in France (350-368 AD), gives a catalogue in which he speaks of “Jeremiah and his epistle,” yet his list numbers only 22. Rufinus of Aquileia in Italy (died 410 AD) likewise gives a complete list of 22 books. Jerome also, the learned monk of Bethlehem (died 420 AD), gives the number of

canonical books as 22, corresponding to the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and explains that the five double books (1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Jeremiah-Lamentations) correspond to the five final letters of the Hebrew alphabet. In his famous Prologus Galeatus or “Helmed Preface” to the books of Samuel and Kings, he declares himself for the strict canon of the Jews; rejecting the authority of the deuterocanonical books in the most outspoken manner, even distinguishing carefully the apocryphal additions to Esther and to Daniel. As the celebrated Catholic writer, Dr. Gigot, very frankly allows, “Time and again this illustrious doctor (Jerome) of the Latin church rejects the authority of the deuterocanonical books in the most explicit manner” (General Intro, 56).

Contemporaneous with Jerome in Bethlehem lived Augustine in North Africa (353-430 AD). He was the bishop of Hippo; renowned as thinker, theologian and saint. In the three great Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397 and 419 AD), of which he was the leading spirit, he closed, as it were, the great debate of the previous generations on the subject of how large shall be the Bible. In his essay on Christian Doctrine, he catalogues the books of Scripture, which had been transmitted by the Fathers for public reading in the church, giving their number as 44, with which he says “the authority of the Old Testament is ended.” These probably correspond with the present canon of Catholics. But it is not to be supposed that Augustine made no distinction between the proto-canonical and deuterocanonical books. On the contrary, he limited the term “canonical” in its strict sense to the books which are inspired and received by the Jews, and denied that in the support of doctrine the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were of unquestioned authority, though long custom had entitled them to respect. And when a passage from 2 Maccabees was urged by his opponents in defense of suicide, he rejected their proof by showing that the book was not received into the Hebrew canon to which Christ was witness. At the third Council of Carthage (397 AD), however, a decree was ratified, most probably with his approval, which in effect placed all the canonical and deuterocanonical books on the same level, and in the course of time they actually became considered by some as of equal authority (*see DEUTERO-CANONICAL BOOKS*). A few years later, another council at Carthage (419 AD) took the additional step of voting that their own decision concerning the canon should be confirmed by Boniface, the bishop of Rome; accordingly, thereafter, the

question of how large the Bible should be became a matter to be settled by authority rather than by criticism.

From the 4th to the 16th century AD the process of gradually widening the limits of the canon continued. Pope Gelasius (492-496 AD) issued a decretal or list in which he included the Old Testament apocrypha. Yet even after this official act of the papacy the sentiment in the western church was divided. Some followed the strict canon of Jerome, while others favored the larger canon of Augustine, without noting his cautions and the distinctions he made between inspired and uninspired writings. Cassiodorus (556 AD) and Isidore of Seville (636 AD) place the lists of Jerome and Augustine side by side without deciding between them. Two bishops of North Africa, Primasius and Junilius (circa 550 AD) reckon 24 books as strictly canonical and explicitly state that the others are not of the same grade. Popular usage, however, was indiscriminate. Outside the Jews there was no sound Hebrew tradition. Accordingly, at the Council of Florence (1442 AD), "Eugenius IV, with the approval of the Fathers of that assembly, declared all the books found in the Latin Bibles then in use to be inspired by the same Holy Spirit, without distinguishing them into two classes or categories" (compare Gigot, General Introduction, 71). Though this bull of Eugenius IV did not deal with the canonicity of the Apocryphal books, it did proclaim their inspiration. Nevertheless, down to the Council of Trent (1546 AD), the Apocryphal books possessed only inferior authority; and when men spoke of canonical Scripture in the strict sense, these were not included.

Luther, the great Saxon Reformer of the 16th century, marks an epoch in the history of the Christian Old Testament canon. In translating the Scriptures into German, he gave the deuterio-canonical books an intermediate position between the Old Testament and the New Testament. The Lutheran church, also, while it does not expressly define the limits of the canon, yet places the Apocryphal writings by themselves as distinct and separate from Holy Scripture. This indeed was the attitude of all the early Reformers. In the Zurich Bible of 1529, as in the Genevan version in English of 1560, the Apocryphal books were placed apart with special headings by themselves. Thus the early Reformers did not entirely reject the Apocryphal writings, for it was not an easy task to do so in view of the usage and traditions of centuries.

Rome had vacillated long enough. She realized that something must be done. The Reformers had sided with those who stood by Jerome. She therefore resolved to settle the matter in an ecclesiastical and dogmatic manner. Accordingly the Council of Trent decreed at their fourth sitting (April 8, 1546), that the Apocryphal books were equal in authority and canonical value to the other books of sacred Scripture; and to make this decree effective they added: "If, however, anyone receive not as sacred and canonical the said books entire with all their facts, and as they have been used to be read in the Catholic church, and as they are contained in the Old Latin Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) edition let him be anathema." The decree was the logical outcome of the ever-accumulating snowball tendency in the western church. The historical effect of it upon the church is obvious. It closed forever the field of Biblical study against all free research. Naturally, therefore, the Vatican Council of 1870 not only reiterated the decree but found it easy to take still another step and canonize tradition.

Repeated endeavors were made during the 16th and 17th centuries to have the Apocryphal books removed from the Scriptures. The Synod of Dort (1618-19), Gomarus, Deodatus and others, sought to accomplish it, but failed. The only success achieved was in getting them separated from the truly canonical writings and grouped by themselves, as in the Gallican Confession of 1559, the Anglican Confession of 1562, and the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566. The Puritan Confession went farther, and declared that they were of a purely secular character. The various continental and English versions of the Bible then being made likewise placed them by themselves, apart from the acknowledged books, as a kind of appendix. For example, the Zurich Bible of 1529, the French Bible of 1535, Coverdale's English translation of 1536, Matthew's of 1537, the second edition of the Great Bible, 1540, the Bishops' of 1568, and the King James Version of 1611. The first English version to omit them altogether was an edition of King James' Version published in 1629; but the custom of printing them by themselves, between the Old Testament and the New Testament, continued until 1825, when the Edinburgh Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society protested that the Society should no longer translate these Apocryphal writings and send them to the heathen. The Society finally yielded and decided to exclude them (May 3, 1827). Since then, Protestants in Great Britain and America have given up the practice of publishing the Apocrypha as a part of sacred Scripture. In

Europe, also, since 1850, the tendency has been in the same direction. The Church of England, however, and the American Episcopal church, do not wholly exclude them; certain “readings” being selected from Wisdom, Ecclesiastes and Baruch, and read on week days between October 27 and November 17. Yet, when the English Revised Version appeared in 1885, though it was a special product of the Church of England, there was not so much as a reference to the Apocryphal writings. The Irish church likewise removed them; and the American Standard Revised Version ignores them altogether.

LITERATURE.

G. Wildeboer, *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*, translated by B. W. Bacon, London, Luzac and Co., 1895; H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, London and New York, Macmillan, 1892; F. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, translated by John MacPherson, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1892; W. H. Green, *General Introduction to the Old Testament*, The Canon, New York, Scribner, 1898; W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd edition, London, A. and C. Black, 1895; F. E. Gigot, *General Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*, 3rd edition, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, Benziger Bros., 1903; B. F. Westcott, *The Bible in the Christian Church*, London and New York, Macmillan, 1901; C. A. Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, New York, Scribner, 1899; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, London and New York, Macmillan, 1892; Hastings, DB, III, 1900, article “Old Testament Canon” by F. H. Woods; Cheney and Black’s EB, I, 1899, article “Canon” by K. Budde; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, II, 1908, article “Canon of Scripture” by H. L. Struck; *Jour. of Biblical Lit.*, 1896, 118-28, article “The Alleged Triple Canon of the Old Testament,” by W. J. Beecher; Abbe A. Loisy, *Histoire du canon de l’ancien testament*, Paris, 1890; J. Furst, *Der Kanon des Altes Testament*, Leipzig, 1868; E. Reuss, *Histoire du canon des saintes ecritures dans l’eglise chretienne*, Strassburg, 1864, English translation, Edinburgh, 1891.

George L. Robinson

CANON, OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, THE

<kan'-un>

I. TWO PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

The canon is the collection of 27 books which the church (generally) receives as its New Testament Scriptures. The history of the canon is the history of the process by which these books were brought together and their value as sacred Scriptures officially recognized. That process was gradual, furthered by definite needs, and, though unquestionably continuous, is in its earlier stages difficult to trace. It is always well in turning to the study of it to have in mind two considerations which bear upon the earliest phases of the whole movement. These are:

1. Early Christians Had the Old Testament:

The early Christians had in their hands what was a Bible to them, namely, the Old Testament Scriptures. These were used to a surprising extent in Christian instruction. For a whole century after the death of Jesus this was the case. These Scriptures were read in the churches, and there could be at first no idea of placing beside them new books which could for a moment rank with them in honor and authority. It has been once and again discussed whether Christianity from the first was a “book-religion.” The decision of the matter depends upon what is referred to by the word “book.” Christianity certainly did have from the very beginning a book which it revered — the Old Testament — but years passed before it had even the beginnings of a book of its own. What has been called “the wealth of living canonical material,” namely, prophets and teachers, made written words of subordinate value. In this very teaching, however, with its oral traditions lay the beginnings of that movement which was ultimately to issue in a canon of writings.

2. No Intention of Writing the New Testament:

When the actual work of writing began no one who sent forth an epistle or framed a gospel had before him the definite purpose of contributing toward the formation of what we call “the Bible.” All the New Testament writers looked for “the end” as near. Their words, therefore, were to meet definite needs in the lives of those with whom they were associated. They had no thought of creating a new sacred literature. And yet these incidental occasional writings have come to be our choicest Scripture. The circumstances and influences which brought about this result are here briefly set forth.

II. THREE STAGES OF THE PROCESS.

For convenience of arrangement and definiteness of impression the whole process may be marked off in three stages:

- (1) that from the time of the apostles until about 170 AD;
- (2) that of the closing years of the 2nd century and the opening of the 3rd (170-220 AD);
- (3) that of the 3rd and 4th centuries. In the first we seek for the evidences of the growth in appreciation of the peculiar value of the New Testament writings; in the second we discover the clear, full recognition of a large part of these writings as sacred and authoritative; in the third the acceptance of the complete canon in the East and in the West.

1. From the Apostles to 170 AD:

(1) Clement of Rome; Ignarius; Polycarp:

The first period extending to 170 AD. — It does not lie within the scope of this article to recount the origin of the several books of the New Testament. This belongs properly to New Testament Introduction (which see). By the end of the 1st century all of the books of the New Testament were in existence. They were, as treasures of given churches, widely separated and honored as containing the word of Jesus or the teaching of the apostles. From the very first the authority of Jesus had full recognition in all the Christian world. The whole work of the apostles was in interpreting Him to the growing church. His sayings and His life were in part for the illumination of the Old Testament; wholly for the understanding of life and its issues. In every assembly of Christians from the earliest days He was taught as well as the Old Testament. In each church to which an epistle was written that epistle was likewise read. Paul asked that his letters be read in this way (1 Thess 5:27; ~~Colossians~~ Colossians 4:16). In this attentive listening to the exposition of some event in the life of Jesus or to the reading of the epistle of an apostle began the “authorization” of the traditions concerning Jesus and the apostolic writings. The widening of the area of the church and the departure of the apostles from earth emphasized increasingly the value of that which the writers of the New Testament left behind them. Quite early the desire to have the benefit of all possible instruction led to the interchange of

Christian writings. Polycarp (110 AD ?) writes to the Philippians, “I have received letters from you and from Ignatius. You recommend me to send on yours to Syria; I shall do so either personally or by some other means. In return I send you the letter of Ignatius as well as others which I have in my hands and for which you made request. I add them to the present one; they will serve to edify your faith and perseverance” (Epistle to Phil, XIII). This is an illustration of what must have happened toward furthering a knowledge of the writings of the apostles. Just when and to what extent “collections” of our New Testament books began to be made it is impossible to say, but it is fair to infer that a collection of the Pauline epistles existed at the time Polycarp wrote to the Philippians and when Ignatius wrote his seven letters to the churches of Asia Minor, i.e. about 115 AD. There is good reason to think also that the four Gospels were brought together in some places as early as this. A clear distinction, however, is to be kept in mind between “collections” and such recognition as we imply in the word “canonical.” The gathering of books was one of the steps preliminary to this. Examination of the testimony to the New Testament in this early time indicates also that it is given with no intention of framing the canonicity of New Testament books. In numerous instances only “echoes” of the thought of the epistles appear; again quotations are incomplete; both showing that Scripture words are used as the natural expression of Christian thought. In the same way the Apostolic Fathers refer to the teachings and deeds of Jesus. They witness “to the substance and not to the authenticity of the Gospels.” That this all may be more evident let us note in more detail the witness of the subapostolic age. Clement of Rome, in 95 AD, wrote a letter in the name of the Christians of Rome to those in Corinth. In this letter he uses material found in Mt, Lk, giving it a free rendering (see chapters 46 and 13); he has been much influenced by the Epistle to the Hebrews (see chapters 9, 10, 17, 19, 36). He knows Romans, Corinthians, and there are found echoes of 1 Timothy, Titus, 1 Peter and Ephesians.

The Epistles of Ignatius (115 AD) have correspondences with our gospels in several places (Ephesians 5; Romans 6; 7) and incorporate language from nearly all of the Pauline epistles. The Epistle to Polycarp makes large use of Phil, and besides this cites nine of the other Pauline epistles. Ignatius quotes from Matthew, apparently from memory; also from 1 Peter and 1 John. In regard to all these three writers — Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius — it is not enough to say that they bring us reminiscences or quotations from

this or that book. Their thought is tintured all through with New Testament truth. As we move a little farther down the years we come to “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles” (circa 120 AD in its present form; *see DIDACHE*); the Epistle of Barnabas (circa 130 AD) and the Shepherd of Hermas (circa 130 AD). These exhibit the same phenomena as appear in the writings of Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp as far as references to the New Testament are concerned. Some books are quoted, and the thought of the three writings echoes again and again the teachings of the New Testament. They bear distinct witness to the value of “the gospel” and the doctrine of the apostles, so much so as to place these clearly above their own words. It is in the Epistle of Barnabas that we first come upon the phrase “it is written,” referring to a New Testament book (Matthew) (see Epis., iv.14). In this deepening sense of value was enfolded the feeling of authoritativeness, which slowly was to find expression. It is well to add that what we have so far discovered was true in widely separated parts of the Christian world as e.g. Rome and Asia Minor.

(2) Forces Increasing Value of Writings:

(a) Apologists, Justin Martyr:

The literature of the period we are examining was not, however, wholly of the kind of which we have been speaking. Two forces were calling out other expressions of the singular value of the writings of the apostles, whether gospels or epistles. These were

(a) the attention of the civil government in view of the rapid growth of the Christian church and

(b) heresy. The first brought to the defense or commendation of Christianity the Apologists, among whom were Justin Martyr, Aristides, Melito of Sardis and Theophilus of Antioch. By far the most important of these was Justin Martyr, and his work may be taken as representative. He was born about 100 AD at Shechem, and died as a martyr at Rome in 165 AD. His two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho are the sources for the study of his testimony. He speaks of the “Memoirs of the Apostles called Gospels” (Ap., i.66) which were read on Sunday interchangeably with the prophets (i.67). Here emerges that equivalence in value of these “Gospels” with the Old Testament Scriptures which may really mark the beginning of canonization. That these Gospels were our four Gospels as we now have them is yet a

disputed question; but the evidence is weighty that they were. (See Purves, *Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity*, Lect V.) The fact that Tatian, his pupil, made a harmony of the Gospels, i.e. of our four Gospels, also bears upon our interpretation of Justin's "Memoirs." (See Hemphill, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*.) The only other New Testament book which Justin mentions is the Apocalypse; but he appears to have known the Acts, six epistles of Paul, Hebrew and 1 John, and echoes of still other epistles are perceptible. When he speaks of the apostles it is after this fashion: "By the power of God they proclaimed to every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach to all the Word of God" (Ap., i.39). It is debatable, however, whether this refers to more than the actual preaching of the apostles. The beginning of the formation of the canon is in the position and authority given to the Gospels.

(b) Gnostics, Marcion:

While the Apologists were busy commending or defending Christianity, heresy in the form of Gnosticism was also compelling attention to the matter of the writings of the apostles. From the beginning Gnostic teachers claimed that Jesus had favored chosen ones of His apostles with a body of esoteric truth which had been handed down by secret tradition. This the church denied, and in the controversy that went on through years the question of what were authoritative writings became more and more pronounced. Basilides e.g., who taught in Alexandria during the reign of Hadrian (AD 117-38), had for his secret authority the secret tradition of the apostle Matthias and of Glaucias, an alleged interpreter of Peter, but he bears witness to Matthew, Luke, John, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians in the effort to recommend his doctrines, and, what is more, gives them the value of Scripture in order to support more securely his teachings. (See *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus, VII, 17). Valentinus, tracing his authority through Theodas to Paul, makes the same general use of New Testament books, and Tertullian tells us that he appeared to use the whole New Testament as then known.

The most noted of the Gnostics was Marcion, a native of Pontus. He went to Rome (circa 140 AD), there broke with the church and became a dangerous heretic. In support of his peculiar views, he formed a canon of his own which consisted of Luke's Gospel and ten of the Pauline epistles. He rejected the Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, Matthew, Mark, John, the

Acts, the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse, and made a recension of both the gospel of Luke and the Pauline epistles which he accepted. His importance, for us, however, is in the fact that he gives us the first clear evidence of the canonization of the Pauline epistles. Such use of the Scriptures inevitably called forth both criticism and a clearer marking off of those books which were to be used in the churches opposed to heresy, and so "in the struggle with Gnosticism the canon was made." We are thus brought to the end of the first period in which we have marked the collection of New Testament books in greater or smaller compass, the increasing valuation of them as depositions of the truth of Jesus and His apostles, and finally the movement toward the claim of their authoritativeness as over against perverted teaching. No sharp line as to a given year can be drawn between the first stage of the process and the second. Forces working in the first go on into the second, but results are accomplished in the second which give it its right to separate consideration.

2. From 170 AD to 220 AD:

The period from 170 AD to 220 AD. — This is the age of a voluminous theological literature busy with the great issues of church canon and creed. It is the period of the great names of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, representing respectively Asia Minor, Egypt and North Africa. In passing into it we come into the clear light of Christian history. There is no longer any question as to a New Testament canon; the only difference of judgment is as to its extent. What has been slowly but surely shaping itself in the consciousness of the church now comes to clear expression.

(1) Irenaeus.

That expression we may study in Irenaeus as representative of the period. He was born in Asia Minor, lived and taught in Rome and became afterward bishop of Lyons. He had, therefore, a wide acquaintance with the churches, and was peculiarly competent to speak concerning the general judgment of the Christian world. As a pupil of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John, he is connected with the apostles themselves. An earnest defender of the truth, he makes the New Testament in great part his authority, and often appeals to it. The four Gospels, the Acts, the epistles of Paul, several of the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse are to him Scripture in the fullest sense. They are genuine and authoritative, as much so as the Old Testament ever was. He dwells upon the fact that there are four gospels, the very number being prefigured in the four winds and the

four quarters of the earth. Every attempt to increase or diminish the number is heresy. Tertullian takes virtually the same position (Adv. Marc., iv. 2), while Clement of Alexandria quotes all four gospels as "Scripture." By the end of the 2nd century the canon of the gospels was settled. The same is true also of the Pauline epistles. Irenaeus makes more than two hundred citations from Paul, and looks upon his epistles as Scripture (Adv. Haer., iii.12, 12). Indeed, at this time it may be said that the new canon was known under the designation "The Gospel and the Apostles" in contradistinction to the old as "the Law and the Prophets." The title "New Testament" appears to have been first used by an unknown writer against Montanism (circa 193 AD). It occurs frequently after this in Origen and later writers. In considering all this testimony two facts should have emphasis:

(1) its wide extent: Clement and Irenaeus represent parts of Christendom which are widely separated;

(2) the relation of these men to those who have gone before them. Their lives together with those before them spanned nearly the whole time from the apostles. They but voiced the judgment which silently, gradually had been selecting the "Scripture" which they freely and fully acknowledged and to which they made appeal.

(2) The Muratorian Fragment.

Just here we come upon the Muratorian Fragment, so called because discovered in 1740 by the librarian of Milan, Muratori. It dates from some time near the end of the 2nd century, is of vital interest in the study of the history of the canon, since it gives us a list of New Testament books and is concerned with the question of the canon itself. The document comes from Rome, and Lightfoot assigns it to Hippolytus. Its list contains the Gospels (the first line of the fragment is incomplete, beginning with Mark, but Matthew is clearly implied), the Acts, the Pauline epistles, the Apocalypse, 1 and 2 John (perhaps by implication the third) and Jude. It does not mention Hebrew, 1 and 2 Peter, James. In this list we have virtually the real position of the canon at the close of the 2nd century. Complete unanimity had not been attained in reference to all the books which are now between the covers of our New Testament. Seven books had not yet found a secure place beside the gospel and Paul in all parts of the church. The Palestinian and Syrian churches for a long time rejected the Apocalypse, while some of

the Catholic epistles were in Egypt considered doubtful. The history of the final acceptance of these belongs to the third period.

3. 3rd and 4th Centuries:

(1) Origen:

The period included by the 3rd and 4th centuries — It has been said that “the question of the canon did not make much progress in the course of the 3rd century” (Reuss, *History of the Canon of Holy Scripture*, 125). We have the testimony of a few notable teachers mostly from one center, Alexandria. Their consideration of the question of the disputed book serves just here one purpose. By far the most distinguished name of the 3rd century is Origen. He was born in Alexandria about 185 AD, and before he was seventeen became an instructor in the school for catechumens. In 203 he was appointed bishop, experienced various fortunes, and died in 254. His fame rests upon his ability as an exegete, though he worked laboriously and successfully in other fields. His testimony is of high value, not simply because of his own studies, but also because of his wide knowledge of what was thought in other Christian centers in the world of his time. Space permits us only to give in summary form his conclusions, especially in regard to the books still in doubt. The Gospels, the Pauline epistles, the Acts, he accepts without question. He discusses at some length the authorship of He, believes that “God alone knows who wrote it,” and accepts it as Scripture. His testimony to the Apocalypse is given in the sentence, “Therefore John the son of Zebedee says in the Revelation.” He also gives sure witness to Jude, but wavers in regard to James, 2 Peter, 2 John, and 3 John.

(2) Dionysius:

Another noted name of this century is Dionysius of Alexandria, a pupil of Origen (died 265). His most interesting discussion is regarding the Apocalypse, which he attributes to an unknown John, but he does not dispute its inspiration. It is a singular fact that the western church accepted this book from the first, while its position in the East was variable. Conversely the Epistle to the He was more insecure in the West than in the East. In regard to the Catholic epistles Dionysius supports James, 2 John, and 3 John, but not 2 Peter or Jude.

(3) Cyprian:

In the West the name of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (248-58 AD), was most influential. He was much engaged in controversy, but a man of great personal force. The Apocalypse he highly honored, but he was silent about the Epistle to the Hebrews. He refers to only two of the Catholic epistles, 1 Peter and 1 John.

These testimonies confirm what was said above, namely, that the end of the 3rd century leaves the question of the full canon about where it was at the beginning. 1 Peter and 1 John seem to have been everywhere known and accepted. In the West the five Catholic epistles gained recognition more slowly than in the East.

(4) Eusebius:

In the early part of the 4th century Eusebius (270-340 AD), bishop of Caesarea before 315, sets before us in his *Church History* (III, chapters iii-xxv) his estimate of the canon in his time. He does not of course use the word canon, but he “conducts an historical inquiry into the belief and practice of earlier generations.” He lived through the last great persecution in the early part of the 4th century, when not only places of worship were razed to the ground, but also the sacred Scriptures were in the public market-places consigned to the flames (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, VIII, 2). It was, therefore, no idle question what book a loyal Christian must stand for as his Scripture. The question of the canon had an earnest, practical significance. Despite some obscurity and apparent contradictions, his classification of the New Testament books was as follows:

(1) The acknowledged books. His criteria for each of these was authenticity and apostolicity and he placed in this list the Gospels, Acts, and Paul’s epistles, including He.

(2) The disputed books, i.e. those which had obtained only partial recognition, to which he assigned Jas, Jude, 2 Peter and 2 Jn. About the Apocalypse also he was not sure. In this testimony there is not much advance over that of the 3rd century. It is virtually the canon of Origen. All this makes evident the fact that as yet no official decision nor uniformity of usage in the church gave a completed canon. The time, however, was drawing on when various forces at work were to bring much nearer this unanimity and enlarge the list of acknowledged

books. In the second half of the 4th century repeated efforts were made to put an end to uncertainty.

(5) Athanasius:

Athanasius in one of his pastoral letters in connection with the publishing of the ecclesiastical calendar gives a list of the books comprising Scripture, and in the New Testament portion are included all the 27 books which we now recognize. "These are the wells of salvation," he writes, "so that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the sayings in these. Let no one add to these. Let nothing be taken away." Gregory of Nazianzen (died 390 AD) also published a list omitting Revelation, as did Cyril of Jerusalem (died 386), and quite at the end of the century (4th) Isidore of Pelusium speaks of the "canon of truth, the Divine Scriptures." For a considerable time the Apocalypse was not accepted in the Palestinian or Syrian churches. Athanasius helped toward its acceptance in the church of Alexandria. Some differences of opinion, however, continued. The Syrian church did not accept all of the Catholic epistles until much later.

(6) Council of Carthage, Jerome; Augustine:

The Council of Carthage in 397, in connection with its decree "that aside from the canonical Scriptures nothing is to be read in church under the name of Divine Scriptures," gives a list of the books of the New Testament. After this fashion there was an endeavor to secure unanimity, while at the same time differences of judgment and practice continued. The books which had varied treatment through these early centuries were He, the Apocalypse and the five minor Catholic epistles. The advance of Christianity under Constantine had much to do with the reception of the whole group of books in the East. The task which the emperor gave to Eusebius to prepare "fifty copies of the Divine Scriptures" established a standard which in time gave recognition to all doubtful books. In the West, Jerome and Augustine were the controlling factors in its settlement of the canon. The publication of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) virtually determined the matter.

In conclusion let it be noted how much the human element was involved in the whole process of forming our New Testament. No one would wish to dispute a providential overruling of it all. Also it is well to bear in mind that all the books have not the same clear title to their places in the canon as far as the history of their attestation is concerned. Clear and full and

unanimous, however, has been the judgment from the beginning upon the Gospels, the Acts, the Pauline epistles, 1 Peter and 1 John.

LITERATURE.

Reuss, History of the Canon of Holy Scriptures; E. C. Moore, The New Testament in the Christian Church; Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament; Introductions to New Testament of Julicher, Weiss, Reuss; Zahn, Geschichte des Neutest. Kanons; Harnack, Das New Testament um das Jahr 200; Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur; Westcott, The Canon of the New Testament; Zahn, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutest. Kanons.

J. S. Riggs

CANOPY

<kan'-o-pi> (**hPj** **ψ**chuppah), from a root meaning “to enclose” or “cover”): ^{<2015>}Isaiah 4:5 the King James Version has “defence,” the English Revised Version “canopy,” the American Standard Revised Version “covering,” the last being best, though “canopy” has much in its favor. In ^{<1915>}Psalm 19:5 (Hebrew 19:6) [chuppah] is used of the bridegroom’s chamber and in ^{<2016>}Joel 2:16 of the bride’s. Among the Hebrews the [chuppah] was originally the chamber in which the bride awaited the groom for the marital union. In Judith 10:21; 13:9,15; 16:19 the word canopy occurs as the English equivalent of the Greek [**κωνωπεῖον**, konopeion], which was primarily a mosquito-net and then a canopy over a bed, whether for useful or for decorative purposes.

John Richard Sampey

CANTICLES

<kan'-ti-k'-lz>.

See SONG OF SONGS.

CAPERBERRY

<ka'-per-ber-i> (**hnw****Ḳā**) [ʾabhiyonah]; [**κάππαρις**, kapparis];

^{<2015>}Ecclesiastes 12:5 the Revised Version, margin): The translation “the

caperberry shall fail” (the Revised Version (British and American) “burst”) instead of “desire shall fail” (the King James Version) has the support of the Septuagint and of some Talmudic writers (see G. F. Moore, JBL, X, 55-64), but it is doubtful.

The caperberry is the fruit of the thorny caper, *Capparis spinosa* (Natural Order Capparidaceae), a common Palestine plant with pretty white flowers and brightly colored stamens. Largely on account of its habit of growing out of crevasses in old walls it has been identified by some with the *HYSSOP* (which see). The familiar “capers” of commerce are the young buds, but the berries were the parts most used in ancient times; their repute as excitants of sexual desire is ancient and widespread. Various parts of this plant are still used for medical purposes by the modern peasants of Palestine.

E. W. G. Masterman

CAPERNAUM

<ka-per'-na-um> ([*απερναούμ*, Kapernaoum] (Textus Receptus), [*αφαρναούμ*, Kapharnaoum] (Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae; etc.)): The woe spoken by the Master against this great city has been fulfilled to the uttermost (^{<40123>}Matthew 11:23; ^{<2015>}Luke 10:15). So completely has it perished that the very site is a matter of dispute today. In Scripture Capernaum is not mentioned outside the Gospels. When Jesus finally departed from Nazareth, He dwelt in Capernaum (^{<4043>}Matthew 4:13) and made it the main center of His activity during a large part of His public ministry. Near by He called the fishermen to follow Him (^{<4006>}Mark 1:16), and the publican from the receipt of custom (^{<4009>}Matthew 9:9, etc.). It was the scene of many “mighty works” (^{<40123>}Matthew 11:23; ^{<40034>}Mark 1:34). Here Jesus healed the centurion’s son (^{<4085>}Matthew 8:5, etc.), the nobleman’s son (^{<4046>}John 4:46), Simon Peter’s mother-in-law (^{<4003>}Mark 1:31, etc.), and the paralytic (^{<4000>}Matthew 9:1, etc.); cast out the unclean spirit (^{<40023>}Mark 1:23, etc.); and here also, probably, He raised Jairus’ daughter to life (^{<40022>}Mark 5:22, etc.). In Capernaum the little child was used to teach the disciples humility, while in the synagogue Jesus delivered His ever-memorable discourse on the bread of life (John 6). From the notices in the Gospels we gather that Capernaum was a city of considerable importance. Some think that the words “shalt thou be exalted,” etc. (^{<40123>}Matthew 11:23; ^{<2015>}Luke 10:15), mean that it stood on

an elevated site. Perhaps more naturally they refer to the excessive pride of the inhabitants in their city. It was a customs station, and the residence of a high officer of the king (⁴⁰⁰⁹Matthew 9:9; ⁴⁰⁴⁶John 4:46, etc.). It was occupied by a detachment of Roman soldiers, whose commander thought the good will of the people worth securing at the expense of building for them a synagogue (⁴⁰⁸⁵Matthew 8:5; ⁴⁰⁷⁵Luke 7:5). It stood by the sea (⁴⁰⁴³Matthew 4:13) and from ⁴⁰⁷⁷John 6:17 ff (compare ⁴⁰⁴¹Matthew 14:34; ⁴⁰⁵³Mark 6:53), we see that it was either in or near the plain of Gennesaret. Josephus twice mentions Capernaum. It played no great part in the history of his time, and seems to have declined in importance, as he refers to it as a "village." In battle in el-BaTeichah his horse fell into a quagmire, and he suffered injury which disabled him for further fighting. His soldiers carried him to the village of Capernaum (this reference is however doubtful; the name as it stands is Kepharnomon which Niese corrects to Kepharnokon), whence he was removed to Tarichea (Vita, 72). Again he eulogizes the plain of Gennesaret for its wonderful fruits, and says it is watered by a most fertile fountain which the people of the country call Capharnaum. In the water of this fountain the Coracinus is found (BJ, III, x, 8). Josephus therefore corroborates the Biblical data, and adds the information as to the fountain and the Coracinus fish. The fish however is found in other fountains near the lake, and is therefore no help toward identification.

The two chief rivals for the honor of representing Capernaum are Tell Chum, a ruined site on the lake shore, nearly 2 1/2 miles West of the mouth of the Jordan; and Khan Minyeh fully 2 1/2 miles farther west, at the Northeast corner of the plain of Gennesaret. Dr. Tristram suggested `Ain El-Madowwerah, a large spring enclosed by a circular wall, on the western edge of the plain. But it stands about a mile from the sea; there are no ruins to indicate that any considerable village ever stood here; and the water is available for only a small part of the plain.

In favor of Tell Chum is Eusebius, Onomasticon, Which places Chorazin 2 miles from Capernaum. If Kerazeh is Chorazin, this suits Tell Chum better than Khan Minyeh. To this may be added the testimony of Theodosius (circa 530), Antoninus Martyr (600), and John of Wurtzburg (1100). Jewish tradition speaks of Tankhum, in which are the graves of Nahum and Rabbi Tankhum. Identifying Kerr Nahum with Tankhum, and then deriving Tell Chum from Tankhum, some have sought to vindicate the claims of this site. But every link in that chain of argument is extremely precarious. A highway ran through Tell Chum along which passed the caravans to and

from the East; but the place was not in touch with the great north-and-south traffic.

There is also no fountain near Tell Chum answering the description of Josephus. Of recent advocates of Tell Chum, it is sufficient to name Schurer (HJP, IV, 71) and Buhl (GAP, 224 f). In this connection it may be interesting to note that the present writer, when visiting the place recently (1911), drew his boatman's attention to a bit of ruined wall rising above the greenery West of the lagoon, and asked what it was called. Kaniset el Kufry, was the reply, which may be freely rendered, "church of the infidels." This is just the Arabic equivalent of the Jewish "church of the minim."

For Khan Minyeh it may be noted that Gennesaret corresponds to el-Ghuweir, the plain lying on the Northwest shore, and that Khan Minyeh stands at the Northeast extremity of the plain; thus answering, as Tell Chum cannot do, the description of the Gospels. The copious fountains at eT-Tabigha, half a mile to the East, supplied water which was conducted round the face of the rock toward Khan Minyeh at a height which made it possible to water a large portion of the plain. If it be said that Josephus must have been carried to Tell Chum as being nearer the scene of his accident — see however, the comment above — it does not at all follow that he was taken to the nearest place. Arculf (1670) described Capernaum as on a "narrow piece of ground between the mountain and the lake." This does not apply to Tell Chum; but it accurately fits Khan Minyeh. Isaac Chelo (1334) says that Capernaum, then in ruins, had been inhabited by Minim, that is, Jewish converts to Christianity. The name Minyeh may have been derived from them. Quaresimus (1620-26) notes a Khan called Menieh which stood by the site of Capernaum. Between the ruined Khan and the sea there are traces of ancient buildings. Here the road from the East united with that which came down from the North by way of Khan Jubb Yusif, so that this must have been an important center, alike from the military point of view, and for customs. This is the site favored by, among others, G. A. Smith (HGHL, 456 f; EB, under the word) and Conder. Sanday argued in favor of Khan Minyeh in his book, *The Sacred Sites of the Gospel*, but later, owing to what the present writer thinks a mistaken view of the relation between Tell Chum and the fountain at eT-Tabigha, changed his mind (*Expository Times*, XV, 100 ff). There is no instance of a fountain 2 miles distant being called by the name of a town. Tell Chum,

standing on the sea shore, was independent of this fountain, whose strength also was spent in a westward direction, away from Tell Chum.

The balance of evidence was therefore heavily in favor of Khan Minyeh until Professor R. A. S. Macalister published the results of his researches. He seems to be wrong in rejecting the name Tell Chum in favor of Talchum; and he falls into a curious error regarding the use of the word tell. No one who speaks Arabic, he says, “would ever think of applying the word Tell, ‘mound,’ to this flat widespread ruin.” In Egyptian Arabic, however, tell means “ruin”; and Asad Mansur, a man of education whose native language is Arabic, writes: “I do not understand what the objectors mean by the word ‘tell.’ In Arabic ‘tell’ is used for any heap of ruins, or mound. So that the ruins of Tell Chum themselves are today a ‘tell’” (Expos, April, 1907, 370). Professor Macalister is on surer ground in discussing the pottery found on the rival sites. At Khan Minyeh he found nothing older than the Arabian period, while at Tell Chum pottery of the Roman period abounds — “exactly the period of the glory of Capernaum” (PEFS, April and July, 1907). If this be confirmed by further examination, it disposes of the claim of Khan Minyeh. Important Roman remains have now been found between the ruined Khan and the sea. It is no longer open to doubt that this was the site of a great Roman city. The Roman period however covers a long space. The buildings at Tell Chum are by many assigned to the days of the Antonines. Is it possible from the remains of pottery to make certain that the city flourished in the time of the Herods? If the city at Tell Chum had not yet arisen in the days of Christ, those who dispute its claim to be Capernaum are under no obligation to show which city the ruins represent. They are not the only extensive ruins in the country of whose history we are in ignorance.

W. Ewing

CAPH

See KAPH.

CAPHARSALAMA

<*kaf-ar-sal'-a-ma*>, <*kaf-ar-sala'-ma*> ([*αφαρσαλαμά*, Chapharsalama]): The site of an indecisive skirmish between Judas Maccabeus and Nicanor, an officer of the king of Syria and governor of Judea. The situation cannot be precisely fixed but it must have been in the

neighborhood of Jerusalem, for Nicanor, after losing 5,000 men, retired with the remainder to “the city of David” (1 Macc 7:26-32). The first part of the word, “Caphar,” means village or hamlet; the last part has been identified with Siloam and also with Khirbet Deir Sellam, about 12 1/2 miles West of Jerusalem.

CAPHENATHA

<ka-fen'-a-tha>.

See *CHAPHENATHA*.

CAPHIRA

<ka-fi'-ra> (Codex Alexandrinus, [**αφιρά**, Kaphira], Codex Vaticanus, [**ειρά**, Peira]): A town whose inhabitants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:19). It corresponds to *CHEPHIRAH* (^{<825>}Ezra 2:25), which see.

CAPHTHORIM

<kaf'-tho-rim> (**μυρτρκ** [kaphtorim]).

See CAPHTORIM.

CAPHTOR; CAPHTORIM

<kaf'-tor>, <kaf'-tor-im> (**ρκτρκ** [kaphtor], **μυρτρκ** [kaphtorim]; [**απαδοκία**, Kappadokia], [**αφτοριείμ**, Gaphtorieim], [**αφτοριείμ**, Kaphtoriem]).

1. FIRST THEORY: CRETE:

The country and people whence came the Philistines (^{<1014>}Genesis 10:14 = ^{<312>}1 Chronicles 1:12 (here the clause “whence went forth the Philistines” should, probably come after Caphtorim); ^{<823>}Deuteronomy 2:23; ^{<3474>}Jeremiah 47:4; ^{<1007>}Amos 9:7). Jeremiah (loc. cit.) calls it an “island”; there is evidence of ancient connection between Crete and Philistia; and the Philistines are called Cherethites, which may mean Cretans (*see* *CHERETHITES*). These considerations have led many to identify Caphtor with the important island of Crete. It should be noted, however, that the

word *yai*['i], used by Jeremiah, denotes not only “isle,” but also “coastland.”

2. SECOND THEORY: PHOENICIA:

Ebers (*Aegypten und die Bucher Moses*, 130 ff) thought that Caphtor represented the Egyptian Kaft-ur, holding that Kaft was the Egyptian name for the colonies of Phoenicians in the Delta, extended to cover the Phoenicians in the north and their colonies. Kaft-ur, therefore, would mean “Greater Phoenicia.” But the discovery of Kaptar among the names of countries conquered by Ptolemy Auletes in an inscription on the Temple of Kom Ombo is fatal to this theory.

3. THIRD THEORY: CILICIA:

A third theory would identify Caphtor with the Kafto of the Egyptian inscriptions. As early as the time of Thotmes III the inhabitants of this land, the Kafti, are mentioned in the records. In the trilingual inscription of Canopus the name is rendered in Greek by [Phoinike], “Phoenicia.” This seems to be an error, as the Kafti portrayed on the monuments have no features in common with the Semites. They certainly represent a western type. It is held that the Egyptian Kafto is a district in Asia Minor, probably Cilicia. The sea-pirates, the purasati, whom Rameses III subdued (circa 1200 BC), entered Syria from the north. The “R” in the name is the Egyptian equivalent of the Semitic “L”. Therefore Purasati = Pilishti, “Philistines.” And so it is proposed to identify Caphtor with Cilicia. A serious objection to this theory is the absence of the final “r” in Kafto. McCurdy’s suggestion (HDB) that it represents a Hebrew [waw], written as a vowel-letter in an original Kafto, does not carry conviction.

It is impossible to give a certain decision; but the balance of probability seems still inclined to the first theory.

W. Ewing

CAPPADOCIA

<*kap-a-do'-shi-a*> ([ἡ *αππαδοκία*, he Kappadokia]): An extensive province in eastern Asia Minor, bounded by the Taurus mountains on the South, the Anti-Taurus and the Euphrates on the East, and, less definitely, by Pontus and Galatia on the North and West. Highest mountain, Argaeus,

over 13,000 ft. above sea-level; chief rivers, the Pyramus now Jihan, Sarus now Sihon, and Halys now the Kuzul; most important cities, Caesarea Mazaca, Comana, Miletene now Malatia, and Tyana now Bor. At Malatia the country unrolls itself as a fertile plain; elsewhere the province is for the most part composed of billowy and rather barren uplands, and bleak mountain peaks and pastures.

The Greek geographers called Cappodax the son of Ninyas, thereby tracing the origin of Cappadocian culture to Assyria. Cuneiform tablets from Kul Tepe (Kara Eyuk), deciphered by Professors Pinches and Sayce, show that in the era of Khammurabi (see *CHAMMURABI*) this extensive ruin on the ox-bow of the Halys and near Caesarea Mazaca, was an outpost of the Assyr-Bah Empire. A Hittite civilization followed, from about 2000 BC onward. Malatia, Gurun, Tyana and other old sites contain important and undoubted Hittite remains, while sporadic examples of Hittite art, architecture and inscriptions are found in many places, and the number is being steadily increased by fresh discovery. After the Hittites faded from sight, following the fall of Carchemish, about 718 BC, Cappadocia emerges as a satrapy of Persia. At the time of Alexander the Great it received a top-dressing of Greek culture, and a line of native kings established an independent throne, which lasted until Cappadocia was incorporated in the Roman Empire, 17 AD. Nine rulers bore the name of Ariarathes (the Revised Version (British and American) Arathes) the founder of the dynasty, and two were named Ariobarzanes. One of these kings is referred to in 1 Macc 15:22. The history of this Cappadocian kingdom is involved, obscure and bloody.

Pagan religion had a deep hold upon the population prior to the advent of Christianity. Comana was famous for its worship of the great goddess Ma, who was served, according to Strabo, by 6,000 priestesses, and only second to this was the worship paid to Zeus at Venasa.

Representatives from Cappadocia were present at Pentecost (~~“*AND*”~~ Acts 2:9), and Peter includes the converts in this province in the address of his letter (1 Pet 1:1). Caesarea became one of the most important early centers of Christianity. Here the Armenian youth of noble blood, Krikore, or Gregory the Illuminator, was instructed in the faith to which he afterward won the formal assent of his whole nation. Here Basil governed the churches of his wide diocese and organized monasticism. His brother, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, lived and labored not far away. Cappadocia

passed with the rest of Asia Minor into the Byzantine Empire, but from its exposed position early fell under the domination of the Turks, having been conquered by the Seljukians in 1074.

G. E. White

CAPTAIN

<kap'-tin>: In the King James Version there are no fewer than 13 Hebrew words, and 4 different Greek words, which are rendered by this one English word. In the Revised Version (British and American) some of these are rendered by other English words, and so we find for “captain”: “marshal” (Jeremiah 27; Nah 3:17), “prince” (^{<0016>}1 Samuel 9:16), “governor” (^{<0573>}Jeremiah 51:23,18), while in the case of one of these Hebrew words a different construction is found altogether (^{<2471>}Jeremiah 13:21).

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

Of Hebrew words in the Old Testament rendered by “captain”

(1) the most frequent is **rc** [sar], which denotes “a military commander,” whether of thousands or hundreds or fifties (^{<0618>}Numbers 31:48; ^{<0082>}1 Samuel 8:12 and many other places). [Sar] is the chief officer of any department, civil and religious, as well as military — captain of the guard the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), chief of the executioners the Revised Version, margin (^{<0576>}Genesis 37:36); chief butler (^{<0409>}Genesis 40:9); chief baker (^{<0406>}Genesis 40:16); chief of a district (^{<1615>}Nehemiah 3:15); chiefs of tribes (Naphtali; Zebulun, ^{<1627>}Psalms 68:27); chiefs over gangs of slaves (^{<0011>}Exodus 1:11); chiefs of the priests and the Levites (^{<1629>}Ezra 8:29).

(2) **br'** [rabh], later Hebrew for chief of the executioners or captain of the guard, a title always given to Nebuzar-adan (^{<1258>}2 Kings 25:8 ff; ^{<2499>}Jeremiah 39:9 ff) and to Arioch (^{<2724>}Daniel 2:14). Compare also Rab-mag, chief of the magicians (^{<2493>}Jeremiah 39:13), and Ashpenaz, chief of the eunuchs (^{<2008>}Daniel 1:3).

(3) **varc** [ro'sh], “head” over a host (Israel in the wilderness, ^{<0406>}Numbers 14:4), over tribes (^{<0590>}Deuteronomy 29:10, where the Revised Version (British and American) renders “heads”), over

thousands (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 12:20). Abijah, king of Judah, before joining battle against Jeroboam, claimed “God himself is with us for our captain” the King James Version, “with us at our head” the Revised Version (British and American) (^{<1432>}2 Chronicles 13:12).

(4) **vyl iv**:[shalish], originally the third man in the chariot, who, when the chief occupant was the king, or commander-in-chief, was of the rank of captain (^{<1302>}2 Kings 7:2; 9:25), the term “third man” being generalized to mean “a captain” in ^{<1205>}2 Kings 10:25; ^{<1489>}2 Chronicles 8:9, where “chief of his captains” combines

(1) and (4).

(5) **dygh**:[naghidh], leader by Divine appointment: of Saul (^{<906>}1 Samuel 9:16, “captain,” the King James Version, “prince” the Revised Version (British and American) ^{<9101>}1 Samuel 10:1); of David (^{<1012>}2 Samuel 5:2); of Hezekiah (^{<1205>}2 Kings 20:5); with a charge in connection with the temple (^{<1413>}2 Chronicles 31:13). It is the word used of Messiah “the prince” (^{<2025>}Daniel 9:25), who is also Prince of the Covenant (11:22).

(6) **ayci**:[nasi’], rendered “captain” in the King James Version ^{<1418>}Numbers 2:3,5,7 only, there in the Revised Version (British and American) and in other places, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), rendered “prince.” In ^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 7:40 “chief of the princes” combines

(3) and (6).

(7) **hj P**:[pechah], is found almost entirely in a foreign title denoting “governor,” and belongs to the later history of Israel (^{<1418>}Nehemiah 2:7,9; ^{<1586>}Ezra 8:36; ^{<3000>}Haggai 1:1), rendered “captain” in exclusively foreign associations (^{<1124>}1 Kings 20:24; ^{<1284>}2 Kings 18:24; ^{<2127>}Daniel 3:27 f).

(8) **^yxq**:[qatsin] (from root of [qadi], Arabic for “judge”), denotes “dictator,” almost “usurper,” and is found in “rulers of Sodom” the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “judges of Sodom” the Revised Version, margin (^{<2010>}Isaiah 1:10), used of Jephthah in sense of “captain” the King James Version, “chief” the

Revised Version (British and American) (~~07106~~ Judges 11:6), found combined with (3), “head and captain” (King James Version, “head and chief” the Revised Version (British and American) (~~07111~~ Judges 11:11). In (~~06124~~ Joshua 10:24 it denotes commanders of troops, the King James Version “captains of the men of war,” the Revised Version (British and American) “chiefs of the men of war.”

(9) **rK** [kar], in (~~35122~~ Ezekiel 21:22 “to set captains” the King James Version, is translated “to set battering rams” the Revised Version (British and American). (10) **I [B** [ba`al], only once in “captain of the ward” (~~24713~~ Jeremiah 37:13). (11) **rs** **pfi** [Tiphcar], a dignitary belonging to an oriental court, in the King James Version rendered “captain,” in the Revised Version (British and American) “marshal” (Nah 3:17; (~~25127~~ Jeremiah 51:27). (12) **fyLiv** [shalliT], in (~~27215~~ Daniel 2:15 of Arioch, the king’s captain; in (~~21088~~ Ecclesiastes 8:8 “having power over,” and in 7:19 used of “mighty men” (the Revised Version (British and American) “rulers”).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

Of Greek words rendered by “captain” in New Testament there are the following:

(1) [**ἀρχηγός**, archegos], rendered “captain” in Hebrew 2:10 the King James Version but relegated to the margin in the Revised Version (British and American), where “author” (of their salvation) is preferred, this being the rendering of Hebrew 12:2 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “author” (and finisher of our faith), “captain” being still retained in the Revised Version, margin. Compare (~~44815~~ Acts 3:15 and 5:31, where the same Greek word is rendered “Prince,” the Revised Version, margin of the former passage giving “Author.” In the Risen and Ascended Christ the various conceptions thus expressed are found to blend.

(2) [**χιλίαρχος**, chiliarchos], the Latin tribunus militum of which there were six to a legion, commanding the six cohorts of which it was composed. In its lit. acceptance it would be “commander of a thousand,” and it is so used in (~~4028~~ Acts 22:28 where it designates the commander of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem, consisting of a cohort, and is rendered “chief captain” (~~6102~~ John 18:12; (~~40213~~ Acts 21:31; 22:24; 24:22). It is used

more vaguely in the sense of “military officer” in ~~<162>~~ Mark 6:21; ~~<165>~~ Revelation 6:15; 19:18.

(3) [στρατηγός, strategos], used only by Luke in the New Testament, and almost exclusively of

(a) officials in charge of the Temple (~~<221>~~ Luke 22:4,52; ~~<401>~~ Acts 4:1; 5:24,26). The captain of the Temple had the superintendence of the Levites and priests who were on guard in and around the Temple, and under him were [strategoí], who were also captains of the Temple police, although they took their instruction from him as their head. He was not only a priest, but second in dignity only to the high priest himself;

(b) the exception to Luke’s general usage is where the word is used of the chief authorities in civil affairs at Philippi; where “the magistrates,” as the word is rendered (~~<416>~~ Acts 16:20 f), called themselves “praetors” ([strategoí]). In the case of Paul and Silas they placed themselves in peril of removal from their office by ordering them to be beaten, being Romans and uncondemned.

(4) [στρατοπεδάρχης, stratopedarches], the captain of the guard to whom Julius of the Augustan band (according to the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, ~~<4216>~~ Acts 28:16) delivered Paul and his fellow-prisoners. The word has disappeared from the Revised Version (British and American), but the passage in which it occurs has attestation which satisfies Blass, Sir William Ramsay, and other scholars. It was supposed that this was the captain of the Praetorian guard, but Mommsen and Ramsay believe him to be the princeps peregrinorum castrorum.

See AUGUSTAN BAND; ARMY, ROMAN.

T. Nicol.

CAPTIVE

<kap'-tiv> (ybiv, [shebhi], hl ʕ: [galah]; [μετοικεσία, aichmalotos] and its derivatives): The frequent references in the Old Testament to captives as men forcibly deported (from the Hebrew root hby; [shabbeh]) or inhabiting a land foreign to them (from Hebrew hl ʕ: [galah]) reflect the universal practice of the ancient world. The treatment of captives was

sometimes barbarous (~~1082~~ 2 Samuel 8:2) but not always so (~~1161~~ 2 Kings 6:21,22).

See further under *ASSIR* and *WAR*.

Figurative: Except in ~~1820~~ Job 42:10 the figurative use of the idea is confined to the New Testament, where reference is made to the triumphal reign of the Lord Jesus (~~1118~~ Luke 4:18; ~~1118~~ Ephesians 4:8), or, on the other hand, to the power of the devil (2 Tim 2:26), or of false teachers (2 Tim 3:6); compare also ~~1173~~ Romans 7:23; ~~1115~~ 2 Corinthians 10:5.

See *CAPTIVITY*.

F. K. Farr

CAPTIVITY

<kap-tiv'-i-ti> (hl wG[galah], tWl G:[galuth], tWbv[shabhuth],
hybyi[shibhyah]; metoikesia):

I. OF THE NORTHERN KINGDOM (THE WORK OF ASSYRIA).

1. Western Campaigns of Shalmaneser II, 860-825 BC:

The captivity of the Northern Kingdom was the work of the great Assyrian power having its seat at Nineveh on the Tigris. The empire of Assyria, rounded nearly 2000 BC, had a long history behind it when its annals begin to take notice of the kingdom of Israel and Judah. The reign of Shalmaneser II (860-825 BC) marks the first contact between these powers. This is not the Shalmaneser mentioned in 2 Kings 17 and 18, who is the fourth of the name and flourished more than a century later. Shalmaneser II was contemporary during his long reign with Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Ahaziah and Joash, kings of Judah; with Ahab, Ahaziah, Jehoram and Jehu, kings of Israel; with Hazael and Benhadad II, kings of Syria at Damascus, and with Mesha, king of Moab. The Assyrian authorities for his reign are an inscription engraved by himself on the rocks of Armenia; the Black Obelisk brought by Layard from Nimroud, now in the British Museum; and the texts engraved on the bronze gates of Balawat, discovered by Hormuzd Rassam in 1878, and recognized as the swinging gates of Shalmaneser's palace. From these authorities we learn that in his 6th year he encountered the combined forces of Damascus, Hamath, Israel, and other states which had united to oppose his progress westward, and

completely routed them in the battle of Karkar (854 BC). The danger which threatened the western states in common had brought Syria and Israel together; and this is in accord with the Scripture narrative which tells of a covenant, denounced by God's prophet, between Ahab and Benhadad (~~1218~~ 1 Kings 20:34 ff), and mentions a period of three years when there was no war between Syria and Israel. The defeat of the allies seems, however, to have broken up the confederacy, for, soon after, Ahab is found, with the aid of Jehoshaphat of Judah, attempting unsuccessfully, and with fatal result to himself, to recover from the weakened power of Syria the city of Ramoth-gilead (1 Kings 22). In another campaign to the West, which likewise finds no record in Scripture, Shalmaneser received the tribute of Tyre and Sidon, and of "Yahua of Khumri," that is, of Jehu, of the land of Omri, as Israel is called on the monuments.

2. Of Rimmon-nirari III, 810-781 BC:

The next Assyrian monarch who turned his arms against the West was Rimmon-nirari III (810-781 BC), grandson of Shalmaneser II. Although he is not mentioned by name in Scripture, his presence and activity had their influence upon contemporary events recorded in 2 Ki. He caused Syria to let go her hold of Israel; and although he brought Israel into subjection, the people of the Northern Kingdom would rather have a ruler exercising a nominal sovereignty over them in distant Nineveh than a king oppressing them in Damascus. Hence, Rimmon-nirari has been taken for the saviour whom God gave to Israel, "so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians" (~~1218~~ 2 Kings 13:5; compare 13:23).

With the death of Rimmon-nirari in 781 BC, the power of Assyria received a temporary check, and on the other hand the kingdom of Judah under Uzziah and the kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam II reached the zenith of their political prosperity. In 745 BC, however, a usurper, Pul, or Pulu, ascended the throne of Assyria, and reigned as Tiglath-pileser III. It is by the former name that he is first mentioned in the Scripture narrative (~~1259~~ 2 Kings 15:19; ~~1316~~ 1 Chronicles 5:26), and by the latter that he is mentioned on the monuments. That the two names belong to one man is now held to be certain (Schrader, COT, I, 230 f).

3. Of Tiglath-pileser III, 745-727 BC:

Tiglath-pileser was one of the greatest monarchs of antiquity. He was the first to attempt to consolidate an empire in the manner to which the world

has become accustomed since Roman times. He was not content to receive tribute from the kings and rulers of the states which he conquered. The countries which he conquered became subject provinces of his empire, governed by Assyrian satraps and contributing to the imperial treasury. Not long after he had seated himself on the throne, Tiglath-pileser, like his predecessors, turned his attention to the West. After the siege of Arpad, northward of Aleppo, the Assyrian forces made their way into Syria, and putting into operation the Assyrian method of deportation and repopulation, the conqueror annexed Hamath which had sought the alliance and assistance of Azariah, that is Uzziah, king of Judah. Whether he then refrained from molesting Judah, or whether her prestige was broken by this campaign of the Assyrian king, it is not easy to say. In another campaign he certainly subjected Menahem of Israel with other kings to tribute. What is stated in a word or two in the Annals of Tiglath-pileser is recorded at length in the Bible history (^{<1215>}2 Kings 15:19 ff): “There came against the land Pul the king of Assyria; and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 50 shekels of silver, to give to the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria tamed back, and stayed not there in the land.” In the reign of Pekah, under his proper name of Tiglath-pileser, he is recorded to have raided the northern parts of Israel, and carried the inhabitants away into the land of Assyria (^{<1215>}2 Kings 15:29). We next hear of Ahaz, king of Judah, appealing to the Assyrians for help against “these two tails of smoking firebrands,” Rezin of Syria and Pekah, the son of Remaliah (^{<2104>}Isaiah 7:4). To secure this help he took the silver and gold of the house of the Lord, and sent it as a present to the king of Assyria (^{<1216>}2 Kings 16:8). Meanwhile Tiglath-pileser was setting out on a new campaign to the West. He carried fire and sword through Syria and the neighboring lands as far as Gaza, and on his return he captured Samaria, without, however, razing it to the ground. Pekah having been slain by his own people, the Assyrian monarch left Hoshea, the leader of the conspiracy, on the throne of Israel as the vassal of Assyria.

4. Of Shalmaneser IV, 727-722 BC — Siege of Samaria:

In 727 BC Tiglath-pileser III died and was succeeded by Shalmaneser IV. His reign was short and no annals of it have come to light. In 2 Kings 17 and 18, however, we read that Hoshea, relying upon help from the king of Egypt, thought the death of Tiglath-pileser a good opportunity for striking

a blow for independence. It was a vain endeavor, for the end of the kingdom of Israel was at hand. The people were grievously given over to oppression and wickedness, which the prophets Amos and Hosea vigorously denounced. Hosea, in particular, was “the prophet of Israel’s decline and fall.” Prophesying at this very time he says: “As for Samaria, her king is cut off, as foam upon the water. The high places also of Aven, the sin of Israel, shall be destroyed: the thorn and the thistle shall come up on their altars; and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and to the hills, Fall on us” (~~2800~~ Hosea 10:7,8; compare 10:14,15). No less stern are the predictions by Isaiah and Micah of the doom that is to overtake Samaria: “Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim, and to the fading flower of his glorious beauty, which is on the head of the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine” (~~2300~~ Isaiah 28:1). “For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel. What is the transgression of Jacob? is it not Samaria? Therefore I will make Samaria as a heap of the field, and as places for planting vineyards” (~~3000~~ Micah 1:5,6). No help came from Egypt. With the unaided and enfeebled resources of his kingdom Hoshea had to face the chastising forces of his sovereign. He was made prisoner outside Samaria and was most likely carried away to Nineveh. Meanwhile the land was over-run and the capital doomed to destruction, as the prophets had declared.

5. Samaria Captured by Sargon, 722 BC:

Not without a stubborn resistance on the part of her defenders did “the fortress cease from Ephraim” (~~2300~~ Isaiah 17:3). It was only after a three years’ siege that the Assyrians captured the city (~~1200~~ 2 Kings 17:5). If we had only the record of the Hebrew historian we should suppose that Shalmaneser was the monarch to whom fell the rewards and honors of the capture. Before the surrender of the city Shalmaneser had abdicated or died, and Sargon, only once mentioned in Scripture (~~2300~~ Isaiah 20:1), but one of the greatest of Assyrian monarchs, had ascended the throne. From his numerous inscriptions, recovered from the ruins of Khorsabad, we learn that he, and not Shalmaneser, was the king who completed the conquest of the revolted kingdom and deported the inhabitants to Assyria. “In the beginning (of my reign),” says Sargon in his Annals, “the city Samaria (I took) with the help of Shamash, who secures victory to me (.... 27,290 people inhabitants of it) I took away captive; 50 chariots the property of my royalty, which were in it I appropriated. (.... the city) I restored, and more than before I caused it to be inhabited; people of the lands conquered by

my hand in it (I caused to dwell. My governor over them I appointed, and tribute) and imposts just as upon the Assyrians I laid upon them.” The Assyrian Annals and the Scripture history support and supplement each other at this point. The sacred historian describes the deportation as follows: “The king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and on the Habor, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes because they obeyed not the voice of Yahweh their God, but transgressed his covenant, even all that Moses, the servant of Yahweh, commanded, and would not hear it, nor do it” (^{<1276>}2 Kings 17:6,7; 18:11,12).

6. Depopulation and Repopulation of Samaria:

The repopulation of the conquered territory is also described by the sacred historian: “And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Avva, and from Hamath and Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof” (^{<1274>}2 Kings 17:24). The fact that Sargon introduced foreign settlers taken in war into Samaria is attested by inscriptions. That there were various episodes of deportation and repopulation in connection with the captivity of the Northern Kingdom appears to be certain. We have seen already that Tiglath-pileser III deported the population of the northern tribes to Assyria and placed over the depopulated country governors of his own. And at a time considerably later, we learn that Sargon’s grandson Esarhaddon, and his great-grandson Ashur-bani-pal, “the great and noble Osnappar,” imported to the region of Samaria settlers of nations conquered by them in the East (^{<1500>}Ezra 4:2,10). Of the original settlers, whom a priest, carried away by the king of Assyria but brought back to Bethel, taught “the law of the god of the land,” it is said that “they feared Yahweh, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations from among whom they had been carried away” (^{<1273>}2 Kings 17:33). The hybrid stock descended from those settlers is known to us in later history and in the Gospels as the Samaritans.

7. The Ten Tribes in Captivity:

We must not suppose that a clean sweep was made Of the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom. No doubt, as in the Babylonian captivity, “the poorest of the land were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen” (^{<1250>}2 Kings 25:12). The numbers actually deported were but a moiety of the whole population. But the kingdom of the Ten Tribes was now at an end.

Israel had become an Assyrian province, with a governor established in Samaria. As regards the Golah — the captives of Israel in the cities of the Medes — it must not be supposed that they became wholly absorbed in the population among whom they were settled. We can well believe that they preserved their Israelite traditions and usages with sufficient clearness and tenacity, and that they became part of the Jewish dispersion so widespread throughout the East. It is quite possible that at length they blended with the exiles of Judah carried off by Nebuchadrezzar, and that then Judah and Ephraim became one nation as never before. The name Jew, therefore, naturally came to include members of what had earlier been the Northern Confederacy of Israel as well as those of the Southern Kingdom to which it properly belonged, so that in the post-exilic period, Jehudi, or Jew, means an adherent of Judaism without regard to local nationality.

II. OF JUDAH (THE WORK OF THE CHALDEAN POWER).

Southern Kingdom and House of David

The captivity of Judah was the work of the great Chaldean power seated at Babylon on the Euphrates. While the Northern Kingdom had new dynasties to rule it in quick succession, Judah and Jerusalem remained true to the House of David to the end. The Southern Kingdom rested on a firmer foundation, and Jerusalem with its temple and priesthood secured the throne against the enemies who overthrew Samaria for nearly a century and a half longer.

1. Break-up of Assyria:

Sargon, who captured Samaria in 722 BC, was followed by monarchs with a great name as conquerors and builders and patrons of literature, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal. When Ashurbanipal died in 625 BC, the dissolution of the Assyrian Empire was not far off. Its hold over the West had greatly slackened, and the tributary peoples were breaking out into revolt. Bands of Scythians, a nomad Aryan race, from the region between the Caucasus and the Caspian, were sweeping through the Assyrian Empire as far as Palestine and Egypt, and the prophecies of Jeremiah and Zephaniah reflect their methods of warfare and fierce characteristics. They were driven back, however, at the frontier of Egypt, and appear to have returned to the North without invading Judah.

2. Downfall of Nineveh, 606 BC:

From the North these hordes were closing in upon Nineveh, and on all sides the Assyrian power was being weakened. In the “Burden of Nineveh,” the prophet Nahum foreshadows the joy of the kingdom of Judah at the tidings of its approaching downfall: “Behold, upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! Keep thy feasts, O Judah, perform thy vows; for the wicked one shall no more pass through thee; he is utterly cut off” (Nah 1:15; compare 3:8-11). The Medes regained their independence and under their king, Cyaxares, formed an alliance with the Chaldeans, who soon afterward revolted under the leadership of Nabopolassar, viceroy of Babylon. Rallying these various elements to his standard Nabopolassar laid siege to the Assyrian capital, and in 606 BC, Nineveh, which had been the capital city of great conquerors, and had “multiplied (her) merchants above the stars of heaven” (Nah 3:16), fell before the combined forces of the Medes and Chaldeans, fell suddenly and finally, to rise no more. Of the new Babylonian Empire upon which the Chaldeans now entered, Nebuchadrezzar, whose father Nabopolassar had associated him with him on the throne, was the first and most eminent ruler.

3. Pharaoh Necho's Revolt:

That the people of Judah should exult in the overthrow of Nineveh and the empire for which it stood we can well understand. Jerusalem herself had by God's mercy remained unconquered when Sennacherib nearly a century before had carried off from the surrounding country 200,150 people and had devastated the towns and fortresses near. But the hateful Assyrian yoke had rested upon Judah to the end, and not upon Judah only but even upon Egypt and the valley of the Nile. In 608 BC Pharaoh Necho revolted from his Assyrian suzerain and resolved upon an eastern campaign. He had no desire to quarrel with Josiah of Judah, through whose territory he must pass; but in loyalty to his Assyrian suzerain Josiah threw himself across the path of the Egyptian invader and perished in the battle of Megiddo. The Pharaoh seems to have returned to Egypt, taking Jehoahaz the son of Josiah with him, and to have appointed his brother Jehoiakim king of Judah, and to have exacted a heavy tribute from the land.

4. Defeat at Carchemish, 604 BC:

But he did not desist from his purpose to win an eastern empire. Accordingly he pressed forward till he reached the Euphrates, where he was completely routed by the Babylonian army under Nebuchadrezzar in the decisive battle of Carchemish, 604 BC. The battle left the Chaldeans undisputed masters of Western Asia, and Judah exchanged the yoke of Assyria for that of Babylon.

5. The New Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadrezzar, 604-562 BC:

So far as cruelty was concerned, there was little to choose between the new tyrants and the old oppressors. Of the Chaldeans Habakkuk, who flourished at the commencement of the new Empire, says: "They are terrible and dreadful. Their horses also are swifter than leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves; and their horsemen spread themselves: yea, their horsemen come from far; they fly as an eagle that hasteth to devour" (~~35007~~ Habakkuk 1:7,8 the American Revised Version, margin). Over Western Asia, including Judah, Nebuchadrezzar since the battle of Carchemish was supreme. It was vain for Judah to coquet with Egypt when Nebuchadrezzar had a long and powerful arm with which to inflict chastisement upon his disloyal subjects.

The Mission of Jeremiah, 626-580 BC.

The mission of Jeremiah the prophet in this crisis of the history of Judah was to preach obedience and loyalty to the king of Babylon, and moral reformation as the only means of escaping the Divine vengeance impending upon land and people. He tells them in the name of God of the great judgment that was to come at the hand of the Chaldeans on Jerusalem and surrounding peoples. He even predicts the period of their subjection to Chaldean domination: "And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years" (~~32511~~ Jeremiah 25:11). This preaching was unpalatable to the partisans of Egypt and to those who believed in the inviolability of Jerusalem. But with stern rebuke and with symbolic action he proclaims the doom of Jerusalem, and in the face of persecution and at the risk of his life, the prophet fulfills his ministry.

6. Revolt and Punishment of Jehoiakim, 608-597 BC:

Jehoiakim, who was first the vassal of Pharaoh Necho, and then of Nebuchadrezzar, was in corruption and wickedness too faithful a representative of the people. Jeremiah charges him with covetousness, the shedding of innocent blood, oppression and violence (^{<2421>}Jeremiah 22:13-19). The fourth year of Jehoiakim was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, who, fresh from the victory of Carchemish, was making his sovereignty felt in the western world. The despicable king of Judah became Nebuchadrezzar's vassal and continued in his allegiance three years, after which he turned and rebelled against him. But he received neither encouragement nor help from the neighboring peoples. "Yahweh sent against him bands of the Chaldeans, and bands of the Syrians, and bands of the Moabites, and bands of the children of Ammon, and sent them against Judah to destroy it, according to the word of Yahweh, which he spake by his servants the prophets" (^{<1241>}2 Kings 24:2). The history of the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign is obscure. The Hebrew historian says that after a reign of eleven years he slept with his fathers, from which we infer that he died a natural death. From Daniel we learn that in the third year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadrezzar came up against Jerusalem and besieged it, and carried off, along with vessels of the house of God, members of the seed royal, and of the nobility of Judah, among whom was Daniel the prophet. That Jehoiakim was included in what seems to be a first installment of the captivity of Judah is expressly affirmed by the Chronicler who says: "Against him (Jehoiakim) came up Nebuchadnezzar and bound him in fetters, to carry him to Babylon" (^{<1481>}2 Chronicles 36:6). However the facts really stand, the historian adds to the record of the death of Jehoiakim and of the succession of Jehoiachin the significant comment: "And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of this 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" (^{<1247>}2 Kings 24:7).

7. Siege and Surrender of Jerusalem under Jehoiachin, 597 BC:

Jehoiachin who succeeded Jehoiakim reigned only three months, the same length of time as his unfortunate predecessor Jehoahaz (^{<1238>}2 Kings 23:31). The captivity of Jehoahaz in Egypt and the captivity of Jehoiachin in Babylon are lamented in a striking elegy by Ezekiel, who compares them to young lions, the offspring of the mother lioness Israel, which learned to catch and their prey and devoured men, but were taken in the pit of the

nations and put in rings, so that their roar was no more heard in the mountains of Israel (~~2390~~Ezekiel 19:1-9). Nebuchadrezzar came in person while his servants were besieging Jerusalem, and Jehoiachin surrendered at discretion. So the king and his mother and his servants and his princes and his officers were carried off with the mighty men of valor, even ten thousand captives. None remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land. He carried out thence all the treasures of the house of Yahweh, and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold, which Solomon king of Israel had made in the temple of Yahweh, as Yahweh had said.

8. First Deportation, 597 BC:

And all the men of might, even seven thousand, and the craftsmen and the smiths a thousand, all of them strong and apt for war, even them the king of Babylon brought captive to Babylon. And the king of Babylon made Mattaniah, Jehoiachin's father's brother, king in his stead, and changed his name to Zedekiah' (~~2240~~2 Kings 24:10-17). From Jehoiachin dates the carrying away into Babylon, the year being 597 BC. The unfortunate monarch lived in exile in Babylon 38 years, and seems to have retained the respect and loyalty of the exiles among whom he dwelt.

The Baskets of Figs:

It was with reference to the deportation of the princes and craftsmen and smiths that Jeremiah had his vision of the baskets of figs — one containing figs very good, like the first ripe figs; the other very bad, so bad they could not be eaten (~~2200~~Jeremiah 24:1-3). The good figs were the captives of Judah carried away into the land of the Chaldeans for good; the bad figs were the king Zedekiah and his princes and the residue of Jerusalem, upon whom severe judgments were yet to fall till they were consumed from off the land (~~2200~~Jeremiah 24:4-10).

9. The Ministry of Ezekiel, 592-570 BC:

Among the captives thus carried to Babylon and placed on the banks of the Chebar was the priest-prophet Ezekiel. Five years after the captivity he began to have his wonderful "visions" of God, and to declare their import to the exiles by the rivers of Babylon. To the desponding captives who were engrossed with thoughts of the kingdom of Judah, not yet dissolved, and of the Holy City, not yet burned up with fire, Ezekiel could only proclaim by symbol and allegory the destruction of city and nation, till the

day when the distressing tidings reached them of its complete overthrow. Then to the crushed and despairing captives he utters no lamentations like those of Jeremiah, but rather joyful predictions of a rebuilt city, of a reconstituted kingdom, and of a renovated and glorious temple.

10. Jeremiah's Ministry in Jerusalem, 597-588 BC:

Although the flower of the population had been carried away into Babylon and the Temple had been despoiled of its treasures, Jerusalem and the Temple still stood. To the inhabitants who were left behind, and to the captives in Babylon, Jeremiah had a message. To the latter he offered counsels of submission and contentment, assured that the hateful and repulsive idolatries around them would throw them back upon the law of their God, and thus promote the work of moral and spiritual regeneration within them. 'Thus saith Yahweh, I will give them a heart to know me, that I am Yahweh: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return unto me with their whole heart' (^{<2415>}Jeremiah 24:5,7). To "the residue of Jerus" his counsels and predictions were distasteful, and exposed him to the suspicion of disloyalty to his people and his God. None of his warnings was more impressive than that symbolically proclaimed by the bands and bars which the prophet was to put upon his neck to send to the kings of Edom and Moab and Ammon and Tyre and Sidon, who seem to have had ideas of forming an alliance against Nebuchadrezzar. Zedekiah was also urged to submit, but still entertained hopes that the king of Babylon would allow the captives of Judah to return. He even himself went to Babylon, perhaps summoned thither by his suzerain (^{<2615>}Jeremiah 51:59). With an Egyptian party in Jerusalem urging an alliance with Egypt, and with a young and warlike Pharaoh on the throne, Hophra (Apries), Zedekiah deemed the opportunity favorable for achieving independence, and entered into an intrigue with the Egyptian king. So Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon (^{<1240>}2 Kings 24:20).

11. Zedekiah's Rebellion and the Siege of Jerusalem, 588-586 BC:

It was a bold throw, but Nebuchadrezzar would brook no such disloyalty from his vassals. He marched at once to the West, and committed to Nebuzaradan the task of capturing Jerusalem, while he himself established his headquarters at Riblah, in Syria, on the Orontes. Meanwhile the Pharaoh with his army crossed the frontier to the help of his allies, and compelled the Chaldeans to raise the siege of Jerusalem and meet him in the field (^{<2615>}Jeremiah 37:5). But here his courage failed him, and he retired

in haste without offering battle. Nebuzaradan now led back his army and the siege became closer than before.

Jeremiah “Falling Away to the Chaldeans”

During the breathing-space afforded by the withdrawal of the Chaldeans, Jeremiah was going out of the city to his native Anathoth, some 4 miles to the Northeast across the ridge, on family business (^{<3571>}Jeremiah 37:11-15). His departure was observed, and he was charged with falling away to the Chaldeans, and cast into an improvised dungeon in the house of Jonathan the scribe. While there the king sent for him and asked, “Is there any word from Yahweh?” And Jeremiah answered fearlessly, “There is. Thou shalt be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon.” For a time Jeremiah, by the favor of Zedekiah, enjoyed after this a greater measure of freedom; but as he continued to urge in hearing of all the people the duty of surrender, his enemies vowed that he should be put to death, and had him cast into a foul empty cistern, where he ran the risk of being choked or starved to death. Once again the king sought an interview with the prophet, giving him private assurance that he would not put him to death nor allow his enemies to do so. Again the prophet counseled surrender, and again he was allowed a measure of freedom.

12. Destruction of Jerusalem, 586 BC:

Flight, Capture, and Punishment of Zedekiah

But the end of the doomed city was at hand. In the 11th year of Zedekiah, 586 BC, in the 4th month, the 9th day of the month, a breach was made in the city (^{<3581>}Jeremiah 39:1,2), and the final assault completed the work that had been done by months of famine and want. Zedekiah and his men of war do not seem to have waited for the delivery of the last assault. They fled from the city by night “by the way of the king’s garden, through the gate betwixt the two walls,” and made eastward for the Arabah. But the army of the Chaldeans pursued them, and overtook Zedekiah in the plains of Jericho. They took him prisoner and brought him to Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah, where the king of Babylon first slew the son of Zedekiah, and then put out his eyes. With the sons of the captured monarch were slain all the nobles of Judah. This time neither city nor temple nor palace was spared. Nebuzaradan “burnt the house of Yahweh, and the king’s house; and all the houses of Jerusalem, even every great house, burnt he with fire” (^{<1291>}2 Kings 25:9). His soldiers, too, broke down the walls of Jerusalem round

about. The treasure and the costly furnishings of the Temple, in so far as they had escaped the former spoliation, were carried away to Babylon. The ruin of Jerusalem was complete. The Book of Lamentations utters the grief and shame and penitence of an eyewitness of the captures and desolation of the Holy City: “Yahweh hath accomplished his wrath, he hath poured out his fierce anger; and he hath kindled a fire in Zion, which hath devoured the foundations thereof. The kings of the earth believed not, neither all the inhabitants of the world, that the adversary and the enemy would enter into the gates of Jerusalem. Woe unto us! for we have sinned. For this our heart is faint; for these things our eyes are dim; for the mountain of Zion, which is desolate: the foxes walk upon it” (^{<25041>}Lamentations 4:11,12; 5:16,18).

13. Second Deportation of Inhabitants, 586 BC:

“So Judah,” says the prophet who had been through the siege and the capture (if not rather the editor of his prophecies), “was carried away captive out of his land” (^{<24527>}Jeremiah 52:27). The statements of the numbers carried away are, however, conflicting. In Jeremiah (59:28-30) we read of three deportations: that of 597 BC when 3,023 Jews were carried off; that of 586 BC when Nebuchadrezzar carried off 832 persons; and one later than both in 581 BC, when Nebuzaradan carried away captive of the Jews 745 persons — a total of 4,600.

14. Third Deportation, 581 BC:

(1) Number and Quality of Exiles:

In ^{<12245>}2 Kings 24:15,16 it is said that in 597 Nebuchadrezzar carried to Babylon 8,000 men. Dr. George Adam Smith taking all the data together estimates that the very highest figures possible are 62,000 or 70,000 men, women and children, less than half of the whole nation (Jerusalem, II, 268-70). In 597 BC, Nebuchadrezzar carried off the princes and nobles and craftsmen and smiths, leaving behind the poorest sort of the people of the land (^{<12244>}2 Kings 24:14).

(2) The Residue Left:

In 586 BC Nebuzaradan carried off the residue of the people that were left in the city, but he “left of the poorest of the land to be vinedressers and husbandmen” (^{<12512>}2 Kings 25:12). “They were, as the Biblical narratives testify, the poorest of the land, from whom every man of substance and energy had been sifted; mere groups of peasants, without a leader and

without a center; disorganized and depressed; bitten by hunger and compassed by enemies; uneducated and an easy prey to the heathenism by which they were surrounded. We can appreciate the silence which reigns in the Bible regarding them, and which has misled us as to their numbers. They were a negligible quantity in the religious future of Israel: without initiative or any influence except that of a dead weight upon the efforts of the rebuilders of the nation, when these at last returned from Babylonia” (Jerusalem, II, 269-70).

15. Gedaliah, Governor of Judah:

Over those who were left behind, Gedaliah was appointed governor, with his residence at Mizpah, where also a Babylonian contingent remained on guard. Jeremiah had the choice of being taken to Babylon or of remaining in Judah. He preferred to remain with the residue of the people under the care of Gedaliah. With the murder of Gedaliah by Ishmael, a traitorous scion of the royal house, who in turn had to flee and made good his escape, it looked as if the last trace of the former kingdom of Judah was wiped out.

(1) Jeremiah and the Flight to Egypt:

Against the counsel of Jeremiah, the remnant, led by Johanan the son of Kareah, resolved to take refuge in Egypt and insisted that Jeremiah and his friend Baruch should accompany them. It is in Egypt, amid disappointment and misrepresentation which he had to endure, that we have our last glimpse of the prophet of the downfall of Judah.

(2) Descendants of the Fugitives, 471-411 BC:

Of the descendants of those settlers in Egypt remarkable remains have been discovered within the last few years. They consist of Aramaic papyri which were found at Assouan, the ancient Syene, and which belong to a time not more than a century after the death of Jeremiah. The documents are accounts and contracts and deeds of various kinds, from which we gather that in the 5th century BC there were Jews keeping themselves apart as they do still, worshipping Yahweh, and no other God, and even having a temple and an altar of sacrifice to which they brought offerings as their fathers did at Jerusalem before the destruction of the Temple. These papyri give us valuable glimpses of the social condition and religious interest of the settlers.

See DISPERSION.

16. The Exiles in Babylon: Their Social Condition, 464-405 BC:

Of the Jewish captives carried off by Nebuchadrezzar and settled by the rivers of Babylon, we learn something from the prophecies of Daniel which are now generally believed to belong to the Maccabean period, and much from the prophecies of Ezekiel, from the Psalms of the Captivity, and from the Second Isaiah, whose glowing messages of encouragement and comfort were inspired by the thought of the Return. From Haggai and Zechariah we see how the work of rebuilding the Temple was conceived and carried out. Of the social condition of the Exiles an interesting revelation is given by the excavations at Nippur. From cuneiform tablets, now in the Imperial Ottoman Museum at Constantinople, preserved among the business archives of the wealthy firm of Murashu, sons of Nippur, in the reign of Artaxerxes I and Darius II (464-405 BC), there can be read quite a number of Jewish names. And the remarkable thing is that many of the names are those known to us from the genealogical and other lists of the Books of Ki and Ch and Ezra and Neh. Professor Hilprecht (*The Babylonian Expedition*, IX, 13 ff) infers from an examination of these that a considerable number of the Jewish exiles, carried away by Nebuchadrezzar after the destruction of Jerusalem, were settled in Nippur and its neighborhood. Of this fact there are various proofs. The Talmudic tradition which identifies Nippur with Calneh (~~Gen~~ Genesis 10:10) gains new force in the light of these facts. And “the river Khebar in the land of the Chaldeans,” by which Ezekiel saw his vision, is now known from inscriptions to be a large navigable canal not far from Nippur (*ibid.*, 27,28).

17. The Rise and Development of Judaism:

The influence of the Captivity as a factor in the development of Judaism can hardly be overestimated. “The captivity of Judah,” says Dr. Foakes-Jackson (*Biblical History of the Hebrews*, 316) “is one of the greatest events in the history of religion. With the captivity the history of Israel ends, and the history of the Jews commences.” Placed in the midst of heathen and idolatrous surroundings the Golah recoiled from the abominations of their neighbors and clung to the faith of their fathers in the God of Abraham. Exposed to the taunts and the scorn of nations that despised them, they formed an inner circle of their own, and cultivated that exclusiveness which has marked them ever since. Being without a country, without a ritual system, without any material basis for their life as a people, they learned as never before to prize those spiritual possessions which had

come down to them from the past. They built up their nationality in their new surroundings upon the foundation of their religion. Their prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, had encouraged and stimulated them with the assurance of spiritual blessings, and the promise of restoration. For their whole social and domestic and spiritual life there was needed some steady and continuous regulative principle or scheme. The need of this threw their leaders and thinkers back upon the Law of Moses. The rabbi and the scribe took the place of the sacrificing priest. The synagogue and the Sabbath came to occupy a new place in the religious practice of the people. These and other institutions of Judaism only attained to maturity after the Return, but the Captivity and the Exile created the needs they were meant to supply. While the prophets were clear and explicit in setting forth the Captivity, they were not less so in predicting the Return. Isaiah with his doctrine of the Remnant, Micah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others gifted with the vision of God, cheered the nation, each in their day, with the hope of restoration and return, not for Judah only but for Israel as well. Vineyards were to be planted again upon the mountains of Samaria as well as in the valleys of Judah. Jeremiah had even predicted the length of the period of the Exile, when he declared that the inhabitants of the land should serve the king of Babylon for seventy years (^{<2452>}Jeremiah 25:12; 29:10).

18. The Return by Permission of Cyrus, 538 BC:

It was in Cyrus, who brought about the fall of Babylon and ended the New Babylonian Empire in 539 BC, that the hopes of the exiles came to be centered. He was “the battle-axe” with which Yahweh was to shatter Babylon (^{<2517>}Jeremiah 51:20), and as he proceeded on his path of victory the unknown Seer whom we call the Second Isaiah welcomed him as the liberator of his people. “Thus saith Yahweh of Jerusalem, She shall be inhabited; and of the cities of Judah, They shall be built, and I will raise up the waste places thereof; that saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built; and of the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid” (^{<2445>}Isaiah 44:26-28).

19. Rebuilding of the Temple, 536 BC:

Within a year of the entry of Cyrus into Babylon an edict was issued (^{<4822>}2 Chronicles 36:22,23; ^{<5308>}Ezra 1:1 ff), granting permission to the exiles to return and build a house for the Lord in Jerusalem. He also brought forth the vessels of the Temple which Nebuchadrezzar had carried away and

handed them over to Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah; and Sheshbazzar brought them with him when they of the Captivity were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem.

Particulars of the Return are given in the Books of Ezra and Neh, and in the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. Of the exiles 42,360 returned under Sheshbazzar, besides slaves; and under Jeshua the son of Jozadak the priest, and Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, first an altar was built and then the foundations of the Temple were laid. In consequence of the opposition of the Samaritans, who were refused any share in the restoration of the Temple, the work of rebuilding was greatly hindered, and came to a stop. It was then that Haggai and Zechariah urged the resumption of the work and partly by denouncing the niggardliness of the people and partly by foreshadowing the glorious future in store for the Temple, hastened forward the enterprise.

Completed 515 BC:

At length in the month Adar, in the 6th year of Darius (515 BC) the work was completed and the Passover celebrated within the courts of the restored Sanctuary (~~458~~ Ezra 6:15-18).

20. Reforms and Labors of Ezra and Nehemiah, 445 BC:

For some decades the history is silent, and it was in 458 BC that Ezra set out for Jerusalem taking 1,800 Jews along with him. He found that the returned Jews had become allied in marriage with the people of the land and were in danger of losing their racial characteristics by absorption among the heathen (Ezra 9). It was due no doubt to his efforts and those of Nehemiah, supported by the searching and powerful utterances of Malachi, that this peril was averted. Thirteen years later (445 BC) Nehemiah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes, having heard of the desolate condition of the Holy City, the place of his fathers' sepulchers, obtained leave of his master to visit Jerusalem. With letters to the governors on the route and to the keeper of the king's forest, he set out, and came safely to Jerusalem. Having himself inspected the walls he called the people to the work of repairing the ruins, and despite the taunts and calumny and active hostility of the Samaritan opposition he had the satisfaction of seeing the work completed, the gates set up and the city repopulated. Nehemiah and Ezra then gathered the people together to hear the words of the Law, and at a solemn convocation the Law was read and explained to the assembly.

Thereafter a covenant was entered into by the people that they would observe the Law of Moses and not intermarry with the heathen nor traffic on the Sabbath, but would pay a third of a shekel annually for the services of the Temple and would bring first-fruits and tithes (~~10:28~~ Nehemiah 10:28 ff).

21. Modern Theories of the Return:

The course of the history as here set forth has been disputed by some modern scholars, who hold that there was no return of the exiles under Cyrus and that the rebuilding of the Temple was the work of the Jews who remained behind in Judah and Jerusalem (EB, article "Ezra-Nehemiah"). This view, held by the late Professor Kusters of Leyden and supported by Professor H. P. Smith and other scholars, proceeds largely upon the rejection of the historical character of the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah. The historical difficulties which are found in the book are by no means such as to warrant us in denying the fact of the Return and the work of Ezra in connection with Nehemiah. As regards the Return, the course of the narrative is too well supported by documents which bear upon them the stamp of historical truth to be rashly disputed. Moreover, it seems highly improbable that an enterprise requiring such energy and skill and faith should have been undertaken, without stimulus from without, by the residue of the people. We have already seen how little initiative was to be expected of the poorest of the people; and the silence of Haggai, on the subject of the Return, is no argument against it. That the Judaism of Palestine required invigoration by an infusion of the zeal and enthusiasm which grew up in the Judaism of Babylonian, is manifest from the story of the Captivity.

22. Importance of the Period Ezra-Nehemiah:

From the age of Nehemiah and the period immediately preceding it came influences of the utmost moment for the future. "Within these hundred years," says the late Dr. P. Hay Hunter in *After the Exile* (I, xvi), "the teaching of Moses was established as the basis of the national life, the first steps were taken toward the formation of a canon of Scripture. Jewish society was moulded into a shape which succeeding centuries modified, but did not essentially change. During this period the Judea of the days of our Lord came into being. Within this period the forces which opposed Christ, the forces which rallied to His side, had their origin. This century saw the rise of parties, which afterward became sects under the names of Pharisees

and Sadducees. It laid the foundation of Rabbinism. It fixed the attitude of the Jews toward the Gentiles. It put the priesthood in the way to supreme authority. It gave birth to the Samaritan schism.”

Figurative uses.

See CAPTIVE.

LITERATURE.

Schrader, COT, I; McCurdy, HPM, I, 281 ff, II, 249 ff, III; C. F. Barney, Notes on Hebrews Text of Bks of Kings; Foakes-Jackson, Biblical Hist of the Hebrews, 260-412; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 223-349; Cambridge Biblical Essays, 93-135; P. Hay Hunter, The Story of Daniel and After the Exile; EB, article “Ezra-Nehemiah”; Nicol, Recent Archaeology and the Bible, 239-78; H. P. Smith, Old Testament Hist, 219-412; Kittel, History of the Hebrews, II, 329 ff.

T. Nicol.

CAPTIVITY EPISTLES

See PHILEMON.

CAR

See PALANQUIN.

CARABASION

<kar-a-ba'-zi-on> ([^ʿ ραβασίων, Rhabasion], [αραβασίων, Karabasion]; Marimoth): One of the sons of Baani (1 Esdras 9:34) who had married foreign wives, during the captivity. The name is allowed to be corrupt; it seems to be represented by Meremoth in the list of <1016> Ezra 10:36.

CARAVAN

<kar'-a-van>, <kar-a-van'> (hraʿq'orach]): This word is not found in the King James Version, but the Revised Version (British and American) employs it three times, namely, in <1018> Job 6:18,19 ([ʿorchoth]), where the King James Version renders “paths” (<1018> Job 6:18) and “troops” (<1019> Job

6:19); in ^{<29113>}Isaiah 21:13 ([ʾorechoth]), where the King James Version and English Versions of the Bible give “travelling companies,” and in ^{<49725>}Ezekiel 27:25 ([sharoth]), where the King James Version gives a totally different translation. The Hebrew text in Ezekiel is dubious, but in Isaiah and Job “caravan” is undoubtedly a correct rendering of the Hebrew (compare also ^{<01375>}Genesis 37:25). The inhabitants of Palestine were familiar with the caravans — the goods trains of the Semitic world — which traveled between BabyIon and Syria on the one hand to Arabia and on the other to Egypt. The main routes between these countries passed through Canaan. Isaiah refers to “caravans of Jedanites” — a trading Arabic tribe who conveyed their wares to Babylon. Job compares his would-be friends to a deceitful brook, full in the rainy season, but dry in summer, which entices caravans to turn aside from the main route in the hope of a plentiful supply of water, but which fails the thirsty travelers when they need it most.

T. Lewis

CARAVANSARY

<kar-a-van'-sa-ri>.

See INN.

CARBUNCLE

<kar'-bun-k'-l>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CARCAS

<kar'-kas> (sK" r" K" [karkac]): One of seven chamberlains, ordered to summon Queen Vashti before King Ahasuerus (Est 1:10). The Targum allegorizes the first five of the names.

CARCASS; CARCASE

<kar'-kas>: The dead body of a beast; used sometimes in a contemptuous way of the dead body of a human being. The use of the word as applied to a living body is not found in either Old Testament or New Testament.

(1) It occurs as a translation of the Hebrew **rgR**, [pegher], in ^{<0151>}Genesis 15:11; this Hebrew word is also translated “dead body” in ^{<0449>}Numbers 14:29; ^{<0746>}1 Samuel 17:46; ^{<2348>}Isaiah 34:3; 66:24; ^{<0105>}Ezekiel 6:5; 43:7:9, and “corpse” in Nah 3:3.

(2) The Hebrew **hl bē** [nebhelah], is also translated “carcass” in ^{<0882>}Leviticus 5:2; 11:8,11; ^{<2468>}Jeremiah 16:18, but as “dead body” in ^{<0536>}Deuteronomy 28:26 (“body,” ^{<0689>}Joshua 8:29; ^{<1132>}1 Kings 13:22,29; ^{<1195>}2 Kings 9:37); ^{<2355>}Isaiah 5:25; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:33; 16:4; 19:7.

(3) In ^{<0748>}Judges 14:8 the word **hl Pm** [mappelah], from **l p** n: [naphal], “to incline” or “fall,” is also translated “carcass.”

(4) In ^{<1208>}Matthew 24:28 the word “carcase” (not “carcass”) is used to render the Greek [πτῶμα, ptoma], the reference probably being here to the dead body of an animal For the body of a human being the Greek is translated “corpse” (^{<0142>}Matthew 14:12; ^{<0109>}Mark 6:29; 15:45), and “dead bodies” (^{<0118>}Revelation 11:8,9).

W. N. Stearns

CARCHEMISH

<kar'-ke-mish> (**vymKt** " K" [karkemish]; [**αρμείς**, Charmeis], [**αρχαμείς**, Karchameis]) : An exceedingly ancient Hittite city on the banks of the Euphrates, identified with Jerablus (Hierapolis) about 23 hours from Aleppo, between Birejik and Membij. The Assyrian form of the name is Kargamis or Gargamis, but its meaning is doubtful, the interpretation “Fort of the god Chemosh” having been suggested before it was known that the Assyrian-Babylon form of Chemosh was not Kamish or Gamish, but Kammosu (Kammosu). Systematic excavations on the site have apparently only just been made, those undertaken by Consul J. Henderson, after the death of G. Smith the Assyriologist, having been mainly devoted to the excavation of sculptures, etc. The site has vast walls and palace-mounds about. 8,000 ft. in circumference.

1. EVIDENCE OF THE CITY'S EARLY EXISTENCE:

The earliest occurrence of the name is in an adjectival form, namely, Karkarnisu, “Carchemishite,” applied to a vase or measure of 200 qa, in a

list of property at Sippar in the reign of Ammi-caduga (circa 1900 BC). Later on, the Egyptian poet known as Pentaur refers to the people of Carchemish (Qarqamesa) as forming, with the men of Arvad, Aleppo and Gozan, part of “the host of the miserable king of the Hittites” (Hattu-sil), who fought against Rameses II at the battle of Kadesh. The first Assyrian king to mention Carchemish is Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1268 BC), who states that he plundered “from the neighborhood of the land of Suhu (the Shuhites) as far as Carchemish of the land of Hattu” in one day.

2. ITS LATER HISTORY:

Later, the city attracted the attention of the Assyrian king Assur-nacir-apli, who started on the 8th of Iyyar, about the year 870 BC, to the conquest of the district, and received tribute from the son of Bit-Bahiani; and, a little later, from Sangara of Carchemish, who is described as king of the Hittites. This tribute consisted of 20 talents of silver, various objects of gold, 100 talents of copper, 250 talents of iron, furniture, chariots and horses — an enormous treasure. Shalmaneser II, son of Assur-nacir-apli, also took tribute from the king of Carchemish here referred to. On the first occasion when the two monarchs met, Sangara was in alliance with the Sam’alians, Patinians, and Til-Bursip. After the capture of Sazabe (858 BC), a strong city of Sangara of Carchemish, all the opposing princes submitted. The tribute paid by the Hittite king on this occasion is depicted on strip F of the bronze coverings of the gates of Balawat, which has four representations of the place — two in the upper and two in the lower row of reliefs. The Kurkh monolith states that the tribute consisted of “2 talents of gold, 70 talents of silver, 80 talents of bronze, 100 talents of iron, 30 talents of purple stuff, 500 weapons, his daughter with a dowry, and 100 daughters of his great men, 500 oxen, and 5,000 sheep.” A yearly tax was also imposed. The reliefs show two long trains of tribute-bearers, that in the lower row escorting the princess, who, apparently accompanied by her father, goes to meet the Assyrian king. Samsi-Adad, Shalmaneser II’s son, merely mentions Carchemish as being on the western limits of his empire.

3. TIGLATH-PILESER IV RECEIVES ITS TRIBUTE, AND SARGON OF ASSYRIA INCORPORATES IT:

In the time of Tiglath-pileser IV, the city was ruled by King Pisiri(s), who paid tribute as an Assyrian vassal. On the accession of Sargon of Assyria, however, Pisiris tried to throw off the Assyrian yoke, and made alliance

with Meta of Moschi (Mesech) and other rulers, but was taken prisoner in the operations which followed. In the subsequent plundering of the city, those who suffered most were the inhabitants of the city who had been most active against Assyria. These were carried captive, and their places filled, as was the custom, by Assyrian settlers. The city's importance under Assyrian rule continued, the "mana of Carchemish" being one of the standard weights in use at Nineveh. After incorporation into the Assyrian empire it was ruled by Assyrian governors, one of whom, Bel-emuranni, was eponym for. the year 691 BC (reign of Sennacherib). The Old Testament gives later details. In the time of Josiah, Pharaoh Necho marched to fight against the city, and the Jewish king went out to meet him, but lost his life at Megiddo (^{<kar>}2 Chronicles 35:20 ff). Four years later (605 BC), the Egyptian king was himself defeated by Nebuchadrezzar under the walls of the city (^{<kar>}Jeremiah 46:2) in the battle which decided the fate of Western Asia.

4. SCULPTURE AND INSCRIPTIONS FOUND AT CARCHEMISH:

The art of Carchemish was that of the Hittite nation to which the city belonged, but it was strongly influenced by the style of the Assyrians, and exhibits a mannerism if anything more pronounced. The Inscriptions found on the site are in the usual Hittite style — boldly carved natural objects and implements in relief arranged in boustrophedonbands between division-lines. It is not improbable, however, that cuneiform was also used, and texts in Phoenician characters may, by chance, be found. The patron-deity of the city was the Asiatic goddess Atargatis, whose worship, when the place lost its importance, was removed to the new Hierapolis now represented by the ruins of Membij.

T. G. Pinches

CARE; CAREFULNESS; CAREFUL

^{<kar>}, ^{<kar'-fool-ness>}, ^{<kar'-fool>}: The English word "care" has such a variety of meanings, and so many Hebrew and Greek words in the Bible are translated by this English expression and its compounds, that it is difficult to organize them into a single brief article. We may do so, however, by remembering that into our word are really woven two strands, one Teutonic and one Latin. The former element implies a measure of trouble or sorrow, as the pain from a blow, a throb, a distress in the mind;

the latter, from Latin *cura*, implies a stretching forward, attention to some person or thing. We can often discern these two senses side by side in the Bible, and sometimes they almost run into one another. This is so especially in the King James Version. We can treat the subject best by keeping separate, as far as possible, these two senses.

I. IN THE SENSE OF ANXIETY, SOLICITUDE.

1. Substantives:

In the Old Testament several words are translated “care” in this sense. “Thy father hath left off caring for the asses,” concern about them literally, “matters of the asses” (**yrbḇl**[dibhre], ^{<0902>}1 Samuel 10:2). “They shall eat bread by weight, and with care” (**hgaḏ** [de’-aghah], “carefulness” the Revised Version (British and American); “fearfulness” the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<0406>}Ezekiel 4:16). The same word is rendered carefulness (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); “fearfulness,” the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<0218>}Ezekiel 12:18-19); and “fear” (King James Version; “carefulness,” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<0224>}Joshua 22:24). Again, “heaviness” (the Kings James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version), but “care” (the Revised Version, margin and the American Revised Version, margin, ^{<0125>}Proverbs 12:25). Once more, “sorrow” (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version), but “care” (the Revised Version, margin and the American Revised Version, margin, ^{<0423>}Jeremiah 49:23). There is also the word **hḏrj** [charadhah] “trembling,” “fear,” “anxiety.” It is rendered “trembling” (^{<0273>}Genesis 27:33 the King James Version). But “thou hast been careful for us with all this care” (“showed us all this reverence,” the Revised Version, margin, the American Revised Version, margin, ^{<0413>}2 Kings 4:13).

In the New Testament, “care,” in the sense of anxiety, is the meaning given to **μέριμνα**, *merimna*], the condition of being drawn mentally in different directions, distraction of mind. “Care of the world” (^{<0132>}Matthew 13:22; ^{<0049>}Mark 4:19; ^{<0084>}Luke 8:14, “cares of this life,” ^{<0214>}Luke 21:34); “care of all the churches” (2 Cor 11:28) (“anxiety,” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version); “casting all

your care upon him” (“anxiety,” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<1087>}1 Peter 5:7). Also in the Apocrypha, “My heart faileth for care” (1 Macc 6:10); “Care bringeth old age before the time” (Sirach 30:24). To these may be added the adjective [amerimnos], “I would have you without carefulness” (King James Version; “free from cares,” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<1072>}1 Corinthians 7:32).

2. Verbs:

In the Old Testament (**ga" D**: [da'agh], “to have concern or anxiety for”). “Not be careful in the year of drought” (^{<2178>}Jeremiah 17:8). (**bl qullc** [sum lebh], “to set the heart upon”), “If we flee away, they will not care for us” (“set their heart upon us” King James Version, margin, ^{<1083>}2 Samuel 18:3).

In the New Testament ([**μεριμνάω**, memrinao]), “Thou art careful and troubled” (“anxious” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<2104>}Luke 10:41). “He that is unmarried careth for things that belong to the Lord” (“is careful for,” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<1072>}1 Corinthians 7:32-34). “Members should have the same care one for another” (1 Cor 12:25). “Who will naturally care (the American Standard Revised Version “care truly”) for your state” (^{<1830>}Philippians 2:20). “Be careful for nothing” (“in nothing be anxious,” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, ^{<1046>}Philippians 4:6). The Apocrypha has “careful” (Baruch 3:18) and the Revised Version (British and American) has “be not careful overmuch,” where a distinction is plainly made between care in the sense of anxiety and of attention, for a person cannot be too attentive, but he may be too anxious (2 Esdras 2:27).

The impersonal verb ([**μέλει**, melei]), though not quite so strong as [merimnao], always implies a degree of concern higher than is felt in mere attention. “Carest thou not that we perish?” (^{<1083>}Mark 4:38). “Carest not for anyone” (the King James Version “no man,” ^{<1216>}Matthew 22:16; ^{<1124>}Mark 12:14). “Dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone?” (^{<2100>}Luke 10:40). “Careth not for the sheep” (^{<1003>}John 10:13). “Cared for the poor” (^{<1016>}John 12:6). “Gallio cared for none of these things” (^{<1087>}Acts 18:17). “Care not for it” (1 Cor 7:21). “He careth for

you” (1 Pet 5:7). “Doth God care for oxen?” (better, “Is it for the oxen that God careth?” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<400>~~ 1 Corinthians 9:9).

II. IN THE SENSE OF ATTENTION.

1. Substantives:

In the sense of attention, with the flavor of earnestness added from the original Teutonic meaning of the word care, we have the translation of [σπουδή, spoude], “speed,” “earnest care.” “What carefulness it wrought in you” (“earnest care,” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<401>~~ 2 Corinthians 7:11). “Our care for you in the sight of God” (“earnest care,” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<401>~~ 2 Corinthians 7:12). “Put the same care into the heart of Titus” (“earnest care,” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<401>~~ 2 Corinthians 8:16). We have also [φρονεῖν, phronein], the infin. used as a substantive “Your care for me hath flourished” (“thought,” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<400>~~ Philippians 4:10). Also [φροντίς, phrontis], “thought” (“care” the American Standard Revised Version, The Wisdom of Solomon 6:17; 7:4).

2. Verbs:

“A land which Yahweh thy God careth for” [darash], “seek after” (“seeketh after,” the Revised Version, margin, the American Revised Version, margin, ~~<401>~~ Deuteronomy 11:12). “No man careth for my soul” (“sought” King James Versions margin, ~~<401>~~ Psalm 142:4; j v” j } [chashach]). “We are not careful to answer” (King James Version, also compare the margin, the American Revised Version, margin; “We have no need to answer,” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<401>~~ Daniel 3:16). In the New Testament [ἐπιμελέομαι, epimeleomai], “Take care of him” (~~<401>~~ Luke 10:34,35). “How shall he take care of the church of God?” (1 Tim 3:5). [φροντίζω, phrontizo], “to be thoughtful or mindful of,” “may be careful to maintain good works” (~~<401>~~ Titus 3:8).

G. H. Trever

CAREAH

<ka-re'-a>.

See *KAREAH*.

CAREFUL; CAREFULNESS

See *CARE*.

CAREFULLY

<kar'-fool-i>: The same two strands of anxiety and of attention appear in this word as in care. Several words in the Hebrew and Greek are thus rendered in the English versions “Anxiously” is the thought in “The inhabitants of Maroth waited carefully for good” (**hl j** ;[chalah], “to be in pain,” “was grieved” King James Version margin, “waiteth anxiously” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, “is in travail” the Revised Version, margin, the American Revised Version, margin, ~~<3016>~~ Micah 1:12).

In the sense of attentively, the Hebrew emphatic expression, the infinite absolute with the finite verb is rendered “carefully” in, “Thou shalt carefully hearken” (literally “hearing, thou shalt hear,” “diligently hearken” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<3016>~~ Deuteronomy 15:5). The same Hebrew is rendered “diligently hearken” the King James Version; “hearken diligently” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version (~~<3013>~~ Deuteronomy 11:13; 28:1).

In the New Testament [**σπουδαιοτέρως**, spoudaioteros], “I sent him the more carefully” (“diligently” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<3028>~~ Philippians 2:28). The verb (**ἐκζητέω**, ekzeteo), “I seek out,” is translated “seek carefully”: “though he sought it carefully with tears” (“diligently” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Hebrew 12:17). The Revised Version (British and American) adds others ([**ἀκριβόω**, akriboo], “I ascertain exactly”), “learned of them carefully” the Revised Version (British and American) (“diligently” the King James Version; “exactly” the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<4017>~~ Matthew 2:7,16). The adverb [akribos], “search out carefully” the Revised Version (British

and American) (“diligently” the King James Version; “exactly” the American Standard Revised Version, ~~4118~~ Matthew 2:8). “Taught carefully” the Revised Version (British and American) (“diligently” the King James Version; “accurately” the American Standard Revised Version, ~~4185~~ Acts 18:25). “More carefully” the Revised Version (British and American) (“more perfectly” the King James Version, “more accurately” the American Standard Revised Version, ~~4185~~ Acts 18:26). [Ἐπισκοπέω, episkopeo], “I oversee,” is rendered “look carefully” (Revised Version, the American Standard Revised Version, “look diligently” the King James Version, Hebrew 12:15).

In the Apocrypha [merimao] is translated “carefully,” as “We should carefully think of thy goodness” (“ponder” the Revised Version (British and American), The Wisdom of Solomon 12:22).

G. H. Trever

CARELESS; CARELESSLY

<kar'-les>, <kar'-les-li>: These words always mean, “without anxiety,” the confidence springing from a sense of security. There is both the verb j f" B_i[baTach], “he trusted,” and the noun j f" B_i[beTach], “Ye careless daughters” (the Revised Version, margin “confident”) (~~2319~~ Isaiah 32:9-11). People dwelt careless (“in security” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~17817~~ Judges 18:7); “careless Ethiopians” (~~2319~~ Ezekiel 30:9). “Thou that dwellest carelessly” (“sittest securely” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~2318~~ Isaiah 47:8). “Thou that dwellest carelessly” (“securely” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, “confidently” King James Version, margin, ~~2316~~ Ezekiel 39:6). “The city that dwelt carelessly” (Zeph 2:15). the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American) add hzB_i[bazah], “he despised,” using the participle in “He that is careless of his ways shall die,” “despiset” the King James Version, the American Revised Version, margin, the Revised Version, margin (~~21916~~ Proverbs 19:16).

G. H. Trever

CAREM

<ka'-rem> ([**αρέμ**, Karem]): A city of Judah interpolated by the Septuagint (^{<1659>}Joshua 15:59). Probably **BETH-HACCHEREM** (which see).

CARIA

<ka'-ri-a> ([**αρία**, Karia]): A country in the Southwest of Asia Minor which extended on the North to Lydia, on the East to Phrygia, on the South to Lycia, and the West to the Aegean Sea. Its borders, however, like those of most of the ancient countries of Asia Minor, were never definitely fixed; hence, the difficulty presented by the study of the political divisions. The general surface of the country is rugged, consisting of mountainous ridges running across it, and terminating as promontories jutting into the sea. Its history consists chiefly of that of its practically independent cities of which Miletus (^{<4015>}Acts 20:15-20) and Cnidus (^{<4207>}Acts 27:7) are the chief. For some time previous to 168 BC it had lost its independence, and belonged to the island of Rhodes, but in that year Rome made it again free. According to 1 Macc 15:23, Caria was one of several places to which the Roman senate in 139-138 BC sent letters in favor of the Jews, a fact showing that its population was mixed. Its coast cities, however, were peopled chiefly by Greeks. In 129 BC Caria became a part of the Roman province of Asia, and from that date its history coincides with that of the province. Though Paul and others of the apostles traversed Caria in their missionary journeys, only its cities are mentioned by name in that connection.

E. J. Banks

CARITES

<kar'-i-tez> (**yrK**;[kari]) , “one ready,” “life-guardsman”): A body of troops mentioned in ^{<2104>}2 Kings 11:4,19 (the King James Version “captains”). Instead of **CHERETHITES** (which see), the Kethibh of ^{<1023>}2 Samuel 20:23 offers the reading Carites.

CARMANIANS

<kar-ma'-ni-anz>.

See **CARMONIANS**.

CARME

<kar'-me>.

See **CHARME**.

CARMEL

<kar'-mel> (l mṛ" K" [karmel], or, with article, l mē" K" h" [ha-karmel], "fruit garden"; Josephus, [ὁ ἄρμηλος, ho Karmelos], [αρμήλιον ὄρος, Karmelion oros]):

(1) A beautifully wooded mountain range running for about 13 miles in a south-easterly direction from the promontory which drops on the shore of the Mediterranean near Haifa, at the southern extremity of the plain of Acre, to the height of el-Machraqah which overlooks the plain of Esdraelon. On the top of the promontory, at a height of 500 ft. the monastery of Elias stands. From this point there is a gradual ascent until the greatest height is reached at Esfiyeh (1,742 ft.), the peak at el-Machraqah being only some 55 ft. lower. The mountain — usually named with the article, "the Carmel" — still justifies its name, "the garden with fruit trees." The steep slopes on the North and East, indeed, afford little scope for cultivation, although trees and brushwood grow abundantly. But to the South and West the mountain falls away to the sea and the plain in a series of long, fertile valleys, where the "excellency" of Carmel finds full illustration today. There are a few springs of good water; but the main supply is furnished by the winter rains, which are caught and stored in great cisterns. The villages on the slopes have a look of prosperity not too often seen in Syria, the rich soil amply rewarding the toil of the husbandmen. Oak and pine, myrtle and honeysuckle, box and laurel flourish; the sheen of fruitful olives fills many a hollow; and in the time of flowers Carmel is beautiful in a garment of many colors. Evidences of the ancient husbandry which made it famous are found in the cisterns, and the oil and wine presses cut in the surface of the rock. There is probably a reference to the vine culture here in ^{<4930>}2 Chronicles 26:10. In the figurative language of Scripture it appears as the symbol of beauty (Song 7:5), of fruitfulness (^{<2381D>}Isaiah 35:2), of majesty (^{<24618>}Jeremiah 46:18), of prosperous and happy life (^{<28019>}Jeremiah 50:19). The languishing of Carmel betokens the

vengeance of God upon the land (Nah 1:4); and her decay, utter desolation (~~<3012>~~ Amos 1:2; ~~<3319>~~ Isaiah 33:9).

ASYLUM AND SANCTUARY:

Roughly triangular in form, with plains stretching from its base on each of the three sides, the mountain, with its majestic form and massive bulk, is visible from afar. Its position deprived it of any great value for military purposes. It commanded none of the great highways followed by armies: the passes between Esdraelon and Sharon, to the East of Carmel, furnishing the most convenient paths. But the mountain beckoned the fugitive from afar, and in all ages has offered asylum to the hunted in its caves and wooded glens. Also its remote heights with their spacious outlook over land and sea; its sheltered nooks and embowering groves have been scenes of worship from old time. Here stood an ancient altar of Yahweh (~~<11830>~~ 1 Kings 18:30). We may assume that there was also a sanctuary of Baal, since the worshippers of these deities chose the place as common ground for the great trim (1 Kings 18). The scene is traditionally located at el-Machraqah, “the place of burnt sacrifice,” which is still held sacred by the Druzes. A Latin chapel stands near, with a great cistern. A good spring is found lower down the slope. Just below, on the North bank of the Kishon stands the mound called Tell el-qissis, “mound of the priest.” From the crest of Carmel Elijah descried the coming storm, and, descending the mountain, ran before the chariot of Ahab to the gate of Jezreel (~~<1182>~~ 1 Kings 18:42 ff). Under the monastery on the western promontory is a cave, said to be that of Elijah. An older tradition locates the cave of the prophet at ed-Deir, near `Ain es-Sih. It may have been the scene of the events narrated in ~~<1700>~~ 2 Kings 1:9 ff. Elisha also was a familiar visitor to Mt. Carmel. It was within the territory allotted to Asher; in later times it passed into the hands of Tyre (BJ, III, iii, 1).

(2) A city of Judah, in the uplands near Hebron, named with Maon and Ziph (~~<1255>~~ Joshua 15:55). Here Saul for some reason not stated set up a monument or trophy (~~<1952>~~ 1 Samuel 15:12; literally “hand”). It was the home of Nabal the churlish and drunken flockmaster, whose widow Abigail David married (1 Samuel 25); and also of Hezro, one of David’s mighty men (~~<1035>~~ 2 Samuel 23:35; ~~<1315>~~ 1 Chronicles 11:37). It is represented by the modern el-Karmil, about 10 miles to the Southeast of Hebron. Karmil is the pronunciation given me by several natives this spring. There are considerable ruins, the most outstanding feature being square tower dating

from the 12th century, now going swiftly to ruin. There are also caves, tombs and a large reservoir.

W. Ewing

CARMELITE

<kar'-mel-it> (yl mṭ" K" [karmeli]; [αρμήλιος, Karmelios], [αρμηλίτης, Karmelites]): A native of the Judean Carmel. Those who are thus named are Nabal, the husband of Abigail (^{<0815>}1 Samuel 30:5, etc.), and Hezro (the King James Version Hezrai), one of David's mighty men (^{<1035>}2 Samuel 23:35). In ^{<1005>}2 Samuel 3:3 Septuagint reads [tes Abigaias tes Karmelias], "of Abigail the Carmelites" (^{<0275>}1 Samuel 27:3; ^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 3:1).

See following article, CARMELITESS.

CARMELITESS

<kar'-mel-it-es>, <kar-mel-i'-tes> (tyl mṭ" K" [karmelith]; [αρμήλια, Karmelia]): A name applied only to Abigail, the wife of Nabal, and subsequently of David, a native of Carmel in Judah (^{<0275>}1 Samuel 27:3; ^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 3:1).

CARMI

<kar'-mi> (ymṭ" K" [karmi], "fruitful," "noble"):

(1) A son of Reuben who came to Egypt with Jacob (^{<0415>}Genesis 46:9; ^{<0614>}Exodus 6:14; ^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 5:3). Also the name of a family of which Carmi was the head (^{<0205>}Numbers 26:6).

(2) A Judahite (^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 2:7), son of Zabdi, according to ^{<0605>}Joshua 7:1, and father of Achan, who is given the name of "Achar" in ^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 2:7. This last form "Achar" is preferred to the usual "Achan" in order to bring out the play on the Hebrew word for "troubler." The Hebrew runs **אֶחָאָר** [ʾakhar ʾokher yisra'el], "Achar, the troubler of Israel." As regards the phrase "the sons of Carmi" (^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 2:7), Carmi is probably to be taken as the son of Zimri (=

Zabdi, ^{<000>}Joshua 7:1). The Targum, however, has “Carmi who is Zimri.” The Septuagint identifies Zimri and Zabdi.

(3) In ^{<000>}1 Chronicles 4:1, Carmi, elsewhere called son of Zabdi or Zimri, is made son of Judah; but Wellhausen correctly changes “Carmi” to “Chelubai” (compare ^{<000>}1 Chronicles 2:9).

Horace J. Wolf

CARMONIANS

^{<kar-mo'-ni-anz>}; the King James Version Carmanians: A people mentioned in one of the visions — “an horrible vision” (2 Esdras 15:30 ff) — of the “Apocalypse of Esdras.” Their country, Carmania, was an extensive province of Asia lying between Parthia and Ariana and the North side of the Persian Gulf, and extending to Drangiana and Gedrosia on the East and to the river Bagradas and Persis on the West. It is frequently mentioned by the ancient writers, among others by Strabo and Arrian, who describe the inhabitants as closely resembling the Medians and Persians in manners and customs. In the passage cited they are intended to denote a fierce and warlike people, being described as “raging in wrath as wild boars of the wood” and associated with the “dragons of Arabia.”

J. Hutchison

CARNAIM

^{<kar-na'-im>}, ^{<kar'-na-im>} ([^{αρνείν}, Karnein], 1 Macc 5:26, [^{αρναίν}, Karnain], verses 43 f, [τὸ ἄρνιον, to Karnion], 2 Macc 12:21,26): One of the strong cities besieged and captured by Judas Maccabeus in his campaign East of the Jordan (1 Macc 5:26,43 f). In the temple of Atargatis, which was situated here, those who fled from the city were put to death. It is apparently identical with Ashteroth Karnaim. It is called Camion in 2 Macc 12:21.

CARNAL

^{<kar'-nal>}: In the Old Testament there is an expression which indicates sexual intercourse [^{rz<tb>} ^{kʿyi} [shikhebhath zera`], “lying of seed,” ^{<000>}Leviticus 18:20; 19:20; ^{<000>}Numbers 5:13). In the New Testament the words rendered “carnal” are derived from [^{σάρξ}, sarks], “flesh.” This

refers to the flesh as opposed to the [pneuma], “spirit,” and denotes, in an ethical sense, mere human nature, the lower side of man as apart from the Divine influence, and therefore estranged from God and prone to sin; whatever in the soul is weak and tends toward ungodliness (*see FLESH*). Thus one may be carnal ([σάρκινος, sarkinos]), sold under sin (~~474~~Romans 7:14). Christians may be carnal ([sarkinos], ~~488~~1 Corinthians 3:1; [sarkikos], ~~488~~1 Corinthians 3:3); the lower side of their being is dominant and not the spirit, hence, they fall into sins of envy and strife. The weapons of the Christian warfare are not carnal, not merely human (of the flesh the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version), but spiritual (2 Cor 10:4); “not after the law of a carnal commandment” (Hebrew 7:16); “The carnal mind is enmity against God” (“mind of the flesh” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~487~~Romans 8:7). So, “to be carnally minded is death” (“mind of the flesh” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~486~~Romans 8:6). There are “carnal ordinances,” in contrast to the spiritual ones of the gospel (Hebrew 9:10); “Minister unto them in carnal things,” those that pertain to the body in contrast to spiritual things (~~457~~Romans 15:27; ~~491~~1 Corinthians 9:11). The same expressions are elsewhere rendered “fleshly” (2 Cor 1:12; 3:3 the Revised Version (British and American) “hearts of flesh”; ~~491~~1 Peter 2:11).

Is there any difference between [sarkinos] and [sarkikos]? The former more definitely denotes the material of which an object is made. It may express with emphasis the idea of [sarkikos], the spiritual given up as it were to the flesh.

See MAN (THE NATURAL).

G. H. Trever

CARNION

<kar'-ni-on>.

See CARNAIM.

CAROUSINGS

<ka-rouz'-ingz> ([πότοις, potois], dative plural of [potos]): This word is found only in the American Standard Revised Version and once only (1 Pet

4:3). The King James Version translates it “banquetings.” It is one of the Gentile excesses of fleshly indulgence against which the Christians are warned by Peter.

CARPENTER

<kar'-pen-ter> (VRj ;[charash]; [τέκτων, tekton]): This word, which is a general word for graver or craftsman, is translated “carpenter” in <1216>2 Kings 22:6; <1412>2 Chronicles 24:12; <15107>Ezra 3:7; <24107>Isaiah 41:7. The same word is rendered “craftsman” in the American Standard Revised Version of <2411>Jeremiah 24:1 and 29:2 and “smith” in the American Standard Revised Version of <3010>Zechariah 1:20. In <10151>2 Samuel 5:11; <12121>2 Kings 12:11; <13141>1 Chronicles 14:1; and <23413>Isaiah 44:13, [charash] occurs with [ets] (wood), and is more exactly translated “carpenter” or “worker in wood.” [Tekton], the corresponding Greek word for artificer, is translated “carpenter” in <4135>Matthew 13:55 and <4103>Mark 6:3.

See CARVING; CRAFTS.

CARPUS

<kar'-pus> ([άρπος, Karpos]): A name but once mentioned in the New Testament (2 Tim 4:13), “the cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus.” These words were written from the dungeons, where Paul was confined during his second imprisonment. The name, common enough in Paul’s day, signifies “fruit” (Young) or “wrist” (Davis). The words indicate that Paul must have been very well acquainted with the family of Carpus. He was presumably one of his converts; and the apostle must have lodged with him and also have had considerable confidence in him, since he committed to his care not only the comparatively valueless “cloak,” but especially the priceless “books and parchments.” It is idle to attempt to find out the identity of Carpus, but one cannot help wondering what were the contents of these books and parchments for which the apostle longed in his bitter second imprisonment.

Henry E. Dosken

CARRIAGE

<kar'-ij> (yl K)[keli], hDWBK][kebhuddah], haWcn" [nesu'ah];

[ἐπισκευασάμενοι, episkeusasamenoι]; the Revised Version (British and American) “We took up our baggage”; the American Revised Version, margin “made ready”): One or the other of the above words occurs in six different places and all have been translated in the King James Version by “carriage” in its obsolete meaning (^{<07821>}Judges 18:21; ^{<09722>}1 Samuel 17:22 (twice); ^{<23008>}Isaiah 10:28; 46:1; ^{<42115>}Acts 21:15). In the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version these are translated by the more modern expressions “goods,” “baggage,” or “the things that you carried.” In ^{<09721>}1 Samuel 17:20 the King James Version margin “place of the carriage” occurs as the equivalent of “trench.” The Hebrew [ma’galah] may mean “the place of wagons” as translated in the Revised Version (British and American), as it is not at all improbable that the encampment was surrounded by the baggage train.

James A. Patch

CARRY

^{<kar’-i>} (acn:[nasa’], gh” n:[nahagh]): The English Versions of the Bible rendering of a number of Hebrew and Greek words, and it has several shades of meaning, of which the following are the most important:

- (1) “To take up,” “to bear,” “to transport from one place to another,” as, “to carry away handkerchiefs” (^{<41912>}Acts 19:12), “to carry a corpse” (^{<05013>}Genesis 50:13), and “to be carried away by the wind” (^{<2025>}Daniel 2:35).
- (2) “To cause to go” or “come,” “to lead,” “to drive” as, “to be carried away to Babylon” (^{<42017>}2 Kings 20:17), “to be carried” away to Pilate” (^{<41501>}Mark 15:1), “to carry away cattle” (^{<03118>}Genesis 31:18), and “to carry daughters” (^{<03126>}Genesis 31:26).
- (3) “To uphold,” or “sustain,” “and even to hoar hairs will I carry you” (^{<23004>}Isaiah 46:4).
- (4) “To bear,” or “endure,” as, “to carry sorrows” (^{<25004>}Isaiah 53:4).
- (5) “To overwhelm,” “to bear away,” “to destroy,” as, “to carry away as with a flood” (^{<19005>}Psalms 90:5).
- (6) “To influence,” “to move,” as, “to carry away with dissimulation” (^{<8213>}Galatians 2:13), “to carry away with error” (2 Pet 3:17), “to be carried

away by strange teachings” (Hebrew 13:9).

A. W. Fortune

CARSHENA

<kar'-she-na>, *<kar-she'-na>* ([karshena']): The first named among the “seven princes of Persia and Media” under Ahasuerus (Est 1:14).

See PRINCES, THE SEVEN.

CART

<kart> (*hl g[]* [aghalah]): The Hebrew word has been translated in some passages “cart,” and in others “wagon.” In one verse only has it been translated “chariot.” The context of the various passages indicates that a distinction was made between vehicles which were used for carrying baggage or produce and those used for carrying riders (chariots), although in their primitive form of construction they were much the same (compare English “cart” and “carriage”).

Carts, like “chariots” (which see), were of Assyrian origin. They were early carried to Egypt where the flat nature of the country readily led to their adoption. From Egypt they gradually found their way among the people of the Palestinian plains. In the hills of Judea and Central Palestine, except where highways were built (*<0062>* 1 Samuel 6:12), the nature of the country prevented the use of wheeled vehicles. *<0007>* 1 Samuel 6:7,8,10,11,14 show that the people of the plains used carts. The men of Kiriath-jearim found it easier to carry the ark (*<0000>* 1 Samuel 7:1). Their attempt to use a cart later (*<0068>* 2 Samuel 6:3,1; *<0307>* 1 Chronicles 13:7) proved disastrous and they abandoned it for a safer way (*<0063>* 2 Samuel 6:13).

That carts were used at a very early date is indicated by *<0008>* Numbers 7:3,7,8. That these vehicles were not the common mode of conveyance in Palestine is shown in Genesis 45. Pharaoh commanded that Joseph’s brethren should return to their father with their beasts of burden (45:21) and take with them Egyptian wagons (45:19,21; 46:6) for bringing back their father and their families. The very unusual sight of the wagons was proof to Jacob of Joseph’s existence (45:27).

Bible descriptions and ancient Babylonian and Egyptian pictures indicate that the cart was usually two-wheeled and drawn by two oxen.

With the Arabian conquests and subsequent ruin of the roads wheeled vehicles disappeared from Syria and Palestine. History is again repeating itself. The Circassians, whom the Turkish government has settled near Caesarea, Jerash (Gerasa) and Amman (Philadelphia), have introduced a crude cart which must be similar to that used in Old Testament times. The two wheels are of solid wood. A straight shaft is joined to the wooden axle, and to this a yoke of oxen is attached. On the Philistian plains may be seen carts of present-day Egyptian origin but of a pattern many centuries old. With the establishment of government roads during the last 50 years, European vehicles of all descriptions are fast coming into the country.

One figurative reference is made to the cart (^{<23518>}Isaiah 5:18), but its meaning is obscure.

James A. Patch

CARVING

^{<karv'-ing>}: Carving, or engraving, was extensively used among the peoples of Bible lands. There were no materials used in the arts which were not subjected to the graver's skill. Carved objects of wood, stone, ivory, clay, bronze, gold, silver and glass discovered today show how skillful the ancient carvers were. Carving was principally done in bas-relief, although ^{<10281>}Exodus 28:11 shows that incised lines were also used. The signets and scarabs are examples of this class of carving. Several Hebrew words have been translated "carved" in the King James Version. [Pecel] or [pecil] is found in ^{<17188>}Judges 18:18; ^{<44317>}2 Chronicles 33:7,22; 34:3,1; [chaqah] in ^{<11035>}1 Kings 6:35. The translation "graven" appears in the Revised Version (British and American) of all these passages. In ^{<11032>}1 Kings 6:29,32,35, [qala] appears; in ^{<11038>}1 Kings 6:18,32, [miqla`ath]; in ^{<11032>}1 Kings 6:29 and ^{<19416>}Psalms 74:6, [pittuach]; in ^{<123105>}Exodus 31:5; 35:33, [charosheth] (*see CARPENTER*); [chaTubhah] in ^{<20716>}Proverbs 7:16 is better translated "striped" as in the Revised Version (British and American). For further notes on carving, see *CRAFTS*.

James A. Patch

CASDIM

^{<kaz'-dim>}

See CHESED.

CASE

<kas>: Ordinarily to describe the circumstances or condition of things; sometimes, juridically ([αἰτία, aitia], ^{<0190>}Matthew 19:10; ^{<4254>}Acts 25:14), as that for which a reckoning has to be given, as frequently the Latin res. In ^{<0159>}Exodus 5:19, “they were in evil case,” is interpreted by the Revised Version (British and American) as “were set on mischief.”

CASEMENT

<kas'-ment>.

See *HOUSE*.

CASIPHIA

<ka-sif'-i-a>, <ka-sif-e'-a> (αργῆΚ; [kaciphya']): An unidentified place in North Babylonia, near the river Ahava, to which Ezra sent for “ministers for the house of our God” (^{<1887>}Ezra 8:17). Some have thought the name to be connected with [keceph], “silver” or “money.” Septuagint renders ([argurio tou topou], as in 1 Esdras 8:45, “the place of the treasury.”

CASLUHIM

<kas'-lu-him>, <kas-lu-him> (μυι ι βΚ" [kacluchim]; [αςμωνιείμ, Chasmonieim]): The name of a people mentioned in ^{<0104>}Genesis 10:14; ^{<0112>}1 Chronicles 1:12 as descended from Mizraim. The parenthesis should probably follow Caphtorim. From them, it is said, sprang the PHILISTINES, which see.

CASPION

<kas'-fon>.

See *CASPHOR*.

CASPHOR

<kas'-for> (the King James Version Casphon; [αςφώρ, Kasphor], 1 Macc 5:26; [αςφών, Chasphon], [αςφώθ, Chasphoth], 5:36; [αςπείν, Kaspein], 2 Macc 12:13): A city East of the Jordan captured by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:36). It is probably identical with Caspi of 2

Macc 12:13. It was a fortress of great strength, with a lake near it. This has led some to think it may be represented by el-Muzerib, an important station on the pilgrim route to Mecca. The ancient name of this city, however, has not been discovered.

See *ASHTAROTH*

CASPIN; CASPIS

<kas'-pin>, <kas'-pis>.

See *CASPHOR*.

CASSIA

<kash'-a>: Two Hebrew words,

(1) **hDqi**[qiddah], which is mentioned, along with myrrh, cinnamon, calamus and olive oil, as one of the ingredients of the “holy anointing oil” (~~<Ex18>~~ Exodus 30:24); it was, too, one of the wares in which Vedan and Javan traded with Tyre (~~<327/19>~~ Ezekiel 27:19); it is identified in the Peshitta and the Targum with (2).

(2) **twDyxqj**[qetsi`oth] (plural only, probably referring to the strips of bark), a word from which is derived the Greek [**κασία**, kasia], and hence, cassia (~~<198/8>~~ Psalm 45:8). It is probable that both

(1) and

(2) refer to *Cassia lignea*, the inner bark of *Cinnamomum cassia*, a plant growing in eastern Asia closely allied to that which yields the cinnamon of commerce. It is a fragrant, aromatic bark and was probably used in a powdered form. Both as an ingredient in unguents and as one of the perfumes at funerals, cassia, like cinnamon, was much used by the Romans. The cassia of Scripture must be clearly distinguished from the entirely distinct *Cassia lanceolata* and *C. obovata* which yield the familiar senna. The proper name **KEZIAH** (which see) is the singular form of [ketsi`oth].

E. W. G. Masterman

CAST

In general “to throw,” with various degrees of violence; usually, with force, but not so necessarily, as e.g. in “cast a net,” “cast lots.” When applied to molten metal, as in English, first, “to let run. into molds,” with reference to their descent by gravity, and, then, “to form,” as in ^{<1252>}Exodus 25:12, etc. Usually in the New Testament for [βάλλω, ballo], but not always. Thus, in ^{<112>}Luke 1:29 “cast in her mind” means “considered” ([διελογίζετο, dielogizeto]); “cast reproach” for Greek [ὀνειδίζον, oneidizon], “reproached” (^{<1244>}Matthew 27:44); “casting down” for [καθαίρέω, kathaireo], “demolishing” (2 Cor 10:4); “casting all anxiety upon” (1 Pet 5:7), a still stronger term, as in ^{<2712>}Luke 17:2 the King James Version; ^{<4279>}Acts 27:19. As a fundamental Greek word, it is compounded with many prepositions, “about,” “away,” “down,” “forth,” “in,” “into,” “off,” “out,” “up,” “upon.” “Cast down” in ^{<4049>}2 Corinthians 4:9 the King James Version is used in a military sense of one prostrated, but not killed in battle. Compare ^{<945>}Psalms 42:5 with the Revised Version, margin. “Castaway” of the King James Version in ^{<4127>}1 Corinthians 9:27, is in the Revised Version (British and American) “rejected” (compare Hebrew 6:8), [ἁδόκιμος, adokimos], i.e. what the application of a test shows to be counterfeit, or unfit; translated “reprobate” in ^{<6128>}Romans 1:28; ^{<4735>}2 Corinthians 13:5,6,7, etc.

H. E. Jacobs

CASTANETS

<kas'-ta-nets>, <kas-ta-nets'> (κy[ḡ" [ḡ" m][mena`an`im]): Are mentioned in ^{<1085>}2 Samuel 6:5 among the musical instruments upon which David and the house of Israel played at the time of the bringing up of the ark out of the house of Abinadab. This word is incorrectly translated “cornets” in the King James Version. The castanet was probably about the same kind of instrument as the Egyptian sistrum, and the Revised Version (British and American) has “sistra” in the margin of ^{<1085>}2 Samuel 6:5. The sistrum was a loop-shaped metal frame through which were passed loose rods at the ends of which were rings. The instrument was held by a long handle and was rattled during songs and dances. It was used in Egypt in religious worship or to scare away evil influences. There is only the one reference to this instrument in the Bible.

A. W. Fortune

CASTAWAY

<kaſt'-a-wa> ([ἀδόκιμος, adokimos], from [dokimazo], “I test,” “I approve after testing,” hence, approved after being tested): This word is rendered “castaway” only in the King James Version: “I myself should be a castaway” (“rejected” the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, ~~<kaſt>~~ 1 Corinthians 9:27). But the same word occurs a number of times usually translated “reprobate” (~~<kaſt>~~ Romans 1:28; ~~<kaſt>~~ 2 Corinthians 13:5-7; ~~<kaſt>~~ 2 Timothy 3:8; ~~<kaſt>~~ Titus 1:16); “rejected” (Hebrew 6:8).

CASTLE

<kaſ'-'-l>.

See FORTIFICATION.

CASTOR AND POLLUX

<kaſ'-ter>, <pol'-uks>.

See DIOSCURI; ASTRONOMY.

CAT

([αἴλουρος, ailouros]): The only mention of this animal is in Baruch 6:22. It is not mentioned in the canonical Scriptures, though Bochart (Hieroz., 862) gives “wild cats” as the equivalent of [tsyim] in ~~<cat>~~ Isaiah 13:21; 34:14; ~~<cat>~~ Jeremiah 50:39; ~~<cat>~~ Psalm 74:19, where English Versions of the Bible gives “wild beasts of the desert.” Mention is, however, made of cats, cathod, in the Welsh Bible (Isa 34:14). The only mention of the catta in classical Latin writers is in Martial xiii.69. How the cat was regarded in Egypt is described in Herod. ii.66 and Rawlinson’s notes. In Baruch 6:22 cats are mentioned with “bats, swallows and birds” as sitting with impunity on the images of the heathen gods which are unable to drive them off.

See also ZOOLOGY.

J. Hutchison

CATECHIST; CATECHUMEN

<kat'-e-kist>, <kate-ku'-men> ([κατηχίζειν, katechizein] “to resound,” “to teach,” “to instruct”): A catechist is a teacher who instructs his pupils in the elements of his own religion. In the Old Testament he teaches them the rudiments of Old Testament truth; in the New Testament he teaches the principles of the Christian faith. A catechumen, one whom the catechist instructs or catechizes, in preparation for the ceremony of baptism.

The words are derived from [κατηχίζειν, katechein], meaning “to give a sound,” “to answer,” “to echo.” Classically it was used of the sounding down of rushing water, of the falling of music from a ship to the sea. Then it came to signify the sounding down of words of command or instruction. The preposition [kata] strengthens the meaning, bringing out more emphatically the back or return sound, the echo, the answer. So it came to mean familiar verbal instruction, a free informal discussion between teacher and pupil. Luke informs Theophilus (~~2104~~ Luke 1:4) that he intends to give him a succinct and orderly account of those things which he had previously received by word of mouth ([peri hon katechethes]). See also the Greek in ~~4195~~ Acts 18:25 and 21:21; ~~828~~ Romans 2:18; ~~649~~ 1 Corinthians 14:19; ~~806~~ Galatians 6:6. In all these passages the Greek verb is “catechised.”

We do not find in the New Testament an organized catechumenate, such as we find in the 3rd and 4th centuries. The apostles preached mainly to synagogue-instructed Jews who were familiar with the law and the prophets and the Psalms, or to Gentiles who had, learned from the Jews and had become “proselytes” (which see). The first apostolic preaching and teaching was to convince the hearers that Jesus was the promised Messiah, the Saviour of the world. As believers multiplied, the contrast between them and those who rejected the teaching became more and more marked. Opposition, scorn and persecution became more bold and bitter. The Christians were compelled to set forth and defend their beliefs more clearly. They had to meet and answer keen and persistent objections. And so the necessity for clear, systematic and organized teaching grew more and more into the form of an ordered catechumenate. The Apostolic Constitutions, from the latter part of the 3rd century, show the institution in a fair state of development. A Jew, pagan, or heretic of good moral standing, upon application to the deacon, presbyter, or bishop, was admitted into the state of catechumen by the sign of the cross and the imposition of hands (Schaff-Herzog, under the word).

The basis for the Christian catechumenate we find in the great commission (~~4189~~ Matthew 28:19,20). The aim of this commission was to make disciples, i.e. believing followers. The means for this discipling are baptizing and teaching. The result of using the means is that those who have become disciples are to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded.

Jesus Himself at twelve years of age had become a child of the law, a catechumen. He increased in wisdom and learned obedience. He became the great Catechist instructing His disciples, other private individuals and the multitudes. See an example of His catechizing in ~~4163~~ Matthew 16:13 ff.

Paul was a master in method. See examples of use of the modern pedagogical method of apperception in ~~4444~~ Acts 14:14 ff; 17:16 ff; 19:8,9. The catechetical method is frequently found in the epistles (see ~~4401~~ 1 Corinthians 3:1,2; Hebrew 5:11,14; 6:1,2; ~~4102~~ 1 Peter 2:2; ~~4103~~ 1 John 2:13), and so the idea of religious nurture and instruction is found all through the New Testament. The catechist and the catechumen are there. It was not something new in the New Testament. Its roots lie back and run through the Old Testament. The narrative of God's first communication with man, inside the gates of Eden, concerning commandment, law, sin, its consequences, its remedy, takes a catechetical form. The importance of systematic instruction, both public and private, is emphasized throughout the Old Testament and New Testament, although it might not always take the form of catechizing in the modern pedagogical sense. In the patriarchal age the father was the prophet, the teacher, the catechist, in his house, which often included several families with their servants (see ~~0189~~ Genesis 18:19). Matthew Henry explains thus: "Abraham not only took care of his children, but his whole household, including his servants, were catechized" (see also ~~0226~~ Exodus 12:26; ~~0501~~ Deuteronomy 6:1-9; ~~0606~~ Joshua 4:6,7; 24:15; ~~0841~~ Psalm 34:11). Priests and Levites in addition to their sacerdotal functions were catechists (instructors) among the people (~~0801~~ Leviticus 10:11; ~~0530~~ Deuteronomy 33:10; ~~4458~~ 2 Chronicles 15:3; ~~3443~~ Ezekiel 44:23). In later times the synagogues had regular instruction in the law and the prophets.

See EDUCATION; INSTRUCTION; TEACHER.

G. H. Gerberding

CATERPILLAR

<kat'-er-pil-er> (l ysj ;[chacil] (~~1986~~ Psalm 78:46; ~~2006~~ Joel 1:4, etc.);

ql y,[yeleq] (~~1953~~ Psalm 105:34 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version “grasshopper”; ~~2514~~ Jeremiah 51:14,27 the King James Version; elsewhere “canker-worm”)): A name given to a larval stage of the *LOCUST* (which see).

CATHOLIC; EPISTLES

<kath'-o-lik> ([ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαί, epistolai katholikai]): In distinction from the apostolic or Pauline epistles which were addressed to individual churches or persons, the term “catholic,” in the sense of universal or general, was applied by Origen and the other church Fathers to the seven epistles written by James, Peter, John and Jude. As early as the 3rd century it came to be used in the sense of “encyclical,” “since,” as Theodoret says, “they are not addressed to single churches, but generally ([katholou]) to the faithful, whether to the Jews of the Dispersion, as Peter writes, or even to all who are living as Christians under the same faith.” Three other explanations of the term have been given, namely,

- (1) that it was intended to indicate a common apostolic authorship (only a few support this view);
- (2) that it signifies that the seven epistles were universally received as genuine;
- (3) that it refers to the catholicity of their doctrine, i.e. orthodox and authoritative versus heretical epistles whose teachings were in harmony with Christian truth. By some misconception of the word “catholic” the Western Church interpreted it as signifying “canonical” and sometimes called these epistles [epistolae canonicae]. That it was originally used in the sense of “general” epistles is now commonly received.

This is evident from their form of address. James wrote to all Jews, “of the Dispersion,” who had embraced the Christian faith. In his first epistle Peter addressed the same Christians, including also Gentile converts, resident in five provinces of Asia Minor: “elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion.” His second epistle is to all Christians everywhere. John’s first letter was evidently written to a cycle of churches and intended for universal use. Jude also had in mind all Christians when he said “to them that are called

beloved in God,” etc. The seeming exceptions are 2 and 3 Jn, addressed to individuals, but included with the catholic epistles as properly belonging with John’s first epistle and of value to the general reader. The character and contents of these seven epistles are treated under their various heads. The letters of James and Jude belong to the Judaic school of Christianity; those of Peter to a broad and non-partisan type of faith that both includes and mediates between the Judaists and Paulinists. John’s letters were written after the internal doctrinal controversies of the church had ceased, and the pressure of opposition and error from without tended to unite his “little children” in a new community of love and spiritual life.

Dwight M. Pratt

CATHUA

<ka-thu’-a> ([αθουά, Kathoua]; Codex Vaticanus, [ουά, Koua]): Head of a family of temple-servants who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:30); corresponds to Giddel in <127> Ezra 2:47.

CATTLE

<kat’-’-l> (hmfhB)[behemah], “a dumb beast”; hneqhi[miqneh], “a possession” from hnq [qanah], “to acquire” (compare Arabic qana’, “to acquire,” and Greek [κτηνος, kienos], “beast,” and plural [κτήνεα, ktenea], “flocks,” from [κτάμαι, ktaomai], “to acquire,” flocks being both with the Homeric peoples and with the patriarchs an important form of property; compare English “fee”); ^axq[tso’n] “small cattle,” “sheep” or goats (compare Arabic [da’n], “sheep”); h[,seh], a single sheep or goat (compare Arabic shah); hkal m[mela’kha], “property,” from ḥ l ; [la’akh], “to minister” (compare Arabic [malakah] and [mulk], “property,” from [malak], “to possess”); ayrh[m] [meri’] “fatling” (1 Kings 19); [θρέμμα, thremma] (<1012> John 4:12), “cattle,” i.e. “that which is nourished,” from [τρέφω, trepho], “to nourish”; rqB[baqar], “kine,” “oxen” (compare Arabic [baqar], “cattle”); rw [shor], rw [tor] (<2025> Daniel 4:25), [ταύρος, tauros] (<1274> Matthew 22:4), “ox” or “bull”; [βόυς, bous], “ox” (<1315> Luke 13:15); ’l a,[’eleph], only in the plural, μυπl a[’alaphim], “oxen” (<1807> Psalm 8:7)): From the foregoing and by

examination of the many references to “cattle,” “kine” or “oxen” it is apparent that there are important points of contact in derivation and usage in the Hebrew, Greek and English terms. It is evident that neat cattle were possessed in abundance by the patriarchs and later Israelites, which is far from being the case in Palestine at the present day. The Bedouin usually have no cattle. The [fellachin] in most parts of the country keep them in small numbers, mostly for plowing, and but little for milk or for slaughtering. Travelers in the Holy Land realize that goat’s milk is in most places easier to obtain than cow’s milk. The commonest cattle of the fellachin are a small black breed. In the vicinity of Damascus are many large, fine milch cattle which furnish the delicious milk and cream of the Damascus bazaars. For some reason, probably because they are not confined and highly fed, the bulls of Palestine are meek creatures as compared with their European or American fellows.

In English Versions of the Bible the word “cattle” is more often used in a wide sense to include sheep and goats than to denote merely neat cattle. In fact, [baqar], which distinctively denotes neat cattle, is often rendered “herds,” as [tso’n], literally “sheep,” is in a large number of instances translated “flocks.” A good illustration is found in ^{<0338>}Genesis 32:7: “Then Jacob divided the, people ([’am]) that were with him, and the flocks ([tso’n]), and the herds ([baqar]), and the camels ([gemallim]), into two companies ([machanoth]).” For the last word the King James Version has “drove” in ^{<0338>}Genesis 33:8, the Revised Version (British and American) “company.” Next to [tso’n], the word most commonly rendered “flock” in English Versions of the Bible is [’edher], from root “to arrange,” “to set in order.” [’Edher] is rendered “herd” in ^{<0223>}Proverbs 27:23, and in ^{<0118>}Joel 1:18 it occurs twice, being rendered “herds of cattle,” [’edhre baqar], and “flocks of sheep,” [’edhre ha-tso’n]. [Miqneh] is rendered “flock” in ^{<0326>}Numbers 32:26, “herd” in ^{<0478>}Genesis 47:18, and “cattle” in a large number of passages. Other words rendered “flock” are: [mar’ith] (r. [ra’ah] (Arabic ra’a), “to pasture”), once in ^{<0401>}Jeremiah 10:21; [’ashteroth tso’n], “flocks of thy sheep,” the Revised Version (British and American) “young of thy flock,” in ^{<0173>}Deuteronomy 7:13, etc., [’ashiaroth] being plural of [’ashtoreth], or Ashtoreth; [chasiph], once in ^{<0173>}1 Kings 20:27: “The Children of Israel encamped before them (the Syrians) like two little flocks of kids,” [chasiph] signifying “something stripped off or separated,” from root [chasaph], “to strip” or “to peel,” like the Arabic [qaTi’], “flock,” from root [qaTa’], “to cut off”; [ποιμνη, poimne] (^{<0151>}Matthew 26:31): “The sheep of the flock shall be scattered,” and (^{<0118>}Luke 2:8): “keeping

watch by night over their flock”; [ποίμνιον, poimnion] (^{<0129>} Luke 12:32): “Fear not, little flock,” and (1 Pet 5:2): “Tend the flock of God which is among you.”

Figurative: Not only [poimne] and [poimnion] but also [ʿedher] and [tsoʿn] are used figuratively of God’s people; e.g. ^{<2401>} Isaiah 40:11: “He will feed his flock ([ʿedher]) like a shepherd”; ^{<3008>} Zechariah 10:3: “Yahweh of hosts hath visited his flock ([ʿedher]), the house of Judah”; ^{<2350>} Isaiah 65:10: “And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks” ([tsoʿn]); ^{<2020>} Jeremiah 23:2: “Ye have scattered my flock” ([tsoʿn]); ^{<3542>} Ezekiel 34:22: “Therefore will I save my flock” ([tsoʿn]); ^{<3074>} Micah 7:14: “Feed the flock ([tsoʿn]) of thy heritage.”

The wild ox or wild bull, the Revised Version (British and American) “antelope” ([teʿo] or [toʿ] of ^{<5445>} Deuteronomy 14:5 and ^{<2510>} Isaiah 51:20), is considered by the writer to be probably the Arabian oryx, and in this he is in agreement with Tristram (NHB). Tristram however thinks that the unicorn ([rem] or [reʿem]), the Revised Version (British and American) “wild ox,” was the aurochs, while the present writer believes that this also may well have been the oryx, which at the present day has at least three names in Arabic, one of which, [baqar-ul-wachsh], means “wild ox.”

See ANTELOPE.

Our domestic cattle are believed by some of the best authorities to be of the same species as the ancient European wild ox or aurochs, *Bos taurus*, which is by others counted as a distinct species under the title of *Bos primigenius*. The aurochs was widely spread over Europe in Roman times, but is now extinct. Some degenerate wild cattle are preserved in some British parks, but these according to Lydekker in the Royal Natural History are probably feral descendants of early domestic breeds. Tristram cites the occurrence in the Dog River bone breccia of teeth which may be those of the aurochs, but this is a deposit accumulated by prehistoric man of an unknown antiquity to be variously estimated according to the predilections of the geologist at a few thousands or a few score of thousands of years, and is far from proving that this animal existed in Palestine in Bible times or at any time.

The European bison (*Bos* or *Bison bonassus*) is thought by some to be the wild ox of the Bible. This is a forest-dwelling species and is now confined to the forests of Lithuania and the Caucasus. It was formerly more widely distributed, but there is no certain evidence that it ever lived as far South as

Palestine, and there have probably never existed in Palestine forests suitable to be the haunts of this animal.

About the Sea of Tiberias and the Jordan valley and in the plain of Coele-Syria there exist today Indian buffaloes (*Bos bubalus*) some feral and some in a state of domestication, which are believed to have been introduced in comparatively recent times.

See BEAST; CALF.

Alfred Ely Day

CAUDA

<ko'-da> ([αὐδα, Kauda]; also called [λαὐδα, Klauda]; the King James Version Claudia; the modern Greek name Gaudho supports the form Cauda): An island 23 miles West of Cape Matala. It is a small island, and can never have supported a large population, or have been of any importance. Its elevation to the rank of a bishopric in Byzantine times must have been due to its association with the voyage of Paul. The ship with Paul on board was driven under the lee of Cauda (<4276> Acts 27:16); in the calm water south of the island the crew succeeded in hauling in the boat, undergirding the ship and slackening sail.

W. M. Calder

CAUL

<kol>:

(1) **tr̥tyō** [tyothereth] (<1293> Exodus 29:13), the large lobe or flap of the liver, which is usually mentioned together with the kidneys and the fat as the special portions set aside for the burnt offering (<1884> Leviticus 3:4,10,15; 4:9; 7:4; 8:16,25; 9:10,19).

(2) **rwōs** [ceghor] (from the root [caghar], “to enclose,” “shut up”), <8138> Hosea 13:8, literally the enclosure or covering of the heart, the caul or pericardium, or perhaps the chest as surrounding the heart. It must not be forgotten, however, that the expression may be taken in the sense of “mailcoat of the heart,” i.e. hardened heart, which is shut to the influence of God’s grace. So Luther and many modern translators and commentators.

CAUSE

<kos>: In both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “for this cause” (the King James Version “cause”) occurs in ^{<1916>}Exodus 9:16 as the rendering of **taorwb[ḅ]** [ba`abhur zo`th] = “in order that”; “to the end that”; so also in ^{<212>}Daniel 2:12 for **hnD** **l beqAl K** [kol-qebhel denah], and in ^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 32:20 the King James Version for **taal** [ʾal-zo`th], where RVS read “because of.” In the New Testament the word is used adverbially in the translation of several Greek phrases: [ἐνεκα τούτου, heneka toutou] (^{<1916>}Matthew 19:5; ^{<1107>}Mark 10:7); [διὰ τοῦτο, dia touto], ^{<127>}John 12:27; ^{<13>}Romans 1:26; 13:6; 15:9 (the Revised Version (British and American) “therefore”); ^{<113>}1 Corinthians 11:30; ^{<123>}1 Thessalonians 2:13; ^{<121>}2 Thessalonians 2:11; ^{<116>}1 Timothy 1:16; Hebrew 9:15; [εἰς τοῦτο, eis touto], ^{<187>}John 18:37 (where the King James Version varying the phraseology reads “to this end” “for this cause”); ^{<116>}1 Peter 4:6 the King James Version; [τούτου χάριν, toutou charin], ^{<114>}Ephesians 3:14. Unusual renderings occur, as “for his cause” (= “because of”), ^{<12>}2 Corinthians 7:12; as = “affair,” “thing,” obsolete in the King James Version ^{<125>}1 Kings 12:15; ^{<115>}2 Chronicles 10:15, where the word occurs as a paraphrase of **hBsi** [necibbah] (= “turn of affairs”). In ^{<151>}1 Samuel 25:31 (King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) “causeless” (= without cause the American Standard Revised Version) occurs arbitrarily in adverb sense.

W. N. Stearns

CAUSEWAY; CAUSEY

<koz'-wa>, <ko'-zi> (more correctly): This word occurs in ^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 26:16,18 for the Hebrew **hLsm** [mecillah]; Septuagint [παστοφορίον της ἀναβάσεως, pastophorion tes anabaseos]. In ^{<11>}2 Chronicles 9:11 the word is translated “terraces” (Septuagint [ἀναβάσεις, anabaseis]). Compare BDB, under the word, where **twQsm** [mecilloth], is an error for **two[sh]** [mic`adhoth] (^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:12). In all the above passages reference is made to a series or flight of steps leading up into the temple. The word also signifies a prepared, traveled road, as in

<0019>Numbers 20:19; <0726>Judges 20:31 f,45; <0062>1 Samuel 6:12; <1002>2 Samuel 20:12 f; <1287>2 Kings 18:17 (<2302>Isaiah 36:2); <2003>Isaiah 7:3; 11:16; 19:23; 33:8; 40:3; 49:11; <2602>Jeremiah 31:21.

Figurative: In <2807>Isaiah 59:7 the word ([mecillah]) occurs in a figurative sense, so also in <0060>Judges 5:20; <2067>Proverbs 16:17.

W. N. Stearns

CAVE

<kav> (hr{m}[me`arah] (compare Arabic magharah), rwḡ [chor] (<3305>Job 30:6 the King James Version), twḡj m[mechilloth] (<2029>Isaiah 2:19); [ὀπή, ope] (Hebrew 11:38), [σπήλαιον, spelaion] (<0013>John 11:38); [chor], more often rendered “hole,” is akin to Arabic khaur, “gulf” or “inlet,” but is also related to [me`arah] (compare also Arabic ghaur “low-land,” especially of the Jordan valley and Dead Sea). [Mechilloth] (root, [chalal], “to pierce” (compare Arabic khall, “to pierce”)) occurs only in <2029>Isaiah 2:19, where the King James Version has “caves” and translates [me`aroth] in the same verse by “holes.” In the Revised Version (British and American) these words are very properly changed about. [Spelaion] is a common Greek word for “cave”; [ope] means rather “hole”): In Palestine as in other limestone countries, caves are of frequent occurrence, and not a few of large size are known. Water from the rain and snow, seeping down through cracks, enlarges the passages through which it goes by dissolving away the substance of the rock. Just as upon the surface of the land the trickling streams unite to form brooks and rivers, so many subterranean streams may come together in a spacious channel, and may issue upon the surface as a bold spring. The cave of the Dog River near Beirut and that of ‘Afqa (perhaps Aphek (<0034>Joshua 13:4)) in Lebanon are excellent examples of this. Not infrequently after forming a cave the stream of water may find some lower outlet by a different route, leaving its former course dry. In some cases the hinder part of the roof of the cave may fall in, leaving the front part standing as a natural bridge. Numerous shallow caves, especially in the faces of cliffs, are formed not by seeping water, but by atmospheric erosion, a portion of a relatively soft stratum of rock being hollowed out, while harder strata above and below it are but little worn away. Many of the hermits’ caves originated in this way and were artificially enlarged and walled up at the mouth. The principal caves

mentioned in the Bible are those of *MACHPELAH*, *MAKKEDAH* and *ADULLAM* (which see).

See DEN.

Alfred Ely Day

CEASE

<ses>: A remarkable array of 20 Hebrew and 6 Greek words is so translated. In the King James Version 15 of the former and 3 of the latter are used only once with this rendering. The originals most frequently in use are **l dj** [chadhal], “to leave off”; **tbvi** [shabhath] “to rest from” (labor); **παύομαι**, pauomai], “to make to cease.” Few words illustrate better the fertility of the Hebrew in expressing limitless shades of meaning, impoverished by the use of one English word. This extensive variety is, however, well expressed by “cease”: i.e. stop, come to an end, e.g. ceasing of tears (^{<2447>}Jeremiah 14:17); work (^{<1504>}Ezra 4:24); grinders (^{<2123>}Ecclesiastes 12:3); thunder (^{<1032>}Exodus 9:29); the wicked (^{<1817>}Job 3:17); anger (^{<1878>}Psalms 37:8). The significance of [shabhath] lies in its being the Hebrew for Sabbath, implying complete cessation: as of [manna] (^{<1652>}Joshua 5:12); strife and ignominy (^{<1720>}Proverbs 22:10); occurs with negative to show the ceaseless Providence of God in Nature: “summer and winter shall not c.” (^{<1082>}Genesis 8:22). In the New Testament it illustrates Christ’s power over Nature; wind and raging sea ceased (^{<4034>}Luke 8:24); over a sinner’s heart: “not ceased to kiss my feet” ([**διαλείπω**, dialeipo]) (^{<4045>}Luke 7:45); devotion of the early disciples, “ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ” (^{<4152>}Acts 5:42); the eternity and blessedness of the believer’s sabbatic rest ([**ἀπολείπω**, apoleipo]) (Hebrew 4:10 the King James Version).

Dwight M. Pratt

CEDAR

<se’-dar>, <se’-der> (**zra**, [’erez], from Hebrew root meaning “to be firm”; [**κέδρος**, kedros]): The [’erez] was in almost all the Old Testament references the true cedar, Cedrus libani, but the name may have been applied in a loose way to allied trees, such as junipers and pines. In ^{<1046>}Numbers 24:6 — ”as cedar-trees beside the waters” — the reference

must, as is most probable, be purely poetical (*see* ALOES) or the [ʿarazim] must signify some other kind of tree which flourishes beside water.

1. CEDAR FOR RITUAL CLEANSING:

Cedar is twice mentioned as a substance for ritual cleansing. In ^{<844>}Leviticus 14:4 the cleansed leper was sprinkled with the blood of a “clean bird” into which had been put “cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop.” In ^{<496>}Numbers 19:6 “cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet” were to be cast into the holocaust of the red heifer. (For the symbolical meaning see CLEAN.) Here it is very generally considered that the cedar could not have been the wood of *Cedrus libani*, which so far as we know never grew in the wilderness, but that of some species of juniper — according to Post, *Juniperis phoenicea*, which may still be found in the wilderness of Edom.

2. CEDAR TREES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

Cedar trees are everywhere mentioned with admiration in the Old Testament. Solomon made the cedar the first of trees (^{<103>}1 Kings 4:33). They are the “glory of Lebanon” (^{<380>}Isaiah 35:2; 60:13). The most boastful threat of Sennacherib was that he would cut down the tall cedars of Lebanon (^{<374>}Isaiah 37:24). They were strong, as is implied in —

*“The voice of Yahweh is powerful; ...
The voice of Yahweh breaketh the cedars;
Yea, Yahweh breaketh in pieces the cedars of Lebanon”
(^{<324>}Psalm 29:4,5).*

The cedars are tall — “whose height was like the height of the cedars” — (^{<119>}Amos 2:9; ^{<293>}2 Kings 19:23); majestic (^{<249>}2 Kings 14:9), and excellent (Song 5:15). The Assyrian power is compared to — “a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a forest-like shade, an high stature; and its top was among the thick boughs its stature was exalted above all the trees of the field; and its boughs were multiplied, and its branches became long” (^{<318>}Ezekiel 31:3-5). They are in particular God’s trees —

*“The trees of Yahweh are filled with moisture,
The cedars of Lebanon, which he hath planted” (^{<946>}Psalm 104:16).*

Doubtless as a reminiscence of this the Syrians today call the cedar [ʿars er rubb], “the cedar of the Lord.” The growth of the cedar is typical of that of the righteous man (^{<922>}Psalm 92:12).

That cedars were once very abundant in the Lebanon is evident (~~<1009>~~1 Kings 6:9-18; 10:27). What they contributed to the glory and beauty of that district may be seen in ~~<3100>~~Zechariah 11:1-2:

*“Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.
Wail, O fir-tree, for the cedar is fallen, because the
glorious (Revised Version margin) ones are destroyed:
Wail, O ye oaks of Bashan, for the strong forest is come down.”*

3. CEDAR TIMBER:

The wood of the cedar has always been highly prized — much more so than the sycamore (~~<1107>~~1 Kings 10:27; ~~<2390>~~Isaiah 9:10). David had a house of cedar built for him by Hiram, king of Tyre (~~<1051>~~2 Samuel 5:11), and he prepared “cedar-trees without number” for the temple which his son was to build (~~<1324>~~1 Chronicles 22:4). Cedar timber was very much used in the construction of Solomon’s temple and palace, the trees being cut in the Lebanon by Sidonians by orders of the king of Tyre — “Hiram gave Solomon timber of cedar and timber of fir according to all his desire” (~~<1056>~~1 Kings 5:6-10). One of Solomon’s most important buildings was known as “the house of the forest of Lebanon” (~~<1002>~~1 Kings 7:2; 10:17; ~~<1496>~~2 Chronicles 9:16), on account of the source of its materials. While cedar was well adapted for beams (~~<1009>~~1 Kings 6:9; Song 1:17), boards (Song 8:9), pillars (~~<1002>~~1 Kings 7:2) and ceilings (~~<2424>~~Jeremiah 22:14), it was suited as well for carved work, such as idols (~~<2414>~~Isaiah 44:14,15). It was also used for ships’ masts (~~<2576>~~Ezekiel 27:5).

4. CEDARS IN MODERN SYRIA:

The *Cedrus libani* still survives in the mountains of Syria and flourishes in much greater numbers in the Taurus mountains. “There are groves of cedars above el-Ma`acir, Baruk, `Ain Zehaltah, Hadith, Besherri, and Sir” (Post, Flora, 751). Of these the grove at Besherri is of world-wide renown. It consists of a group of about 400 trees, among them some magnificent old patriarchs, which lies on the bare slopes of the Lebanon some 6,000 ft. above the sea. Doubtless they are survivors of a forest which here once covered the mountain slopes for miles. The half a dozen highest specimens reach a height of between 70 and 80 ft., and have trunks of a circumference of 40 ft. or more. It is impossible to estimate with any certainty their age, but they may be as much as 800, or even 1,000, years old. Though magnificent, these are by no means the largest of their kind. Some of the

cedars of Amanus are quite 100 ft. high and the Himalayan cedar, *Cedrus deodara*, a variety of *Cedrus libani*, reaches a height of 150 ft. The impressiveness of the cedar lies, however, not so much in its height and massive trunk, as in the wonderful lateral spread of its branches, which often exceeds its height. The branches grow out horizontally in successive tiers, each horizontal plane presenting, when looked at from above, the appearance of a green sward. The leaves are about an inch long, arranged in clusters; at first they are bright green, but they change with age to a deeper tint with a glaucous hue; the foliage is evergreen, the successive annual growths of leaves each lasting two years. The cones, 4 to 6 inches long, are oval or oblong-ovate, with a depression at times at the apex; they require two years to reach maturity and then, unlike other conifers, they remain attached to the tree, dropping out their scales bearing the seeds.

The wood of the cedar, specially grown under the conditions of its natural habitat, is hard, close grained, and takes a high polish. It is full of resin (^{<1924>}Psalm 92:14) which preserves it from rot and from worms. Cedar oil, a kind of turpentine extracted from the wood, was used in ancient times as a preservative for parchments and garments.

E. W. G. Masterman

CEDRON

<se'-dron>.

See *KIDRON*.

CEILAN

<se'-lan>.

See *KILAN*.

CEILED; CEILING

<seld>, <sel'-ing> (the King James Version and the English Revised Version Cielel, Cieling; the Hebrew words for "ceiled" are **hPj i** [chippah], **ˆp" s;**[caphan], **ˆ1yj ċ;**[sachiph]; for "ceiling," **ˆPš i** [cippun]): Ceiling occurs only in ^{<1095>}1 Kings 6:15. It comes from the root [caphan], meaning "to cover." It has its common meaning of the upper

surface of a room; there is, however, some doubt of the textual Ceiled is found in ^{<485>}2 Chronicles 3:5 ([chippah]); ^{<424>}Jeremiah 22:14; ^{<3004>}Haggai 1:4 ([caphan] in both); ^{<3416>}Ezekiel 41:16 ([sachiph]), the text of the last passage being doubtful. In none of these cases does “ceiled” refer to the upper surface of a room, but to the covering or paneling of the inner walls of a house with cedar or other costly wood. This is in accordance with a common early use of the English word, no longer frequent.

George Ricker Berry

CELEBRATE

^{<sel'-e-brat>}: Of the three Hebrew words so rendered **לל"ה** [halal], “to praise” is preeminently significant. It is an onomatopoeic word meaning “to give a clear sharp sound,” as word in vocal rejoicing, celebration. Its equivalent in Ethiopic is ellell, German hallen, English halloo, and appears in the great choral word Hallelujah of the Hebrew religion. Passing into Christian use it has become the term most expressive of majestic praise. Psalms 113 through 118 and 136 are called Hallel psalms. Found in Hezekiah’s psalm of praise for his miraculous recovery: “Death cannot celebrate thee” (^{<2888>}Isaiah 38:18). [chaghagh], root meaning “to move in a circle” hence, “to keep a festival” by sacred leaping and dancing; “celebrate (the Revised Version (British and American) “keep”) a feast” (^{<434>}Leviticus 23:41); [shabhath], “to rest,” i.e. keep or observe a holy day; “celebrate (the Revised Version (British and American) “keep”) your sabbath” (^{<432>}Leviticus 23:32).

Dwight M. Pratt

CELESTIAL

^{<se-les'-chal>} ([ἐπουράνιος, epouranios], “above the sky,” “heavenly”): Peculiar to Paul’s majestic argument on the resurrection: celestial verses terrestrial bodies (1 Cor 15:40) with reference possibly to sun and moon, etc., but more probably to the bodies of angels in distinction from those of beasts and mortal men (compare Christ’s words, ^{<4230>}Matthew 22:30; ^{<4216>}Luke 20:36); including also doubtless in the apostle’s thought the resurrection-body of Jesus and of the saints already taken-into glory. Light is thrown on its meaning by the rendering of the same Greek original as “heavenly places” (^{<4008>}Ephesians 1:3,20; 2:6; 3:10); “heavenly” (1 Cor

15:48). Hence, “celestial” as used by Paul indicates the soul’s continued life beyond the grave, the spiritual body of the redeemed in heaven, who, in Christ, have put on immortality.

Dwight M. Pratt

CELLAR

<sel’-er>, <sel’-ar> ([κρύπτη, krup̄te]; ρῥῶσαρ [otsar]): [Krup̄te] is found only in ^{<2113>}Luke 11:33, and is rendered “cellar” in the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version has “secret place.” In this passage it doubtless means a cellar beneath a house. Etymologically the Greek word means “a covered place,” and in classical Greek its usage includes vaults and crypts as well as cellars. It seems evident that it was only the larger houses in Palestine in which cellars were used with any frequency. It is shown by the excavations that in rebuilding a town which was in ruins the old houses were sometimes utilized as cellars for the new. [’otsar], is rendered cellar only in ^{<1377>}1 Chronicles 27:27 f. It is an erroneous rendering, the correct meaning being stores, or supplies, of wine and oil.

George Ricker Berry

CELOSYRIA

<se-lo-sir’-i-a>.

See COELE-SYRIA.

CENCHREAE

<sen’-kre-e> ([εγχρεαί, Kegchreai], Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek [Kenchreai]; the King James Version incorrectly Cenchrea): A seaport of Corinth on the eastern side of the isthmus (see *CORINTH*). Here according to ^{<41818>}Acts 18:18, Paul had his hair shorn before sailing for Syria, since he had a vow. A local church must have been established there by Paul, since Phoebe, the deaconess of Cenchrea, was entrusted with the Epistle to the Romans, and was commended to them in the highest terms by the apostle, who charged them to “assist her in whatsoever matter she may have need” (^{<5141>}Romans 16:1,2).

CENDEBAEUS

<sen-de-be'-us> ([ενδεβαῖος, Kendebaios]; the King James Version Cendebeus): A general of Antiochus VII who was appointed “captain of the seacoast” of Palestine (1 Macc 15:38 ff) after the defeat of Tryphon by Antiochus 138 BC. He fortified Kedron and harassed the Jews in various ways. As Simon Maccabeus was too old to attack Cendebaeus in person he sent his two eldest sons, Judas and John, who defeated him with great loss at Modin (1 Macc 16:1-10).

CENSER

<sen'-ser>: In the King James Version censer is used as a translation of two Hebrew words, namely, **חַתָּה** [machtah], and **מִיָּקְתֶּרֶת**. The former word is generally rendered “censer,” sometimes “firepan,” and in three cases (¹²⁵⁸Exodus 25:38; 37:23; ¹⁰⁰⁹Numbers 4:9) “snuffdish” It denoted a bowl-shaped vessel used for different purposes, namely,

- (1) a censer, in which incense was burnt (⁸⁰⁰Leviticus 10:1);
- (2) a firepan, made of bronze, used in connection with the altar of burnt offering (¹²⁷⁸Exodus 27:3);
- (3) a snuffdish, i.e. a receptacle to hold pieces of burnt lamp-wick removed by the tongs or snuffers (¹²⁵⁸Exodus 25:38). Probably in all these cases the same kind of vessel was meant, namely, a bowl-shaped utensil with a handle, not unlike a saucepan. The other Hebrew word (derived from the same root as the word for “incense”) denoted a vessel for conveying incense (²⁰⁸¹Ezekiel 8:11; ¹⁴⁹⁹2 Chronicles 26:19). The Greek word **θυμιατήριον**, thumiaterion], by which the Septuagint rendered [miqTereth], is used also in Hebrew 9:4, where the King James Version gives “censer,” but the American Standard Revised Version is probably more correct, namely, “altar of incense” (see Commentaries under the word). Compare also ⁶⁸⁸Revelation 8:3,1, where **λιβανωτός**, libanotos], properly the adjective of “frankincense,” is translated “censer.”

T. Lewis

CENSUS

<sen'-sus>.

See DAVID; QUIRINIUS.

CENTURION

<sen-tu'-ri-un>: As the name implies, [ἑκατοντάρχης, hekatontarches] or [ἑκατοντάρχος, hekatontarchos], [κεντυρίων, kenturion], Latin centurio, was the commander of a hundred men, more or less, in a Roman legion. Matthew and Luke use the Greek word while Mark prefers the Latin form, as he does in the case of other words, seeing that he wrote primarily for Roman readers. The number of centurions in a legion was 60, that being at all epochs the number of centuries, although the number varied in the cohort or [speira]. The ordinary duties of the centurion were to drill his men, inspect their arms, food and clothing, and to command them in the camp and in the field. Centurions were sometimes employed on detached service the conditions of which in the provinces are somewhat obscure. Men like Cornelius and Julius (<400>Acts 10:1; 27:1) may have been separated from the legion to which they properly belonged for the discharge of special duties. They and other centurions mentioned in the Gospels and the Acts (<1085>Matthew 8:5; <4159>Mark 15:39,44,45; <2237>Luke 23:47) are represented by the sacred writers in a favorable light.

See AUGUSTAN BAND.

T. Nicol.

CEPHAS

<se'-fas>.

See PETER (SIMON).

CERAS

<se'-ras> ([ηράς, Keras]; the Revised Version (British and American) KERAS (which see)).

CERTAIN; CERTAINLY; CERTAINTY

<ser'-tin>, <ser'-tin-li>, <ser'tin-ti>: The rendering of some Hebrew words and forms expressive of what is definitely settled or determined.

- (1) Translation of the Hebrew נָחֻן:[nakhon], “to be established” or “fixed,” as in ^{<B34>}Deuteronomy 13:14 (Hebrew 15); 17:4; ^{<B23>}1 Samuel 23:23 (of ^{<B4>}Exodus 16:4, “a certain rate every day” the King James Version). In the New Testament it is the rendering of [ἀσφαλής, asphales], [ἀσφάλεια, asphaleia], from “a” privative and [sphallein], “to shake” or “move”; as in ^{<B4>}Luke 1:4, “the certainty of those things” = actual circumstances; ^{<B34>}Acts 21:34; 22:30; 25:26.
- (2) The word “certain” is also employed in the Old Testament to bring out the force of the absolute infinitive form used with the finite verb to express emphasis or to strengthen the idea of the main verb (Kautzsch-Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, translation Collins-Cowley, 357, 3). Such usage occurs in ^{<B30>}Genesis 18:10; ^{<B24>}Joshua 9:24; ^{<B59>}Leviticus 5:19; 24:16; ^{<B18>}1 Samuel 20:3 the King James Version; ^{<B37>}1 Kings 2:37; ^{<B5>}Jeremiah 26:15; 36:29; 42:19,22; 44:17.
- (3) The word “certain” is also made auxiliary to bring out the force of such expressions as the Hebrew בָּרַח:[yatsabh], “to be firm,” as in ^{<B18>}Daniel 2:8; also in the New Testament, of the verb [ἀστατεῖν, astatein] as in ^{<B11>}1 Corinthians 4:11, “have no certain dwelling-place.”
- (4) Mention might be made also of “certain” as the rendering of sundry words, as בָּרַח [’akh], in ^{<B16>}Lamentations 2:16; רָכִי[ki], in ^{<B12>}Exodus 3:12; and [ὄντως, ontos], in ^{<B37>}Luke 23:47, all being expressions for what is sure, beyond doubt.

W. N. Stearns

CERTIFY

<ser'-ti-fi>: Occurs in

- (1) ^{<B58>}2 Samuel 15:28 (dygh" [haggidh], “to show,” “announce,” from dgh:[naghadh]);

(2) ^{<1044>}Ezra 4:14,16; 5:10; 7:24 ([**דחב** [hodha`], “to make known,” from [**דח**” [yedha’]; Aramaic for [**דח**: [yadha`]);

(3) Est 2:22 the King James Version (**רמ”א** [’amar], “to say,” “tell,” so the Revised Version (British and American)); and

(4) ^{<1011>}Galatians 1:11 the King James Version [**γνωρίζω**, gnorizo], “to make to know,” so the Revised Version (British and American)). In the English Versions of the Bible, accordingly, the word has not the strong, specific sense of “to make certain,” but only the broader sense of “to make to know.” Compare ^{<1016>}Psalms 39:5 (Prayer Book version), “that I may be certified how long I have to live.”

CETAB

^{<se’-tab>}.

See *KETAB*.

CHABRIS

^{<ka’-bris>} ([**בְּרִיס**, Abris], [**אַבְרֵיס**, Chabreis]): Son of Gothoniël, one of the three rulers of Bethulia in the time of Judith (Judith 6:15; 8:10; 10:6).

CHADIAS, THEY OF; CHADIASAI

^{<ka’-di-as>}, ^{<ka’-di-a-si>}; (the Revised Version (British and American) Codex Alexandrinus, [**αδάσαι**, Chadasai]; Codex Vaticanus, [οἱ **αδιάσαι**, hoi Chadasai]): The inhabitants of the city here referred to returned with Zerubbabel, along with the Ammidioi (1 Est 5:20). The name is not found in Ezra and Nehemiah. The Chadasai have been taken for the people of Kadesh and the Ammidioi for the people of Humtah (^{<1654>}Joshua 15:54). Possibly the place is identical with Kedesh of ^{<1653>}Joshua 15:23.

CHAEREAS

^{<ke’-re-as>} ([**αιρέας**, Chaireas]; the King James Version Chereas): Brother of Timotheus, the Ammonite leader against Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:6). He held the fortress of Gazara (the “Jazer” of 1 Macc 5:8) to which Timotheus fled from Judas. The latter pursued him and captured the

fortress after a vigorous siege. In the slaughter which followed the two brothers, Chaereas and Timotheus, were killed (2 Macc 10:32,37).

CHAFE

<chaf> (רמ" [mar], "bitter"; hence, bitter of soul, deadly, destructive, ferocious, "as a bear robbed of her whelps"): Occurs only in <1078> 2 Samuel 17:8; used by Hushai to characterize David's supposedly fierce mood at the time of Absalom's armed rebellion.

CHAFF

<chaf>: Four different words have been translated "chaff" in the Old Testament:

(1) אַמֹּץ [mots], is found in <8218> Job 21:18; <1904> Psalm 1:4; 35:5; <2173> Isaiah 17:13; 29:5; 41:15; <2838> Hosea 13:3; Zeph 2:2.

(2) כַּשִּׁשׁ [chashash], occurs in two verses (<2154> Isaiah 5:24 and 33:11). Compare "[chashish]," an Arabic word which, as commonly used, denotes grass either standing or cut, green or dry, although, strictly speaking, dry or cut grass alone. In the Revised Version (British and American) <2154> Isaiah 5:24 the translation is "dry grass."

(3) תִּבְנִי [tebhen], is translated "chaff" in the King James Version (<2238> Jeremiah 23:28). The same word is rendered "straw" in the Revised Version (British and American) (compare Arabic tibn).

(4) אֲחֻרוֹן [’ur], a Chaldaic word, occurs in <2125> Daniel 2:35.

In the New Testament [ἄχυρον, achuron], is found in <4182> Matthew 3:12 and <4187> Luke 3:17.

In the process of winnowing, as it has been carried on in the East for thousands of years, the grain is tossed into the air so that the wind may cause a separation of chaff and straw. The light husks from the wheat and fine particles of straw are dispersed by the wind in the form of a fine dust; the heavier straw which has been broken into short pieces by the threshing process falls near at hand on the edge of the threshing-floor, while the grain falls back upon the pile. In Syria and Palestine, that which falls near at hand as cut straw is called tibn. This word occurs in the Arabic

translation of ^{<0812>}Matthew 3:12 and ^{<0817>}Luke 3:17. This straw is ordinarily saved and fed as “roughage” to the animals. It could easily be gathered and burned, as indicated in the above-mentioned verses, while the chaff is blown away beyond recovery, a strong figure to depict complete annihilation (^{<0218>}Job 21:18; ^{<2915>}Isaiah 29:5; 41:16; ^{<2813>}Hosea 13:3, ^{<2125>}Daniel 2:35).

See AGRICULTURE; STRAW; WINNOWING.

JAMES A. Patch

CHAIN; CHAINS

^{<chan>}, ^{<chanz>}: Chains were used by the Hebrews:

(1) As ornaments: ^{hd[xā,} [’ets`adhah], ^{hpyfi} [neTiphah], ^{qn[;} [’anaq], ^{dybr:} [rabhidh], ^{hrvṭ” v”} [sharsherah], ^{qwṾr’} [rattoq]. As ornaments for the person they were worn about the ankles (^{<0615>}Numbers 31:50; ^{<2120>}Isaiah 3:20) and about the neck (^{<0409>}Song 4:9; ^{<2611>}Ezekiel 16:11). They were used as ornaments for the ephod and breastplate of the high priest (^{<0214>}Exodus 28:14; 39:15). These chains were of pure gold. Solomon placed chains before the oracle in the temple (^{<1021>}1 Kings 6:21), and these were also of pure gold. They were used as ornaments for graven images (^{<2409>}Isaiah 40:19) and around the necks of prized animals. This was true of the camels taken from the Midianites by Gideon (^{<0721>}Judges 8:21,26).

(2) As marks of distinction: ^{dybr:} [rabhidh], ^{ḥmḥ} [hamunekh] (^{ḥnmḥ} [hamnikh]): That seems to be true of the chain which Pharaoh placed about the neck of Joseph (^{<0442>}Genesis 41:42), and of the one which the king of Babylon promised to the wise men (^{<2125>}Daniel 5:7).

(3) As means of confining prisoners: ^{tvj Ṿ’} [nechosheth]; [^{αλυσις}, halusis]: A number of passages that were translated “chains” in the King James Version are translated “fetters” in the Revised Version (British and American) (see ^{<0721>}Judges 16:21; ^{<1034>}2 Samuel 3:34). Among the Romans the prisoner was chained to one or two guards (^{<4126>}Acts 12:6,7; 21:33; ^{<0121>}Ephesians 6:20; ^{<5016>}2 Timothy 1:16). These chains were perhaps made of copper or an alloy of copper and tin.

(4) As a figurative expression: **qnl** [ʾanaq]. The Psalmist likens pride to a chain about the neck (^{<19716>}Psalm 73:6), and in Proverbs it is stated that the young man who hears the instruction of his father and forsakes not the law of his mother shall find that they are chains about his neck (1:9). In ^{<6116>}Revelation 20:1 the angel is described as descending with a great chain in his hand. According to the King James Version Peter speaks of the fallen angels as having been delivered into “chains of darkness” (2 Pet 2:4), [**σειρά**, seira], and Jude speaks of them as being reserved in “everlasting chains” (^{<6106>}Jude 1:6, the Revised Version (British and American) “bonds”), [**δεσμός**, desmos].

See also PUNISHMENTS.

A. W. Fortune

CHAIR

<char>.

See SEAT; SEATS, CHIEF.

CHALCEDONY

<kal-sed'-o-ni>, <kal'-se-do-ni>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CHALCOL.

<kal'-kol>.

See CALCOL.

CHALDEA; CHALDEANS

<kal-de'-a>, <kal-de'-anz> (**קַשְׁדִּים** [kasdim], **קַשְׁדִּי** [ʾerets kasdim]; [**αλδαία**, Chaldaia], [**αλδαίοι**, Chaldaioi]):

“[Kasdim],” “land of [Kasdim]” or “the Chaldeans,” is the usual designation, in the Old Testament, for the land and the people (^{<2810>}Jeremiah 50:10; 51:24; 24:5; 25:12). The corresponding Greek form with l for s follows the Assy-Bab Kaldu, mat Kaldi, “Chaldean, land of the

Chaldeans.” [Kasdim] is possibly connected with the name of Kesed ([Kesedh]), nephew of Abraham (^{<1222>}Genesis 22:22), and may be derived from the Assy-Bab root [kasadu], “to capture,” suggesting that the Chaldeans were originally tribes of nomadic plunderers (compare ^{<1017>}Job 1:17).

1. GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION:

Seats of the Chaldeans:

In its widest acceptance, Chaldea is the name of the whole of Babylonia, owing to the fact that the Chaldeans had given more than one king to the country. In the strict sense, however, their domain was the tract at the Northwest end of the Persian Gulf, which was often called by the Assyro-Babylonians mat Tamtim, “the Land of the Sea,” a province of unknown extent. When these tribes migrated into Babylonia is uncertain, as is also their original home; but as they are closely related to the Arameans, it is possible that their first settlements lay in the neighborhood of the Aramean states bordering on the Holy Land. Tiglath-pileser IV (742 BC) speaks of the ra’asani or chiefs of the Kaldu, and the mention of numerous Aramean tribes in Babylonia itself shows that their example of settling there soon found imitators, as did the Anglo-Saxons when they invaded Britain. Among the Chaldean tribes in Babylonia may be mentioned Bit Amukkani, whose capital was Sapia; Bit Yakin which furnished the dynasty to which Merodach-baladan II belonged; and probably also Bit Dakkuri, as all three lay near the Persian Gulf. Sargon of Assyria excludes Bit-Amukkani and Bit-Dakkuri, and speaks of “the whole of the land of Chaldea, as much as there is; the land of Bit-Yakini, on the shore of the Salt River (the Persian Gulf), to the border of Tilmun” (the island of Bahrein and the adjacent mainland) (Pavement Inscr., IV, ll. 82, 83, 85, 86). It was probably the influence of the Babylonians among whom they settled which changed these nomads into city-dwellers. Sennacherib refers to 75 (var. 89) strong cities and fortresses of Chaldea, and 420 (var. 800) smaller towns which were around them; and there were also Chaldeans (and Arameans) in Erech, Nippur (Calneh), Kis, Hursag-kalama, Cuthah, and probably Babylon.

2. ORIGINALLY SUMERO-AKKADIAN:

The “land of the sea” (mat Tamtim) is mentioned in the chronicle of the early Babylonian kings (rev. 14) as being governed by Ea-gamil, contemporary of Samsu-Titana (circa 1900 BC), but at that period it was

apparently one of the original Sumero-Akkadian states of Babylonia. It is doubtful whether, at that early date, the Chaldeans had entered Babylonia and founded settlements there, though the record mentions Arameans somewhat later on.

3. HISTORY OF THE CHALDEAN TRIBES:

One of the earliest references to the Chaldeans is that of Shalmaneser II of Assyria, who, on invading Babylonia in the eponymy of Belbunaya (851 BC), captured the city Baqani, which belonged to Adini of the Chaldean tribe of Dakuri. After plundering and destroying the place, Shalmaneser attacked Enzudi, the capital, whereupon Adini submitted and paid tribute. On this occasion Yakini of “the Land of the Sea,” also paid tribute, as did Musallim-Marduk, son of Amukkani (the Bit-Amukkani mentioned above). The next Assyrian ruler to mention the country is Adadnirari III (810 BC), who speaks of all the kings of the Chaldeans, which evidently refers to the various states into which the Chaldean tribes were divided. Later on, Sargon of Assyria, in his 12th year, decided to break the power of Merodach-baladan, who had made himself master of Babylon. To effect this, he first defeated the Gambulians, who were the Chaldean king’s supporters, and the Elamites, his allies over the border. The Chaldean, however, did not await the Assyrian king’s attack, but escaped to Yatburu in Elam, leaving considerable spoil behind him.

4. MERODACH-BALADAN AND SARGON OF ASSYRIA:

Though extensive operations were carried out, and much booty taken, the end of the campaign seems only to have come two years later, when Dur-Yakin was destroyed by fire and reduced to ruins. In the “Annals of Hall XIV” Sargon claims to have taken Merodach-baladan prisoner, but this seems doubtful. Merodach-baladan fled, but returned and mounted the throne again on Sargon’s death in 705 BC. Six months later Sennacherib, in his turn, attacked him, and he again sought safety in flight.

5. SUZUBU:

A Chaldean chief named Suzubu, however, now came forward, and proclaimed himself king of Babylon, but being defeated, he likewise fled. Later on, Sennacherib attacked the Chaldeans at Nagitu and other settlements in Elamite-territory which Merodach-baladan and his followers had founded.

6. MUSEZIB-MARDUK:

After the death of Merodach-baladan, yet another Chaldean, whom Sennacherib calls likewise Suzubu, but whose full name was Musezib-Marduk, mounted the Babylonian throne. This ruler applied for help against Sennacherib of Assyria to Umman-menanu, the king of Elam, who, taking the bribe which was offered, supported him with an armed force, and a battle was fought at Chalule on the Tigris, in which Sennacherib claims the victory — probably rightly. Musezib-Marduk reigned 4 years, and was taken prisoner by his whilom ally, Umman-menanu, who sent him to Assyria.

7. MERODACH-BALADAN'S SON:

In the reign of Esarhaddon, Nabu-zer-napistilisir, one of the sons of Merodach-baladan, gathered an army at Larsa, but was defeated by the Assyrians, and fled to Elam. The king of that country, however, wishing to be on friendly terms with Esarhaddon, captured him and put him to death.

8. NA'ID-MARDUK:

This prince had a brother named Na'id-Marduk, who, not feeling himself safe in the country which had acted treacherously toward his house, fled, and made submission to Esarhaddon, who received him favorably, and restored to him the dominion of the "Land of the Sea." This moderation secured the fidelity of the Chaldeans, and when the Elamite Urtaku sent inviting them to revolt against their suzerain, they answered to the effect that Na'id-Marduk was their lord, and they were the servants of the king of Assyria. This took place probably about 650 BC, in the reign of Esarhaddon's son Assur-bani-apli (see OSNAPPAR).

9. PALIA:

Hostility to Assyria, however, continued to exist in the tribe, Palia, grandson of Merodach-baladan, being one of the prisoners taken by Assur-bani-apli's troops in their operations against the Gambulians (a Babylonian, and perhaps a Chaldean tribe) later on. It was only during the struggle of Samas-sumukin (Saosduchimos), king of Babylon, Assur-bani-apli's brother, however, that they took sides against Assyria as a nationality. This change was due to the invitation of the Babylonian king — who may have been regarded, rather than Assur-bani-apli, as their overlord.

10. NABU-BEL-SUMATI:

The chief of the Chaldeans was at that time another grandson of Merodach-baladan, Nabu-bel-sumati, who seized the Assyrians in his domain, and placed them in bonds. The Chaldeans suffered, with the rest, in the great defeat of the Babylonian and allied forces, when Babylon and the chief cities of the land fell. Mannu-ki-Babili of the Dakkurians, Ea-sum-ikisa of Bit-Amukkani, with other Chaldean states, were punished for their complicity in Samas-sum-ukin's revolt, while Nabu-bel-sumati fled and found refuge at the court of Indabigas, king of Elam. Assur-bani-apli at once demanded his surrender, but civil war in Elam broke out, in which Indabigas was slain, and Ummanaldas mounted the throne.

His Tragic End:

This demand was now renewed, and Nabu-bel-sumati, fearing that he would be surrendered, decided to end his life. He therefore directed his armor-bearer to dispatch him, and each ran the other through with his sword. The prince's corpse, with the head of his armor-bearer, were then sent, with some of the Chaldean fugitives, to Assyria, and presented to the king. Thus ended, for a time, Chaldean ambition in Babylonia and in the domain of eastern politics.

11. THE CHALDEANS FORGE AHEAD:

With the death of Assur-bani-apli, which took place about 626 BC, the power of Assyria fell, his successors being probably far less capable men than he. This gave occasion for many plots against the Assyrian empire, and the Chaldeans probably took part in the general movement. In the time of Saracus (Sin-sarra-iskun of Assyria, circa 620 BC) Busalossor would seem to have been appointed general of the forces in Babylonia in consequence of an apprehended invasion of barbarians from the sea (the Persian Gulf) (Eusebius, Chronicon, book i).

12. NABOPOLASSAR'S REVOLT AGAINST ASSYRIA:

The new general, however, revolted against the Assyrians, and made himself master of Babylonia. As, in other cases, the Assyrians seem to have been exceedingly faithful to their king, it has been thought possible that this general, who was none other than Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadpolassar's rezzar, was not really an Assyrian, but a Babylonian,

and probably a Chaldean. This theory; if correct, would explain how Babylonia, in its fullest sense, obtained the name of Chaldea, and was no longer known as the land of Shinar (~~Q1100~~Genesis 10:10). The reputation of Merodach-baladan, the contemporary of Hezekiah, may have been partly responsible for the change of name.

13. THE CHALDEANS AS LEARNED MEN:

It was not in the restricted sense, but as a synonym of Babylonian, that the name Chaldean obtained the signification of “wise man.” That the Chaldeans in the restricted and correct sense were more learned than, or even as learned as, the Babylonians in general, is unlikely. Moreover, the native inscriptions give no indication that this was the case. The Babylonians in general, on the other hand, were enthusiastic students from very early times. From their inscriptions, it is certain that among their centers of learning may be classed Sippar and Larsa, the chief seats of sun-worship; Nippur, identified with the Calneh of ~~Q1100~~Genesis 10:10; Babylon, the capital; Borsippa in the neighborhood of Babylon; Ur of the Chaldees; and Erech. There is, also, every probability that this list could be extended, and will be extended, when we know more; for wherever an important temple existed, there was to be found also a priestly school. “The learning of the Chaldeans” (~~Q1004~~Daniel 1:4; 2:2; 4:7; 5:7,11) comprised the old languages of Babylonia (the two dialects of Sumerian, with a certain knowledge of Kassite, which seems to have been allied to the Hittite; and other languages of the immediate neighborhood); some knowledge of astronomy and astrology; mathematics, which their sexagesimal system of numeration seems to have facilitated; and a certain amount of natural history. To this must be added a store of mythological learning, including legends of the Creation, the Flood (closely resembling in all its main points the account in the Bible), and apparently also the Temptation and the Fall. They had likewise a good knowledge of agriculture, and were no mean architects, as the many celebrated buildings of Babylonia show — compare not only the descriptions of the Temple of Belus (*see BABEL, TOWER OF*) and the Hanging Gardens, but also the remains of Gudea’s great palace at Lagas (Tel-loh), where that ruler, who lived about 2500 BC, is twice represented as an architect, with plan and with rule and measure. (These statues are now in the Louvre.) That their architecture never attained the elegance which characterized that of the West, is probably due to the absence of stone, necessitating the employment of brick as a substitute (~~Q1103~~Genesis 11:3).

See *BABYLONIA; SHINAR*.

T. G. Pinches

CHALKSTONE

<*chok'-ston*> (*rgAynbḥ*) [ʾabhneghir] (compare Eben-ezer, *rzḥh*; [ʾebhen ha-`ezer], “stone of the help,” ^{<00712>}1 Samuel 7:12)): In ^{<00719>}Isaiah 27:9 we have: “Therefore by this shall the iniquity of Jacob be forgiven, and this is all the fruit of taking away his sin: that he maketh all the stones of the altar as chalkstones that are beaten in sunder, so that the Asherim and the sun-images shall rise no more.” [ʾAbhne-ghir] is compounded of [ʾebhen], “stone,” which occurs in many passages, and [gir] or [gir], “lime” (compare Arabic jir, “gypsum” or “quicklime”), which occurs only here and in ^{<00715>}Daniel 5:5: “wrote upon the plaster (gir) of the wall of the king’s palace.” Nearly all the rock of Palestine is limestone. When limestone is burned, it is converted into lime, which is easily broken into pieces, and, if allowed to remain open to the air, becomes slaked by the moisture of the atmosphere and crumbles into dust. The reference is to the destruction of the altar. It may mean that the altar will be burned so that the stones will become lime, or, more probably, that the stones of the altar will be broken as chalkstones (i.e. lumps of quicklime) are broken. There is no doubt that lime was known to the Egyptians, Assyrians and Hebrews, though clay, with or without straw, was more commonly used in building. Even bitumen (“slime”) appears to have been used for mortar.

See *CLAY; LIME; SLIME*.

Alfred Ely Day

CHALLENGE

<*chal'-enj*>: Only in ^{<00720>}Exodus 22:9, where the King James Version has taken Hebrew [ʾamar], “say,” in the sense of “claim.” the Revised Version (British and American) “whereof one saith, This is it,” points more definitely to the idea of identification of the stolen personal property.

CHALPHI

<*kal'-fi*> ([*αλφί*, Chalphi]; the King James Version Calphi): Father of Judas, who, along with Mattathias, steadily supported Jonathan at the

battle of Gennesar when the hosts of Demetrius' princes were routed (1 Macc 11:70).

CHAMBER

<cham'-ber> (the translation of the following Hebrew words: **rdk**, [chedher], **hPj** [chuppah], **[yxy]** [yatsia`], **[Wxy]** [yatsua`], **hKv** [lishkah], **hKv** [nishkah], **hYl** [aliyah], **[l x]** [tsela`], and the Aramaic word **tyL** [illith]): For the most part the word chamber is the expression of an idea which would be adequately expressed by the English word "room," in accordance with an earlier use of the word, now little employed. For the arrangement of rooms in a Hebrew house, *see* HOUSE. [Chedher] is a word of frequent occurrence, and designates a private room. [Chuppah] is translated "chamber" only in ^{<1915>}Psalm 19:5, where it is used in connection with "bridegroom," and means a bridal chamber. The same Hebrew word used of the bride in ^{<2026>}Joel 2:16 is rendered "closet." [Yatsia`] and [yatsua`] are found only in ^{<1005>}1 Kings 6:5,6,10 (the King James Version only in all the passages), [yatsua`] being the reading of Kethibh and [yatsia`] of Kere in each case. Here the meaning is really "story," as given in the Revised Version (British and American), except in ^{<1005>}1 Kings 6:6, where doubtless the text should be changed to read [hatsela`], "the side-chamber." [Lishkah], a frequent word, and the equivalent [nishkah], infrequent, are used ordinarily of a room in the temple utilized for sacred purposes, occasionally of a room in the palace. [Aliyah] and the equivalent Aramaic [illith] signify "a roof chamber," i.e. a chamber built on the flat roof of a house. [Tsela`], when used of a chamber, designates a side-chamber of the temple. It is usually rendered "side-chamber," but "chamber" in ^{<1005>}1 Kings 6:5,8 (the King James Version), where the Revised Version (British and American) has "side-chamber."

George Ricker Berry

CHAMBER, ROOF

See CHAMBER.

CHAMBERING

<cham'-ber-ing>: Illicit intercourse; the rendering in English Versions of

the Bible since Tyndale of [κοίταις, koitias] (literally “beds,” ~~<613>~~ Romans 13:13). The Greek usage is paralleled in classic authors and the Septuagint; like the English participle, it denotes repeated or habitual acts. The word is not recorded elsewhere in English literature as verb or participle in this sense; in Othello, iii, 3, a chamberer is an intriguer, male wanton, in Byron, Werner, IV, 1, 404, a gallant or carpet knight, and in Chaucer, Clerk’s Tale, 766, a concubine.

CHAMBERLAIN

~~<cham’-ber-lin>~~: In the Old Testament the word rendered chamberlain, ~~syrb~~[caric], is more properly “eunuch,” an officer which oriental monarchs placed over their harems (Est 1:10,12,15; 2:3,14,21; 4:4 f; 6:2,14; 7:9; ~~<1231>~~ 2 Kings 23:11). This officer seems also to have had other duties. See under *EUNUCH*. In the New Testament

- (1) [οἰκονόμος, oikonomos], literally manager of the household, apparently the “treasurer” as in the Revised Version (British and American) “Erastus the treasurer of the city saluteth you” (~~<613>~~ Romans 16:23). Compare adapted use as applied to Christian apostles and teachers, bishops, and even to individual members; in which cases, rendered “stewards” (1 Cor 4:1; ~~<500>~~ Titus 1:7; ~~<1010>~~ 1 Peter 4:10).
- (2) In ~~<4121>~~ Acts 12:20, “Blastus the king’s chamberlain” ([ho epi toa koitonos tou basileos], “he who is over the king’s bed-chamber”), not treasure-chamber, as above; here praefectus cubiculo, or chief valet de chambre to the royal person, a position involving much honor and intimacy.

Edward Bagby Pollard

CHAMBERS IN THE HEAVENS

See ASTRONOMY; DIAL OF AHAZ.

CHAMBERS IN THE SOUTH

See ASTRONOMY; SOUTH, CHAMBERS OF.

CHAMBERS OF IMAGERY

~~<im’-aj-ri>~~, ~~<im’-a-je-i>~~ (~~tyKic̣ḥn~~ [maskith]): The reference (~~<3812>~~ Ezekiel 8:12) is to chambers in the temple where the elders of Israel

were wont to assemble and practice rites of an idolatrous character. What the imagery consisted of, we may gather from 8:10: symbolic representations of beasts and reptiles and “detestable things.” It is thought that these symbols were of a zodiacal character. The worship of the planets was in vogue at the time of the prophet among the degenerate Israelites.

CHAMELEON

<ka-me'-le-un> (j " Kō [koach], the Revised Version (British and American) *LAND CROCODILE* (^{<B113>}Leviticus 11:30); tmyh" Ti [tinshemeth], the King James Version mole, the Revised Version (British and American) *CHAMELEON* (^{<B113>}Leviticus 11:30)):

[Koach], which in the King James Version is rendered “chameleon” and in the Revised Version (British and American) “land crocodile,” means also “strength” or “power,” as in ^{<B0412>}Genesis 4:12; ^{<B0119>}1 Samuel 2:9; ^{<B215>}Psalm 22:15; ^{<B419>}Isaiah 40:29, and many other passages. The Septuagint has [χαμαιλέων, chamaileon], but on account of the ordinary meaning of the word, [koach], it has been thought that some large lizard should be understood here. The desert monitor, *Varanus griseus*, one of the largest of lizards, sometime attaining the length of 4 ft., is common in Palestine and may be the animal here referred to. The name “monitor” is a translation of the German warnen, “to warn,” with which has been confused the Arabic name of this animal, waran or waral, a word of uncertain etymology.

The word [tinshemeth] in the same verse is rendered in the King James Version “mole” and in the Revised Version (British and American) “chameleon.” The Septuagint has [ἀσπάλαξ, aspalax] (= [spalax], “mole”). Tinshemeth also occurs in the lists of unclean birds in ^{<B118>}Leviticus 11:18 and ^{<B416>}Deuteronomy 14:16, where it is rendered: the King James Version “swan”; the Revised Version (British and American) “horned owl”; Septuagint [πορφυρίων, porphurion] (i.e. “coot” or, according to some, “heron”); Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) cygnus, “swan.” It appears to come from the root nasham, “to breathe”; compare [neshamah], “breath” (^{<B007>}Genesis 2:7; ^{<B278>}Job 27:3 the King James Version, etc.). It has therefore in ^{<B113>}Leviticus 11:30 been referred to the chameleon on account of the chameleon’s habit of puffing up its body with air and hissing, and in the other passages to the pelican, on account of the pelican’s great pouched bill.

The common chameleon is abundant in Palestine, being found also in North Africa and in Spain. The other species of chameleons are found principally in Africa and Madagascar. It is not only a harmless but a decidedly useful creature, since it feeds upon insects, especially flies. Its mode of capturing its prey is most interesting. It slowly and cautiously advances until its head is from 4 to 6 inches from the insect, which it then secures by darting out its tongue with great rapidity. The pigment cells in its skin enable it to change its color from pale yellow to bright green, dark green and almost black, so that it can harmonize very perfectly with its surroundings. Its peculiar toes and prehensile tail help to fit it for its life in the trees. Its prominent eyes with circular lids, like iris diaphragms can be moved independently of each other, and add to its striking appearance.

See LAND CROCODILE; MOLE; SWAN; HORNED OWL; PELICAN.

Alfred Ely Day

CHAMOIS

<sham'-i>, <sha-mwa'>, <sha-moi'> (רמז {zemer};

[καμηλοπάρδαλις, kamelopdrdalis]): Occurs only once in the Bible, i.e. in the list of clean animals in ^{<645>}Deuteronomy 14:5. Gesenius refers to the verb zamar, “to sing,” and suggests the association of dancing or leaping, indicating thereby an active animal. M’Lean in Encyclopedia Biblica cites the rendering of the Targums [dica’], or “wild goat.” Now there are two wild goats in Palestine. The better known is the ibex of the South, which may well be the [ya`el] (English Versions, “wild goat”; ^{<1301>}Job 39:1; ^{<1948>}Psalms 104:18; ^{<1241>}1 Samuel 24:2), as well as the [’aqqo] (English Version, “wild goat,” ^{<545>}Deuteronomy 14:5). The other is the pasang or Persian wild goat which ranges from the Northeast of Palestine and the Syrian desert to Persia, and which may be the zemer (English Versions “chamois”). The accompanying illustration, which is taken from the Royal Natural History, shows the male and female and young. The male is distinguished by its larger horns and goatee. The horns are in size and curvature very similar to those of the ibex (*see* **GOAT**, section 2), but the front edge is like a nicked blade instead of being thick and knotty as in the ibex. Like the ibex it is at home among the rocks, and climbs apparently impossible cliffs with marvelous ease.

Tristram (NHB) who is followed by Post (HDB) suggests that zemer may be the Barbary sheep (*Ovis tragelaphus*), though the latter is only known to inhabit the Atlas Mountains, from the Atlantic to Tunis. Tristram supports his view by reference to a [kebsh] (“ram”) which the Arabs say lives in the mountains of Sinai, though they have apparently neither horns nor skins to show as trophies, and it is admitted that no European has seen it. The true chamois (*Rupicapra tragus*) inhabits the high mountains from the Pyrenees to the Caucasus, and there is no reason to suppose that it was ever found in Syria or Palestine.

Alfred Ely Day

CHAMPAIGN

<*sham-pan'*>, <*sham'-pan*> (**hbr**[:]) [ʿarabḥah], **h**[**qBi**[:] [biq`ah]): A campaign is a flat open country, and the word occurs in ^{<613>}Deuteronomy 11:30 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “the Arabah”) as a translation of [ʿarabḥah], for which the King James Version has in most places “the plain,” and the Revised Version (British and American) “the Arabah,” when it is used with the article and denotes a definite region, i.e. the valley of the Jordan from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea (^{<818>}Deuteronomy 2:8; 3:17; 4:4:9; ^{<816>}Joshua 3:16; 8:14; 11:16; 12:1,3,1; ^{<129>}2 Samuel 2:29; 4:7; ^{<1245>}2 Kings 14:25; 25:4; ^{<2406>}Jeremiah 39:4; 52:7), and also the valley running southward from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah (^{<810>}Deuteronomy 1:1). ^{<3478>}Ezekiel 47:8 has for [ha-ʿarabḥah] “the desert,” the King James Version margin “plain,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the Arabah.” The plural is used in ^{<810>}Joshua 5:10; ^{<1235>}2 Kings 25:5, “the plains of Jericho,” and in ^{<921>}Numbers 22:1 and 26:3, “the plains of Moab.” Elsewhere [ʿarabḥah] is rendered in English Versions of the Bible “desert” or “wilderness” (^{<3415>}Job 24:5; 39:6; ^{<330>}Isaiah 33:9; 35:1,6; 40:3; 41:19; 51:3; ^{<2416>}Jeremiah 2:6; 17:6; 50:12). At the present day, the Jordan valley is called the Ghaur (compare Hebrew [ʿur], “to dig,” [me`arah], “cave,” and Arabic magharah, “cave”). This name is also applied to the deltas of streams flowing into the Dead Sea from the East, which are clothed with thickets of thorny trees and shrubs, i.e. Ghaur-ul-Mezra`ah, at the mouths of Wadi-Kerak and Wadi-Beni-Chammad, Ghaur-uc-Cafiyeh, at the mouth of Wadi-ul-Hisa. The name “Arabah” (Arabic al-ʿArabah) is now confined to the valley

running southward from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah, separating the mountains of Edom from Sinai and the plateau of at-Tih.

See ARABAH.

^{<6512>}Ezekiel 37:2 the King James Version margin has “champaign” for [biq`ah], which is elsewhere rendered “vale” or “valley.” [Biq`ah] seems to be applied to wide, open valleys, as: “the valley of Jericho” (^{<6543>}Deuteronomy 34:3), “the valley of Megiddo” (^{<4852>}2 Chronicles 35:22; ^{<8121>}Zechariah 12:11), “the valley of Lebanon” (^{<16117>}Joshua 11:17). If Baal-Gad be [Ba`albeq] and “the valley of Lebanon” be Coele-syria, the present name of Coele-syria, [al-Biqā`] (plural of [buq`ah], “a low, wet place or meadow”), may be regarded as a survival of the Hebrew [biq`ah].

Alfred Ely Day

CHAMPION

^{<cham'-pi-un>} (חַיִּיבַי" *Avyai*['ish habenayim]): In ^{<19704>}1 Samuel 17:4,23 this unusual expression occurs in the description of Goliath. It means literally “the man of the two spaces,” “spaces,” or “space between,” and is perhaps to be explained by the fact that there was a brook flowing through the valley separating the two armies. In ^{<19751>}1 Samuel 17:51 the word champion is the rendering of the Hebrew [gibbor], “mighty man.”

CHANAAN; CHANAANITE

^{<ka'-nan>}, ^{<ka'-na-an>}, ^{<ka'-nan-it>} ([*αναάν*, Chanaan]), the King James Version in the Apocrypha (Judith 5:3,16) and New Testament (^{<44711>}Acts 7:11; 13:19) for the Revised Version (British and American) *CANAAN*, *CANAANITE* (which see).

CHANCE

^{<chans>}: The idea of chance in the sense of something wholly fortuitous was utterly foreign to the Hebrew creed. Throughout the whole course of Israel's history, to the Hebrew mind, law, not chance, ruled the universe, and that law was not something blindly mechanical, but the expression of the personal Yahweh. Israel's belief upon this subject may be summed up in the couplet,

*“The lot is cast into the lap;
But the whole disposing thereof is of Yahweh”
(~~<163>~~ Proverbs 16:33).*

A number of Hebrew and Greek expressions have been translated “chance,” or something nearly equivalent, but it is noteworthy that of the classical words for chance, [~~<163>~~ **συντυχία**, *suntuchia*], and [~~<163>~~ **τύχη**, *tuche*], the former never occurs in the Bible and the latter only twice in the Septuagint.

The closest approach to the idea of chance is found in the statement of the Philistines that if their device for ascertaining the cause of their calamities turned out a certain way they would call them a chance, that is, bad luck (~~<163>~~ **hraqhi**[miqreh], ~~<163>~~ 1 Samuel 6:9). But note that it was a heathen people who said this. We have the same Hebrew noun and the verb, from which the noun is taken, a number of times, but variously rendered into English: Uncleaness that “chanceth him by night” (~~<163>~~ Deuteronomy 23:10). “Her hap was to light on the portion of the field” (~~<163>~~ Ruth 2:3). “Something hath befallen him” (~~<163>~~ 1 Samuel 20:26). “One event happeneth to them all” (~~<163>~~ Ecclesiastes 2:14,15); “that which befallerth the sons of men” (“sons of men are a chance,” the English Revised Version, margin) (~~<163>~~ Ecclesiastes 3:19). “There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked” (~~<163>~~ Ecclesiastes 9:2,3). Here the idea certainly is not something independent of the will of God, but something unexpected by man.

There is also ~~<163>~~ **arq**[qara’], “If a bird’s nest chance to be before thee in the way” (~~<163>~~ Deuteronomy 22:6). Both the above Hebrew words are combined in the statement “As I happened by chance upon Mount Gilboa” (~~<163>~~ 2 Samuel 1:6). “And Absalom chanced to meet the servants of David” (“met the servants,” ~~<163>~~ 2 Samuel 18:9, the King James Version). “And there happened to be there a base fellow” (~~<163>~~ 2 Samuel 20:1).

We have also ~~<163>~~ **gP**[pegha’], “Time and chance happeneth to them all,” meaning simply occurrence (~~<163>~~ Ecclesiastes 9:11). “Neither adversary, nor evil occurrence” (~~<163>~~ 1 Kings 5:4).

In the New Testament we have [~~<163>~~ **συγκυρία**, *sugkuria*], “coincidence,” a meeting apparently accidental, a coincidence. “By chance a certain priest was going down that way” (~~<163>~~ Luke 10:31). Also [~~<163>~~ **εἰ τύχοι**, *ei tuchoi*]. “It may chance of wheat, or of some other kind,” i.e. we cannot tell which (1 Cor 15:37). “It may be” (1 Cor 14:10).

If we look at the Septuagint we find *tuche* used twice. “And Leah said, (En *tuche*) With fortune” (“a troop cometh,” the King James Version; “fortunate,” the Revised Version (British and American); “with fortune,” the Revised Version, margin, ^{<0301>}Genesis 30:11). Note, it was no Israelite, but who said this. “That prepare a table for Fortune, and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny” (“fate,” ^{<2851>}Isaiah 65:11). In this passage *tuche* stands for the Hebrew [*meni*], the god of destiny, and Fortune is for Gad, the old Semitic name for the god of fortune found in inscriptions, private names, etc. Note here, however, also, that the prophet was rebuking idolatrous ones for apostasy to heathen divinities.

We have also in the Apocrypha, “these things which have chanced,” the Revised Version (British and American) “to be opened unto thee” (2 Esdras 10:49).

See also GAD; MENI.

George Henry Trever

CHANCELLOR

^{<chan'-sel-er>}: The rendering in ^{<1508>}Ezra 4:8,9,17 of the Hebrew $\mu[\text{𐤇} \text{𐤌}]$ [*be`el Te`em*]; Septuagint [*Βάαλ*, Baal] (4:9), [*Βαλγάμ*, Balgam] (4:17), the latter being an incorrect translation of Hebrew `ayin. In 1 Esdras 2:16,25, [*Βεέλτεθμος*, Beeltethmos] (compare ^{<1508>}Ezra 4:8) occurs as a corruption, doubtless of $\mu[\text{𐤇} \text{𐤌}]$ [*be`el Te`em*]. The term in question designates an Assyrian office, namely, that of the “master or lord of official intelligence,” or “postmaster” (Sayce).

CHANGE

^{<chanj>}: A word which seeks to express the many shades of meaning contained in 13 variations of 9 Hebrew words and 5 Greek. These signify, in turn, “to change” “to exchange,” “to turn,” “to put or place,” “to make other” i.e. “alter,” “to disguise oneself.” $\text{𐤇} \text{𐤌} \text{𐤁}$ [*chalaph*], and its derivatives, occurring often, indicates “to pass away,” hence, alter, renew, e.g.

(1) “changes of raiment” (^{<0452>}Genesis 45:22; ^{<07412>}Judges 14:12,13,19);

(2) “changed my wages ten times” (^{<03107>}Genesis 31:7,41);

(3) heavens changed “as a vesture” (^{<19226>}Psalm 102:26);

(4) “changes and warfare” (^{<18007>}Job 10:17), i.e. relays of soldiers as illustrated in ^{<1054>}1 Kings 5:14 (the Revised Version, margin “host after host is against me”);

(5) “till my change come” (the Revised Version (British and American) “release”), i.e. death (^{<18444>}Job 14:14);

(6) “changed the ordinances” (the American Standard Revised Version “violated the statutes”), i.e. disregarded law (^{<2345>}Isaiah 24:5);

(7) change of mind (^{<3811>}Habakkuk 1:11 the King James Version). Used also of change of character, **ḥ** [haphakh]:

(1) of leprosy, “changed unto white” (^{<1836>}Leviticus 13:16);

(2) figuratively of the moral life, “Can the Ethiopian change his skin?” (^{<2433>}Jeremiah 13:23); so also [mur], and derivatives, “changed their gods” and “their glory,” etc. (^{<1960>}Psalm 106:20; ^{<3421>}Jeremiah 2:11; ^{<3047>}Hosea 4:7). Other words used to indicate change of name (^{<1247>}2 Kings 24:17); of day and night (^{<1872>}Job 17:12); of times and seasons (^{<202>}Daniel 2:21); of countenance. (^{<2028>}Daniel 7:28); of behavior (^{<9213>}1 Samuel 21:13); God’s unchangeableness, “I, Yahweh, change not” (^{<3016>}Malachi 3:6).

In the New Testament the word has to do chiefly with spiritual realities:

(1) [μετατίθημι, metatithemi], of the necessary change of the priesthood and law under Christ (^{<3072>}Hebrews 7:12);

(2) [ἀλλάττω, allatto], of His changing the customs of Moses (^{<4164>}Acts 6:14);

(3) of moral change, e.g. debasement (^{<6123>}Romans 1:23,25,26);

(4) of bodily change at the resurrection (1 Cor 15:51,52);

[μετασχηματίζω, metaschematizo], ^{<5021>}Philippians 3:21 the King James Version);

(5) [μεταβάλλω, metaballo], of change of mind in presence of a miracle (^{<4806>}Acts 28:6);

(6) of the change to come over the heavens at the great day of the Lord (^{<3012>}Hebrews 1:12; compare ^{<6180>}2 Peter 3:10,12).

Figurative uses indicated separately in the course of the article.

Dwight M. Pratt

CHANGE OF RAIMENT

<ra'-ment>.

See *DRESS*.

CHANGER

<chan'-jer> ([κολλυβιστής, kollubistes], “money-changer,” and so rendered ^{<4212>}Matthew 21:12; ^{<41115>}Mark 11:15): A banker or other person who changes money at a fixed rate. Indignant at the profane traffic in the temple Jesus “poured out the changers’ money” (^{<4215>}John 2:15). So used only here. For fuller treatment see *BANK; MONEY-CHANGERS*.

CHANNEL

<chan'-el> (qypā;[’aphiq] (root qṣ” a;[’aphaq], “to hold or contain,” “to be strong”; compare Arabic [’afaq] “to overcome” and [’afiq], “preeminent”); t l βōi[shibboleth] (l b” v;[shabhal], “to go,” “to go up or grow,” “to flow”; compare Arabic [’asbal], “to flow,” “to rain,” “to put forth ears”; sabalat, “an ear of grain”; sabil, “a road,” “a public fountain”)): In ^{<48221>}Job 12:21; 40:18; 41:15 we have [’aphiq] in the sense of “strong” (but compare 40:18, the Revised Version (British and American) “tubes” (of brass)). Elsewhere it is translated “river,” “brook,” “stream,” “channel” or “watercourse.” Shibboleth (in the dialect of Ephraim cibboleth (^{<47215>}Judges 12:6)) means “an ear of grain” (^{<44115>}Genesis 41:5 ff; ^{<48112>}Ruth 2:2; ^{<23715>}Isaiah 17:5) or “a flood of water” (^{<49912>}Psalms 69:2,15; ^{<23712>}Isaiah 27:12). In ^{<41216>}2 Samuel 22:16 (compare ^{<49815>}Psalms 18:15) we have:

*“Then the channels of the sea appeared,
The foundations of the world were laid bare,
By the rebuke of Yahweh,
At the blast of the breath of his nostrils.”*

This is reminiscent of “fountains of the deep” (^{<48071>}Genesis 7:11; 8:2; ^{<41838>}Proverbs 8:28). It is a question how far we should attribute to these ancient writers a share in modern notions of oceanography, but the idea

seems to be that of a withdrawal of the water of the ocean, and the laying bare of submarine declivities and channels such as we know to exist as the result of erosion during a previous period of elevation, when the given portion of ocean floor was dry land.

The fact that many streams of Palestine flow only during the rainy season seems to be referred to in ^{<1815>}Job 6:15; and perhaps also in ^{<1804>}Psalms 126:4.

See BROOK; RIVER.

Alfred Ely Day

CHANT

(^{frP};^[paraT]): Occurs only once in the King James Version in ^{<1085>}Amos 6:5, and the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain. [ParaT] corresponds to an Arabic root meaning to anticipate. It may therefore signify to improvise, to sing without care or preparation. the Revised Version (British and American) “to sing idle songs” suits the context. See Driver, Joel and Amos.

CHANUNEUS

^{<ka-nun'-e-us>} ([^{ανουναιος}, Chanounaios]; the King James Version Channuneus): A Levite in the list of 1 Esdras 8:48, probably corresponding to “Merari” in ^{<1819>}Ezra 8:19.

CHAPEL

^{<chap'-el>} (^{vDqñi}[miqdash], “a holy place”; the Revised Version (British and American) SANCTUARY, which see): “It is the king’s chapel” (^{<1073>}Amos 7:13 the King James Version), an expression indicative of the dependence of this sanctuary on the court.

CHAPHENATHA

^{<ka-fen'-a-tha>} ([^{αφεναθά}, Chaphenatha]; the King James Version Caphenatha): A name apparently given to part of the eastern wall of Jerusalem or a fort in that neighborhood which is said (1 Macc 12:37) to have been repaired by Jonathan Maccabeus. The place cannot now be

identified. Various speculations have been made as to the origin of the name, but they can hardly be said to throw any light on the passage cited.

CHAPTER

<chap'-i-ter>.

See ARCHITECTURE; JACHIN AND BOAZ; TEMPLE, II, 4.

CHAPMAN

<chap'-man> (plural **pyrΠh" yvæ" a"** [ʾanshe ha-tarim]): Word used only once in the King James Version (^{<4094>}2 Chronicles 9:14, the American Standard Revised Version "the traders"; compare also ^{<11005>}1 Kings 10:15 the Revised Version (British and American), where the Hebrew uses the same expression). The English word means "merchant"; compare the verb "to chaffer," and the German Kaufmann. The Hebrew means "those who go about" as merchants.

CHAPT

(**tt" j** ;[chathath]): The Hebrew term [chathath] means "broken," "terrified" or "dismayed." This term as it occurs in ^{<2440>}Jeremiah 14:4 is rendered "chapt" in English Versions of the Bible, "cracked" in the American Standard Revised Version, and "dismayed" in the Revised Version, margin. Inasmuch as the Hebrew term means "broken," it is not incorrectly rendered "chapt" or "chapped," which means to be cracked Open.

CHARAATHALAN

<kar-a-ath'-a-lan> ([**αρααθαλάν**, Charaathalan]; the King James Version Charaathalar (1 Esdras 5:36)): Most probably a corruption of the text. The names "Cherub, Addan, and Immer" in the lists of ^{<1829>}Ezra 2:59 and ^{<1876>}Nehemiah 7:61 are presented in the text cited as "Charaathalan leading them, and Allar."

CHARACA

<kar'-a-ka>.

See CHARAX.

CHARASHIM

<kar'-a-shim> (כַּרְאִשִּׁים [charashim], “craftsmen”).

See GE-HARASHIM.

CHARAX; CHARACA

<kar'-ax>, <kar'-a-ka>; ([εἰς τὸν ἄρακα, eis ton Charaka]; the King James Version [ἄραξ, Charax]): A place mentioned only in 2 Macc 12:17. It lay East of the Jordan and is said to be 750 stadia from Caspis, and to be inhabited by Jews called Tubieni, that is, of Tobie (Tob) in Gilead (1 Macc 5:9,13; 2 Macc 12:17). There is no clue as to the direction in which Ch. lay from Caspis. Possibly Kerak (Kir-moab), in post-Biblical times called Charamoba and Moboucharax, may represent the place. It lay about 100 miles South of el-Mezerib, Southeast of the Dead Sea.

CHARCHEMISH

<kar'-ke-mish>.

See CARCHE-MISH.

CHARCHUS

<kar'-kus>.

See BARCHUS.

CHAREA

<kar'-re-a> ([ἀρέα, Charea]): Head of a family of temple-servants (1 Esdras 5:32); called “Harsha” in ^{<112>}Ezra 2:52; ^{<115>}Nehemiah 7:54.

CHARGE; CHARGEABLE

<charj>, <char'-ja-b'-l> (from Latin carrus, “a wagon,” hence, “to lay or put a load on or in,” “to burden, or be a burden”):

Figurative:

(1) of a special duty **trṁvḥi**[mishmereth], “thing to be watched”), “the charge of Yahweh” (^{<0035>}Leviticus 8:35), the injunctions given in Exodus 29; “the charge of the tabernacle” (^{<0035>}Numbers 1:53); “the charge of the sons of Getshon” (^{<0035>}Numbers 3:25);

(2) of the burden of expense (**dbk**;^{<0035>}[kabhedh], “to be, or make heavy”; [**ᾠδάπανος**, adapanos], “without expense”), “lest we be chargeable unto thee” (^{<0035>}2 Samuel 13:25 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “burdensome”); “The former governors were charge unto the people” (^{<0035>}Nehemiah 5:15 margin “laid burdens upon”); “that I may make the gospel without charge” (1 Cor 9:18; *see CHARGES*);

(3) of oversight, care, custody, “Who gave him a charge over the earth?” (^{<0035>}Job 34:13); “to have the charge of the gate” (^{<0035>}2 Kings 7:17); “charge of the vessels of service” (^{<0035>}1 Chronicles 9:28); “cause ye them that have charge (**twḡqḇ**)^{<0035>}[pequddoth], “inspectors”) over the city” (^{<0035>}Ezekiel 9:1); “who had the charge of all her treasure” (^{<0035>}Acts 8:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “was over”);

(4) of a command, injunction, requirement, “He gave him a charge” (^{<0035>}Genesis 28:6); “His father charged the people with the oath” (^{<0035>}1 Samuel 14:27); “Jesus strictly (m “sternly”) charged them” (^{<0035>}Matthew 9:30); “I charge you by the Lord” (1 Thess 5:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “adjure”); “having received such a charge” (^{<0035>}Acts 16:24, [**παράγγελία**, paraggelia], “private or extra message”); “This charge I commit unto thee” (1 Tim 1:18);

(5) of blame, responsibility, reckoning, “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge” (^{<0035>}Acts 7:60); “nothing laid to his charge” (^{<0035>}Acts 23:29); “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?” (^{<0035>}Romans 8:33).

M. O. Evans

CHARGER

<char’-jer> (the American Standard Revised Version “platter”): A word which meant in the older English speech a flat dish or platter. It is used in the Bible as the translation

(1) of **hr[q]** [qe`arah], which in ^{<0479>}Numbers 7:19 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “platter”) and repeatedly in that chapter denotes one of the gifts made by the several princes at the dedication of the tabernacle;

(2) of **l fr" ga]** [’agharTal], a word of uncertain derivation used in ^{<009>}Ezra 1:9 (the King James Version) twice to designate certain temple vessels which might better be called “libation bowls”;

(3) of **[πίναξ, pinax]**, used ^{<0408>}Matthew 14:8,11; ^{<005>}Mark 6:25,28 (EV) for the dish in which the head of John the Baptist was presented.

David Foster Estes

CHARGES

<char’-jiz> ([**δαπανάω**, dapanao], “to spend”): “Be at charges for them” (^{<0024>}Acts 21:24, the King James Version “with them”), i.e. pay the sacrificial expenses of these poorer Nazirites (compare Josephus, Ant, XIX, xvi, 1).

CHARIOT

<char’-i-ot> (**bKr" m**, [merkabh], **hbKr" m**, [merkabhah], “riding-chariot,” **bkr** [rekhebh], “war-chariot”; [**αρμα**, harma]):

1. CHARIOTS OF EGYPT:

It is to the chariots of ancient Egypt that reference is first made in Scripture. Joseph was honored by being made to ride in the second chariot of King Pharaoh (^{<0443>}Genesis 41:43). Joseph paid honor to his father on his arrival in Goshen by meeting him in his chariot (^{<0429>}Genesis 46:29). In the state ceremonial with which the remains of Jacob were escorted to Canaan, chariots and horsemen were conspicuous (^{<0509>}Genesis 50:9). In the narrative of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt and of Pharaoh’s futile attempts to detain them the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh figure largely (^{<0247>}Exodus 14:17,18,23,15; 15:4,19). It was with the Hyksos invasion, some centuries before the Exodus, that the horse, and subsequently the chariot, were introduced for purposes of war into Egypt; and it may have been the possession of chariots that enabled those hated shepherd warriors to overpower the native Egyptians. The Egyptian

chariot was distinguished by its lightness of build. It was so reduced in weight that it was possible for a man to carry his chariot on his shoulders without fatigue. The ordinary chariot was made of wood and leather, and had only two occupants, the fighting man and his shield-bearer. The royal chariots were ornamented with gold and silver, and in the battle of Megiddo Thothmes III is represented as standing in his chariot of electrum like the god of war, brandishing his lance. In the battle the victorious Egyptians captured 2,041 horses and 924 chariots from the Syrian allies.

2. CHARIOTS OF THE CANAANITES:

The Canaanites had long been possessed of horses and chariots when Joshua houghed their horses and burnt their chariots with fire at the waters of Merom (~~<0106>~~ Joshua 11:6,9). The chariots of iron which the Canaanites could manœuvre in the plains and valleys proved a formidable obstacle to the Complete conquest of the land (~~<0019>~~ Judges 1:19). Jabin had 900 chariots of iron, and with them he was able to oppress the children of Israel twenty years (~~<0018>~~ Judges 4:3). The Philistines of the low country and the maritime plain, of whom we read in Judges and Samuel, were a warlike people, were disciplined and well armed and their possession of chariots gave them a great advantage over the Israelites. In the war of Michmash they put into the field the incredible number of 30,000 chariots and 6,000 horsemen, only in the end to suffer a grievous defeat (~~<0015>~~ 1 Samuel 13:5; 14:20). In the battle of Gilboa, however, the chariots and horsemen of the Philistines bore down all opposition, and proved the destruction of Saul and his house. Of these chariots there have come down to us no detailed description and no representation. But we cannot be far wrong in turning to the chariot of the Hittites as a type of the Canaanite and Philistine chariot. It is not from the monuments of the Hittites themselves, however, but from the representations of the Kheta of the Egyptian monuments, that we know what their chariots were like. Their chariotry was their chief arm of offense. The Hittite chariot was used, too, for hunting; but a heavier car with paneled sides was employed for war. The Egyptian monuments represent three Hittites in each car, a practice which differed from that of Egypt and attracted attention. Of the three, one guided the chariot, another did the fighting with sword and lance, and the third was the shield-bearer.

3. CHARIOTS OF SOLOMON AND LATER KINGS:

The Israelites living in a mountainous country were tardy in adopting the chariot for purposes of war. David houghed all the chariot horses of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and “reserved of them for a hundred chariots” (~~<108>~~2 Samuel 8:4), and Adonijah prepared for himself chariots and horsemen with a view to contest the throne of his father (~~<100>~~1 Kings 1:5). But Solomon was the first in Israel to acquire chariots and horses on a national scale, and to build cities for their accommodation (~~<109>~~1 Kings 9:19). In Massoretic Text of the Old Testament we read that Solomon had agents who received droves of horses from Egypt, and it is added: “And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for 600 shekels of silver, and a horse for 150; and so for all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria, did they bring them out by their means” (~~<110>~~1 Kings 10:29). On the strength of a warrantable emendation of the text it is now proposed to read the preceding (~~<110>~~1 Kings 10:28): “And Solomon’s import of horses was from Mucri and from Kue; the king’s traders received them from Kue at a price” — where Mucri and Kue are North Syria and Cilicia. No doubt it was Egypt out of which the nation was forbidden by the Deuteronomic law to multiply horses (~~<576>~~Deuteronomy 17:16), but on the other hand the statement of Ezekiel (27:14) that Israel derived horses, chargers and mules not from Egypt but from Togarmah — North Syria and Asia Minor — agrees with the new rendering (Burney, Notes on Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings, in the place cited.). From Solomon’s time onward chariots were in use in both kingdoms. Zimri, who slew Elah, son of Baasha, king of Israel, was captain of half his chariots (~~<110>~~1 Kings 16:9). It was when sitting in his chariot in disguise beside the driver that Ahab received his fatal wound at Ramoth-gilead (~~<123>~~1 Kings 22:34). The floor of the royal chariot was a pool of blood, and “they washed the chariot by the pool of Samaria” (~~<125>~~1 Kings 22:35,38). It was in his war-chariot that his servants carried Josiah dead from the fatal field of Megiddo (~~<1230>~~2 Kings 23:30). The chief pieces of the Hebrew chariot were

- (1) the pole to which the two horses were yoked,
- (2) the axle — resting upon two wheels with six or eight spokes (~~<1073>~~1 Kings 7:33) — into which the pole was fixed,
- (3) a frame or body open behind, standing upon the axle and fitted by a leather band to the pole. The chariots of iron of which we read (~~<1008>~~Judges 4:3) were of wood strengthened or studded with iron. Like

that of the Hittite, the Hebrew chariot probably carried three men, although in the chariot of Ahab (^{<1223>}1 Kings 22:34) and in that of Jehu (^{<1198>}2 Kings 9:24 f) we read of only two.

4. CHARIOTS OF THE ASSYRIANS:

In the later days when the Assyrians overran the lands of the West, the Israelites had to face the chariots and the hosts of Sennacherib and of the kings (^{<1223>}2 Kings 19:23). And they faced them with chariots of their own. An inscription of Shalmaneser II of Assyria tells how in the battle of Karkar (854 BC) Ahab of the land of Israel had put into the field 2,000 chariots and 10,000 soldiers. But the Assyrian chariotry was too numerous and powerful for Israel. The Assyrian chariot was larger and heavier than the Egyptian or the Hebrew: it had usually three and sometimes four occupants (Maspero, *Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria*, 322). When we read in Nahum's prophecy of "chariots flashing with steel," "rushing to and fro in the broad ways" (Nah 2:3,4), it is of the Assyrian chariots that we are to think being hastily got together for the defense of Nineveh.

5. CHARIOTS OF CHALDEANS, PERSIANS, GREEKS:

In early Babylonian inscriptions of the 3rd millennium before Christ there is evidence of the use of the war-chariots, and Nebuchadnezzar in his campaigns to the West had chariots as part of his victorious host (^{<3478>}Jeremiah 47:3). It was the Persians who first employed scythed chariots in war; and we find Antiochus Eupator in the Seleucid period equipping a Greek force against Judea which had 300 chariots armed with scythes (2 Macc 13:2).

6. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In the New Testament the chariot is only twice mentioned. Besides the chariot in which the Ethiopian eunuch was traveling when Philip the evangelist made up to him (^{<4038>}Acts 8:28,29,38), there is only the mention of the din of war-chariots to which the onrush of locusts in Apocalyptic vision is compared (^{<609>}Revelation 9:9).

7. FIGURATIVE USE:

In the figurative language of Scripture, the chariot has a place. It is a tribute to the powerful influence of Elijah and Elisha when they are separately called "the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof" (^{<1122>}2

Kings 2:12; 13:14). The angelic hosts are declared to be God's chariots, twice ten thousand, thousands upon thousands (~~<P87>~~ Psalm 68:17). But chariots and horses themselves are a poor substitute for the might of God (~~<P17>~~ Psalm 20:7). God Himself is represented as riding upon His chariots of salvation for the defense of His people (~~<P88>~~ Habakkuk 3:8). In the Book of Zec, the four chariots with their horses of various colors have an apocalyptic significance (Zechariah 6). In the worship of the host of heaven which prevailed in the later days of the kingdom of Judah, "the chariots of the sun" (see article) were symbols which led the people into gross idolatry and King Josiah burnt them with fire (~~<D231>~~ 2 Kings 23:11).

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebrew Archaeology, I, 366 f; Garstang, Land of the Hittites, 363 f; Maspero, Struggle of the Nations and Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria; Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, II, 1-21.

T. Nicol.

CHARIOTS OF THE SUN

(~~vm~~yh" tw~~OK~~h" m" [markebhoth ha-shemesh]): These, together with "horses of the sun," are mentioned in ~~<D231>~~ 2 Kings 23:11. They are said to have stood in the temple, a gift of the kings of Judah. Josiah removed the horses from the precincts of the temple and burned the chariots. Among the Greeks, Helios was endowed with horses and chariots. Thus the course of the sun as he sped across the skies was understood by the mythological mind of antiquity. The Babylonian god Shamash (= Hebrew [Shemesh]) likewise had his chariot and horses as well as his charioteer. The cult of the sun and other heavenly bodies which was particularly in vogue during the latter days of the Judean monarchy (compare ~~<D231>~~ 2 Kings 23:5; ~~<P816>~~ Ezekiel 8:16 f; ~~<P1778>~~ Deuteronomy 17:3; ~~<P810>~~ Jeremiah 8:2) seems to have constituted an element of the Canaanitish religion (compare the names of localities like [Beth-shemesh] and the like). The chariots of the sun are also referred to in Enoch 72:5,37; 75:4, and Greek Apocrypha of Baruch 6.

Max L. Margolis

CHARITABLY

~~<char'-i-ta-bli>~~ ([~~κατὰ ἀγάπην~~, kata agapen]): The Revised Version

(British and American), which substitutes “love” for “charity” regularly, removing the latter word from the vocabulary of Scripture, makes a like change in ^{<645>}Romans 14:15, the only occurrence of “charitably” in the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “in love.”

See CHARITY.

CHARITY

<char'-i-ti> ([^{<645>}ἀγάπη, agape]):

In the King James Version in 26 places from ^{<645>}1 Corinthians 8:1 onward. The same Greek word, which appears in the New Testament 115 times, is elsewhere translated by “love.”

1. A NEW WORD:

The substantive agape is mainly, if not exclusively, a Biblical and ecclesiastical word (see Deissmann, Bible Studies, 198 ff), not found in profane writings, although the verb agapan, from which it is derived, is used in classical Greek in the sense of “love, founded in admiration, veneration, esteem, like the Latin diligere” (Grimm-Thayer), rather than natural emotion (Latin, amare).

2. A NEW IDEAL:

It is a significant evidence of the sense of a new ideal and principle of life that permeated the Christian consciousness of the earliest communities, that they should have made current a new word to express it, and that they should derive that word, not from the current or philosophical language of Greek morality, but from the Septuagint.

3. AN APOSTOLIC TERM:

In the New Testament the word is apostolic, and appears first and predominantly in the Pauline writings. It is found only twice in the Synoptics (^{<645>}Matthew 24:12; ^{<645>}Luke 11:42), and although it is in both places put in the mouth of the Saviour, it can easily be understood how the language of a later time may have been used by the narrator, when it is considered that these gospels were compiled and reduced to writing many years after the spread of the Pauline epistles. The word is not found in James, Mark or Acts, but it appears in Paul 75 times, in John 30 times, in Peter 4 times, in Jude twice and in Hebrews twice. Jesus Christ gave the

thing and the spirit in the church, and the apostles (probably Paul) invented the term to express it.

4. LATIN EQUIVALENTS:

When Jerome came to translate the Greek Testament into Latin, he found in that language no word to represent agape. Amor was too gross, and he fell back on dilectio and caritas, words which, however, in their original meanings were too weak and colorless to represent agape adequately. No principle seems to have guided him in the choice of the one word or the other in particular places.

5. ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

Caritas in English became “charity,” and was taken over by the English translators from the Vulg, though not with any regularity, nor as far as can be judged, according to any definite principle, except that it is used of agape only in man, never as it denotes a quality or action of God, which is always translated by “love.” When agape is translated by “charity” it means either

- (1) a disposition in man which may qualify his own character (1 Cor 8:1) and be ready to go forth to God (1 Cor 8:3) or to men; or
- (2) an active and actual relation with other men, generally within the church (~~5084~~ Colossians 3:14; ~~5086~~ 1 Thessalonians 3:6; ~~5008~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:3; ~~5005~~ 1 Timothy 1:5; 4:12; ~~6008~~ 1 Peter 4:8; 5:14), but also absolutely and universally (1 Cor 13). In the earlier epistles it stands first and unique as the supreme principle of the Christian life (1 Cor 13), but in the later writings, it is enumerated as one among the Christian virtues (1 Tim 2:15; ~~6022~~ 2 Timothy 2:22; 3:10; ~~5002~~ Titus 2:2; ~~6007~~ 2 Peter 1:7; ~~6029~~ Revelation 2:19).

6. INWARD MOTIVE:

In Paul’s psalm of love (1 Cor 13) it is set forth as an innermost principle contrasted with prophecy and knowledge, faith and works, as the motive that determines the quality of the whole inner life, and gives value to all its activities. If a man should have all gifts of miracles and intellect, and perform all the works of goodness and devotion, “and have not love, it profiteth nothing,” for they would be purely external and legal, and lacking in the quality of moral choice and personal relation which give life its value

(1 Cor 13:1-3). Love itself defines men's relation to men as generous, tolerant and forgiving.

7. CHARACTER:

"Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not" (1 Cor 13:4). It determines and defines a man's own character and personality. It is not boastful and arrogant, but dignified, pure, holy, courageous and serene. Evil cannot provoke it nor wrong delight it. It bears cheerfully all adversity and follows its course in confident hope (1 Cor 13:4-7). It is final virtue, the ultimate ideal of life. Many of life's activities cease or change, but "love never faileth."

8. ULTIMATE IDEAL:

To it all other graces and virtues are subordinated. "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love" (1 Cor 13:8-13). In one passage only in the New Testament (~~6006~~3 John 1:6) [agape] seems to have a meaning that comes near to the later, ecclesiastical meaning of charity as almsgiving.

9. ALMSGIVING:

With the growing legalism of the church and the prevalence of monastic ideals of morality, caritas came to mean the very opposite of Paul's [agape] — just "the giving of goods to feed the poor," which "without love profiteth nothing." At present, the word means either liberality to the poor, or tolerance in judging the actions of others, both qualities of love, but very inadequate to express its totality.

10. TOLERANCE:

The Revisers have therefore accurately dropped the word and substituted "love" for it in all passages. It is interesting to note that in Welsh the reverse process has occurred: cariad (from Latin caritas) was used throughout to translate [agape], with the result that, in both religious and ordinary speech, the word has established itself so firmly as almost to oust the native word "serch."

T. Rees

CHARM

<charm>: Definition. — The word charm is derived from the Latin *carmen*, “a song,” and denotes strictly what is sung; then it comes to mean a magical formula chanted or recited with a view to certain desired results. Charm is distinguished from amulet in this, that the latter is a material object having as such a magical potency, though it is frequently an inscribed formula on it that gives this object its power (*see* **AMULET**). The word charm stands primarily for the incantation, though it is often applied to an inscribed amulet.

A charm may be regarded as having a positive or a negative effect. In the first case it is supposed to secure some desired object or result (*see* **AMULET**). In the second, it is conceived as having the power of warding off evils, as the evil eye, the inflictions of evil spirits and the like. In the last, its negative meaning, the word “countercharm” (German, *Gegenzauber*) is commonly used.

Charms are divisible into two general classes according as they are written (or printed) or merely spoken:

(1) Written charms — Of these we have examples in the phylacteries and the [mezuzah] noticed in the article **AMULET**. In ~~Acts~~ Acts 19:13-20 we read of written charms used by the Ephesians, such as are elsewhere called (*ἑφέσια γράμματα*, *ephesia grammata*). Such magical formulas were written generally on leather, though sometimes on papyrus, on lead, and even on gold. Those mentioned in the above passage must have been inscribed on some very valuable material, gold perhaps, or they could not have cost 2,000 British pounds (= 50,000 drachmas). Charms of the kind have been dug up from the ruins of Ephesus. In modern Egypt drinking-bowls are used, inscribed with passages from the Koran, and it is considered very lucky to drink from such a “lucky bowl,” as it is called. Parts of the Koran and often complete miniature copies are worn by Egyptians and especially by Egyptian soldiers during war. These are buried with the dead bodies, just as the ancient Egyptians interred with their dead portions of the Book of the Dead or even the whole book, and as the early Abyssinians buried with dead bodies certain magical texts. Josephus (*Ant.*, VIII, ii, 5) says that Solomon composed incantations by which demons were exorcised and diseases healed.

(2) Spoken charms are at least as widespread as those inscribed. Much importance was attached by the ancients (Egyptians, Babylonians, etc.) to the manner in which the incantations were recited, as well as to the substance of the formulas. If beautifully uttered, and with sufficient frequency, such incantations possessed unlimited power. The stress laid on the mode of reciting magical charms necessitated the existence of a priestly class and did much to increase the power of such a class. The binding force of the uttered word is implied in many parts of the Old Testament (see ~~<1001>~~Joshua 9:20). Though the princes of Israel had promised under false pretenses to make a covenant on behalf of Israel with the Gibeonites, they refused to break their promise because the word had been given. The words of blessing and curse were believed to have in themselves the power of self-realization. A curse was a means of destruction, not a mere realization (see Numbers 22 through 24, Balaam's curses; ~~<1012>~~Judges 5:23; Job 31). In a similar way the word of blessing was believed to insure its own realization. In ~~<1048>~~Genesis 48:8-22 the greatness of Ephraim and Manasseh is ascribed to the blessing of Jacob upon them (see further ~~<1012>~~Exodus 12:32; ~~<1071>~~Judges 17:2; ~~<1013>~~2 Samuel 21:3). It is no doubt to be understood that the witch of Endor raised Samuel from the dead by the recitation of some magical formula (~~<1087>~~1 Samuel 28:7 ff).

The uttering of the tetragrammaton (YHWH) was at a very early time (at latest 300 BC) believed to be magically potent, and hence, its ordinary use was forbidden, so that instead of [Yahweh], the Jews of the time, when the earliest part of the Septuagint was translated, used for this Divine name the appellative [ʾadonai] = "Lord." In a similar way among the Jews of post-Biblical and perhaps of even Biblical times, the pronunciation of the Aaronic blessing (~~<1064>~~Numbers 6:24-26) was supposed to possess great efficacy and to be a means of certain good to the person or persons involved. Evil spirits were exorcised by Jews of Paul's day through the use of the name of the Lord Jesus (~~<4193>~~Acts 19:13). In the Talmud ([Pecachim] 110a) it is an instruction that if a man meets a witch he should say, "May a pot of boiling dung be stuffed into your mouth, you ugly witch," and her power is gone.

For literature *see* **AMULET**.

T. Witton Davies

CHARME

<kar'-me> (so the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version Carme; [αρμή, Charme]): A Greek transliteration of Hebrew [charim]. The name of a priestly family in the list of those who returned from the Exile (1 Esdras 5:25 = Harim in ~~<KJB>~~ Ezra 2:39 = ~~<KJB>~~ Nehemiah 7:42).

CHARMIS

<kar'-mis> ([άρμεις, Charmeis], [αρμείς, Charmeis], A, [αλμείς, Chalmeis]): The son of Melchiel, one of the three elders or rulers of the town of Bethulia (Judith 6:15; 8:10; 10:6).

CHARRAN

<kar'-an> ([αῤῥάν, Charrhan]): Greek form of *HARAN* (which see) (~~<KJB>~~ Acts 7:2,4).

CHASE

<chas>.

See HUNTING.

CHASEBA

<kas'-e-ba> ([ασεβά, Chaseba]): The name of a family of temple-servants in the list of those who returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:31). The name is not given in the parallel passages in Ezra and Nehemiah.

CHASTE; CHASTITY

<chast>, <chas'-ti-ti>.

See CRIMES; MARRIAGE.

CHASTENING; CHASTISEMENT

<chas'-'-n-ing>, <chas'-tiz-ment>: These two words corresponding to Hebrew רסלם [mucar], and Greek [παιδεία, paideia], are distinguished in English use, in that "chastisement" is applied to the infliction of pain,

either as a punishment or for recalling to duty, while “chastening,” is a wider term, indicating the discipline or training to which one is subjected, without, as in the other term, referring to the means employed to this end. The narrower term occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) but once in the New Testament and then in its verbal form, ^{<4236>}Luke 23:16: “I will therefore chastise him.” the King James Version uses it also in ^{<8178>}Hebrews 12:8.

The meaning of the word [paideia] grows with the progress of revelation. Its full significance is unfolded in the New Testament, when reconciliation through Christ has brought into prominence the true fatherhood of God (^{<8178>}Hebrews 12:5,10). In the Old Testament, where it occurs about 40 times, the radical meaning is that simply of training, as in ^{<8886>}Deuteronomy 8:5: “As a man chasteneth his son, so Yahweh thy God chasteneth thee.” But, as in a dispensation where the distinguishing feature is that of the strictest justice, retributive punishment becomes not only an important, but a controlling factor. in the training, as in ^{<8338>}Leviticus 26:28: “I will chastise you seven times for your sins.” In this sense, it is used of chastisements inflicted by man even unjustly: “My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions” (^{<1121>}1 Kings 12:11). As, therefore, the thought of the suffering inflicted, or that of the end toward which it is directed, preponderates, the Psalmist can pray: “Neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure” (^{<8881>}Psalm 6:1), and take comfort in the words: “Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest” (^{<8942>}Psalm 94:12). Hence, it is common in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) to find the Hebrew [mucar], and Greek [paideia] translated as “instruction.” Illustrations are most numerous in Prov.

In the New Testament the Greek [paideia] is used with a variety similar to its corresponding Hebrew in the Old Testament. Examples of the fundamental idea, namely, that of “training,” are found in such passages as ^{<4072>}Acts 7:22; 22:3, where Moses and Paul are said to have been “instructed,” and ^{<8886>}2 Timothy 3:16, where Scripture is said to be “profitable for instruction” (compare ^{<5011>}1 Timothy 1:20; ^{<8125>}2 Timothy 2:25; ^{<8122>}Titus 2:12; ^{<8121>}Romans 2:20). A similar, but not identical, thought, is found in ^{<8081>}Ephesians 6:4: “Nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord.” But when [paideia] is described as bringing pain, the mystery of suffering, which in the Old Testament is most fully treated in the Book of Job, at last finds its explanation. The child of God realizes that he cannot be beneath God’s wrath, and hence, that the chastening

which he endures is not destructive, but corrective (1 Cor 10:13; 11:32; ~~<1019>~~ 2 Corinthians 6:9; ~~<1119>~~ Revelation 3:19). In ~~<8216>~~ Hebrews 12:5-11, such consolation is afforded, not, as in the above passages, by incidental allusions, but by a full argument upon the basis of ~~<1119>~~ Proverbs 3:11 f, an Old Testament text that has depth and richness that can be understood and appropriated only by those who through Christ have learned to recognize the Omnipotent Ruler of heaven and earth, as their loving and considerate Father. On the basis of this passage, a distinction is often drawn between punishment and chastisement; the former, as an act of justice, revealing wrath, and the latter, as an act of mercy, love. Since to them that are in Christ Jesus, there is no condemnation (~~<8101>~~ Romans 8:1) they can suffer no punishment, but only chastisement. Where there is guilt, there is punishment; but where guilt has been removed, there can be no punishment. There being no degrees of justification, no one can be forgiven in part, with a partial guilt still set to his account for which he must yet give a reckoning, either here or hereafter. If, then, all the righteousness of Christ belongs to him, and no sin whatever remains to be forgiven, either in whole or in part, all life's sorrows are remedial agencies against danger and to train for the kingdom of heaven.

H. E. Jacobs

CHATTER

~~<chat'-er>~~ (¹p" X:[tsaphaph]): This word, which means to "peep," "twitter" or "chirp," as small birds do, is translated "chatter" only in ~~<2384>~~ Isaiah 38:14, "Like a swallow or a crane, so did I chatter."

See CHIRP.

CHAVAH

~~<ka'-va>~~ Septuagint [ωή, Zoe]): A transliteration of the Hebrew hwh" [chawwah] or [chavvah], which means "life giver" "living" and appears in our English versions as Eve (~~<1019>~~ Genesis 3:20, see the King James Version margin).

CHEBAR

<ke'-bar> (**rbK**)[kebhar], “joining” (Young), “length” (Strong); [**οβάρ**, Chobar]): The river by the side of which his first vision was vouchsafed to Ezekiel (1:1). It is described as in “the land of the Chaldeans,” and is not, therefore, to be sought in northern Mesopotamia. This rules out the Habor, the modern Chabour, with which it is often identified. The two names are radically distinct: **rwḪ**:[chabhor] could not be derived from **rbK**:[kebhar]. One of the great Babylonian canals is doubtless intended. Hilprecht found mention made of (naru) kabaru, one of these canals large enough to be navigable, to the East of Nippur, “in the land of the Chaldeans.” This “great canal” he identifies with the rood. [shaTT en-Nil], in which probably we should recognize the ancient Chebar.

W. Ewing

CHECK

(**rsWm** [mucar]): Occurs in ~~<KJB>~~ Job 20:3 the King James Version, “I have heard the check of my reproach” (the Revised Version (British and American) “the reproof which putteth me to shame”), i.e. a check or reproof, such as that which closes the last speech of Job (chapter 19), and intended to put Zophar to shame.

CHECKER-WORK; (NETWORK)

<chek'-er-wurk> (**hkbḥ**)[sebhakhah]): This was a kind of ornamentation used on the tops of the pillars of Jachin and Boaz before the porch of the Temple (~~<KJB>~~ 1 Kings 7:17). Its exact form is not known. *See* TEMPLE. For “a brodered coat” (~~<KJB>~~ Exodus 28:4 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) gives “a coat of checker work.”

See BROIDERED; EMBROIDERY.

CHEDORLAOMER

<ked-or-la-o'-mer>, <ked-or-la'-omer> (**rm[br" dK]**
[kedhorla`omer]; [**οδαλλογόμορ**, Chodollogomor]):

The name of the Elamite overlord with whom Amraphel, Arioch and Tidal marched against Sodom and Gomorrah, and the other cities of the plain (~~Gen~~ Genesis 14:1 ff). The Greek (Septuagint) form of the name is [Chodollogomor], implying a different vocalization, the assimilation of “R” with “L”, and the pronunciation of “o” as “gho” (Codorlaghomer). This suggests that the Elamite form, in cuneiform, would be Kudur-lagamar, the second element being the name of a god, and the whole therefore meaning “servant of La`omer” (Lagamar), or the like. A Babylonian deity worshipped at Dilmu, Lagamal, may be the same as the Elamite Lagamar. This name is not found in the cuneiform inscriptions, unless it be, as is possible, the fancifully-written Kudur-lah(gu)mal (or Kodorlahgomal) of three late Babylonian legends, one of which is in poetical form. Besides this Elamite ruler, two of these tablets mention also a certain Eri-Aku or Eri-Akua, son of Durmah-ilani, and one of them refers to Tudhul(a) or Tidal.

See ERI-AKU, 4.

1. WAS HE THE ELAMITE KING KUDUR-LAHGUMAL?:

Objections have been made to the identification of Chedorlaomer with the Kudur-lah(gu)mal of these texts, some Assyriologists having flatly denied the possibility, while others expressed the opinion that, though these names were respectively those with which they have been identified, they were not the personages referred to in Genesis 14, and many have refrained from expressing an opinion at all. The main reason for the identification of Kudur-lah(gu)mal(?) with Chedorlaomer is its association with the names Eri-Eaku and Tudgul(a) found on two of the documents. No clear references to the expedition against the Cities of the Plain, however, have been found in these texts.

2. KUDUR-LAHGUMAL AND THE BABYLONIANS:

The longer of the two prose compositions (Brit. Mus., Sp. II, 987) refers to the bond of heaven (extended?) to the four regions, and the fame which he (Merodach?) set for (the Elamites) in Babylon, the city of (his) glory. So (?the gods), in their faithful (or everlasting) counsel, decreed to Kudur-lahgumal, king of Elam (their favor?). He came down, and (performed) what was good to them, and exercised dominion in Babylon, the city of Kar-Dunias (Babylonia). When in power, however, he acted in a way which did not please the Babylonians, for he loved the winged fowl, and favored the dog which crunched the bone. “What(?) king of Elam was

there who had (ever) (shown favor to?) the shrine of E-saggil?" (E-sagila, the great temple of Belus at Babylon).

3. THE SON OF ERI-EKUA:

A letter from Durmah-ilani son of Eri-Ekua (?Arioch) is at this point quoted, and possibly forms the justification for the sentences which had preceded, giving, as they do, reasons for the intervention of the native ruler. The mutilation of the inscription, however, makes the sense and sequence very difficult to follow.

4. DURMAH-ILANI, TUDHUL(A) AND KUDUR-LAHMAL:

The less perfect fragment (Sp. III, 2) contains, near the beginning, the word hammu, and if this be, as Professor F. Hommel has suggested, part of the name Hammurabi (Amraphel), it would in all probability place the identification of Kudur-lahgumal(?) with Chedorlaomer beyond a doubt. This inscription states, that Merodach, in the faithfulness of his heart, caused the ruler not supporting (the temples of Babylonia) to be slain with the sword. The name of Durmah-ilani then occurs, and it seems to be stated of him that he carried off spoil, and Babylon and the temple E-saggil were inundated. He, however, was apparently murdered by his son, and old and young (were slain) with the sword. Then came Tudhul(a) or Tidal, son of Gazza(ni?), who also carried off spoil, and again the waters devastated Babylon and E-saggil. But to all appearance Tudhul(a), in his turn, was overtaken by his fate, for "his son shattered his head with the weapon of his hands." At this point there is a reference to Elam, to the city Ahhea(?), and to the land of Rabbatum, which he (? the king of Elam) had spoiled. Whether this refers to some expedition to Palestine or not is uncertain, and probably unlikely, as the next phrase speaks of devastation inflicted in Babylonia.

5. THE FATE OF SINFUL RULERS:

But an untoward fate overtook this ruler likewise, for Kudur-lahmal (= lahgumal), his son, pierced his heart with the steel sword of his girdle. All these references to violent deaths are apparently cited to show the dreadful end of certain kings, "lords of sin," with whom Merodach, the king of the gods, was angry.

6. THE POETICAL LEGEND:

The third text is of a poetical nature, and refers several times to “the enemy, the Elamite” — apparently Kudur-lahgu(mal). In this noteworthy inscription, which, even in its present imperfect state, contains 78 lines of wedge-written text, the destruction wrought by him is related in detail. He cast down the door (of the temple) of Istar; entered Du-mah, the place where the fates were declared (*see* BABEL, BABYLON), and told his warriors to take the spoil and the goods of the temple.

7. KUDUR-LAHGUMAL’S MISDEEDS:

He was afraid, however, to proceed to extremities, as the god of the place “flashed like lightning, and shook the (holy) places.” The last two paragraphs state that he set his face to go down to Tiamtu (the seacoast; *see* CHALDEA), whither Ibi-Tutu, apparently the king of that district, had hastened, and founded a pseudo-capital. But the Elamite seems afterward to have taken his way north again, and after visiting Borsippa near Babylon, traversed “the road of darkness — the road to Mesku” (?Mesech). He destroyed the palace, subdued the princes, carried off the spoil of all the temples and took the goods (of the people) to Elam. At this point the text breaks off.

8. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SERIES:

Where these remarkable inscriptions came from there ought to be more of the same nature, and if these be found, the mystery of Chedorlaomer and Kudur-lahgumal will probably be solved. At present it can only be said, that the names all point to the early period of the Elamite rulers called Kudurides, before the land of Tiamtu or Tamdu was settled by the Chaldeans. Evidently it was one of the heroic periods of Babylonian history, and some scribe of about 350 BC had collected together a number of texts referring to it. All three tablets were purchased (not excavated) by the British Museum, and reached that institution through the same channel. See the *Journal of the Victoria Institute*, 1895-96, and Professor Sayce in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (1906), 193 ff, 241 ff; (1907), 7 ff.

T. G. Pinches

CHEEK; CHEEKBONE

<chek>, <chek'-bon>:

(1) yj l [lechi]; [σιαγών, siagon], “the jaw,” “jaw-bone,” “side of the face.” The Hebrew word denotes originally freshness and rounded softness of the cheek, a sign of beauty in youth and maiden (Song 1:10; 5:13). The oriental guards with jealous care his cheek from touch or defilement, therefore a stroke on the cheek was, and is to this day, regarded as an act of extreme rudeness of behavior, a deadly affront. Our Saviour, however, teaches us in ^{<4153>}Matthew 5:39 and ^{<4169>}Luke 6:29 that even this insult is to be ignored and pardoned.

Jawbones of animals have been frequently used as tools and weapons among primitive people. We see this sufficiently proven from cave deposits in many parts of the world, and from recent ethnological researches, especially in Australia. In the light of this evidence it is interesting to note that Samson used a jawbone of an ass with success against his enemies the Philistines (^{<0715>}Judges 15:15).

(2) j " wQl jh" [malqoach] (^{<4215>}Psalm 22:15), is a dual form indicative of the two jaws, to which a parched tongue seems to cleave.

(3) h[Ljt" m][methalle`ah] (^{<4297>}Job 29:17), better “cheek teeth” (which see).

H. L. E. Luering

CHEEK TEETH

(h[Ljt" m][methalle`ah], transposed from h[;TLjh" [malta`ah] (only in ^{<4806>}Psalm 58:6), literally “the biter,” “crusher,” “molar,” “jaw-teeth,” “great teeth” (^{<4297>}Job 29:17 m; ^{<2006>}Joel 1:6)).

Figurative: The word is used as a synonym of reckless strength and cruelty.

CHEER; CHEERFULNESS

<cher>, <cher'-fool-nes>: The English word “cheer” meant

(1) originally face, countenance (Greek [κάρα, kara], “head,” through Old French, chere, “face”),

(2) then the expression on the face, especially

(3) the expression of good spirits, and finally

(4) good spirits, without any reference to the facial expression. The noun “cheer” in English Versions of the Bible is only found with adjective “good” (except 1 Esdras 9:54, “great cheer”), the word not having quite lost its earlier neutral character (any face expression, whether joyous or otherwise). In Old Testament, **bwō** [Tobh], is translated “cheer,” “let thy heart cheer thee” (see **GOOD**); **j me**:[sameach], “to rejoice” is so translated in ^{<13415>}Deuteronomy 24:5, “shall cheer his wife” (the King James Version “cheer up his wife”), and ^{<10913>}Judges 9:13, “wine, which cheereth God (l’elohim)) and man.” The phrase “of good cheer” occurs in Old Testament in ^{<18927>}Job 9:27 (the King James Version “comfort”); in Apocrypha, 1 Esdras 9:54; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:6; Baruch 4:5,30; Sirach 18:32 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “luxury”); in New Testament for Greek [euthumeo], [euthumos], in ^{<4772>}Acts 27:22,25,36, and for [tharseo] in ^{<1091>}Matthew 9:2,22. (the King James Version “comfort”); 14:27; ^{<10161>}Mark 6:50; 10:49 (RV; “comfort” in the King James Version); ^{<1363>}John 16:33; ^{<4231>}Acts 23:11. “Cheer” as verb transitive occurs in ^{<2119>}Ecclesiastes 11:9; Deut 24:5; ^{<10913>}Judges 9:13.

Cheerful occurs in ^{<10513>}Proverbs 15:13,15 (the King James Version “merry”); ^{<8889>}Zechariah 8:19; 9:17 the King James Version; Sirach 30:25; ^{<1091>}2 Corinthians 9:7.

Cheerfully, ^{<10910>}Acts 24:10.

Cheerfulness, ^{<15128>}Romans 12:8.

D. Miall Edwards

CHEESE

<chez>.

See **FOOD**; **MILK**.

CHELAL

<ke’-lal> (**l l K**)[kelal], “perfection”): One of the [bene Pachath-Mo’abh] who took “strange wives” (^{<15100>}Ezra 10:30).

CHELCIAS

<kel'-si-as>.

See *HELKIAS*; *HILKIAH*.

CHELLIANS

<kel'-i-anz>: The people of “Chellus” (Judith 2:23) (which see).

CHELLUH

<kel'-u>.

See *CHELUHI*.

CHELLUS

<kel'-us> ([ελλούς, Chellous]), a place named (Judith 1:9) among those West of the Jordan to which Nebuchadnezzar sent his summons. It is mentioned along with “Kades,” and as it lay North of the “children of Ishmael” it may with some probability be taken as lying Southwest of Jerusalem. It has been conjectured that it may be Chalutzah (Reland, Palestine, 717), a place under the form Elusa well known to the ancient geographers.

CHELOD

<ke'-lod> ([ελεούδ, Cheleoud], [ελεούλ, Cheleoul]): In Judith 1:6 it is said that “many nations of the sons of Chelod assembled themselves to the battle.” They are mentioned as obeying the summons of Nebuchadnezzar to his war against Arphaxad. No very probable suggestion has been made as to the meaning of Chelod.

CHELUB

<ke'-lub>:

(1) **bwl K** [kelubh], father of Mehir (^{<13041>}1 Chronicles 4:11); the name is probably a variation of Caleb. Wellhausen (Deuteronomy gentibus et familiis Judaeis) reads **^wOz" j , ^B,bl K**; [kalebh ben chezron].

(2) Father of Ezri (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 27:26), one of the officers of David.

See GENEALOGY.

CHELUBAI

^{<ke-loo'-bi>} (ybwl K)[kelubhay]): Another form of Caleb used in ^{<1319>}1 Chronicles 2:9; compare 2:18,42. Caleb is here described as the brother of Jerahmeel, and son of Hezron, a remote ancestor, instead of as the son of Jephunneh.

See CALEB.

CHELUHI

^{<kel'-oo-hi>} (yhwl K)[keluhi], Kt.; ^{Whwl K}[keluhu], Qere; the Revised Version, margin Cheluhu; the King James Version Chelluh): Mentioned in the list of persons with foreign wives (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:35 = 1 Esdras 9:34).

CHEMARIM

^{<kem'-a-rim>} (pyrmlK)[kemarim], a plural whose singular komer is not found in the Old Testament): Occurs only once in the text of English Versions of the Bible (Zeph 1:4, the King James Version Chemarims), though the Hebrew word is found also in ^{<1235>}2 Kings 23:5 (English Versions “idolatrous priests”) and ^{<2805>}Hosea 10:5 (English Versions “priests,” English Versions margins, however, having “Chemarim” in both places). Some regard the word as an interpolation in Zeph 1:4, since the Septuagint omits it and its presence disturbs the parallelism. The word, which is of Aramaic origin (kumra, priest), is used in the Old Testament only in an unfavorable sense, its origin and associations naturally suggesting Syriac affinities. In the Syriac, however, no such connotation is involved. In the Peshitta version of the Old Testament it is used indifferently of idolatrous priests and of priests of Yahweh, while in the same version of the New Testament it is used of the Levitical priests and of our Lord (e.g. ^{<3027>}Hebrews 2:17; 3:1; 4:14,15, and often) and in ^{<4185>}Acts 19:35 it is the rendering of [neokoros] (the Revised Version (British and American) “temple-keeper,” the King James Version “worshipper”). The question of the root idea of the word remains unsettled. The traditional supposition, which finds some support even among modern scholars, is

that the verbal form means “to be black,” the priests being supposed to have been clad in black. But it is doubtful whether the root had this meaning. Another conjecture takes the root to mean “to be sad,” the priest being a man of a sad countenance, an ascetic. Cheyne would relate the word to the Assyrian *kummaru*, having the sense of “a clean vesture.” It is at all events probable that the priests, both in Israel and in the surrounding nations, employed white vestments, rather than black, when in the performance of their official functions. According to the Mishna, Middoth, verse 4, a Levitical priest who had become disqualified for service put on black garments and departed, while the others put on white garments and went in and ministered. The reference to the Baal worship in ^{<1212>}2 Kings 10:22 seems more congruous with this view; hence, probably blackrobed priests (Chemarim) of Baal and the unfaithful priests of Yahweh shall be cut off together. G. A. Smith (BTP, II, 56) reads “the priestlings with the priests.”

J. R. Van Pelt

CHEMOSH

<ke'-mosh> (vwΘK)[kemosh]; [αμός, Chamos]:

1. MOABITES, THE PEOPLE OF CHEMOSH:

The national God of the Moabites, as Baal of the Zidonians, or Milcom (Moloch, Malcam) of the Ammonites. The Moabites are apostrophized in an old Hebrew song as the “people of Chemosh” (^{<1212>}Numbers 21:29). Jeremiah in his oracle of doom upon Moab has recourse to the same old song and calls the people “the people of Chemosh.” The impotence of the god to deliver his people is described by the prophet in figures representing him as going into captivity with them, his priests and princes together, and Moab is to be ashamed of him as Israel was of the Golden Calf of Bethel, which did not avail to save the Northern Kingdom from the conquering Assyrian power (^{<2417>}Jeremiah 48:7,13,16).

2. SOLOMON AND CHEMOSH WORSHIP:

For Chemosh, “the abomination of Moab,” as for Moloch, “the abomination of the children of Ammon,” Solomon, under the influence of his idolatrous wives, built a high place in the mount before Jerusalem (^{<1110>}1 Kings 11:7). It was natural that they should desire to worship still after the

manner of the gods of their native land, but although the effect of all this was seen in the moral and spiritual deterioration of Solomon himself there is no indication that the immoralities and cruelties associated with such worship were then practiced in Jerusalem. In the days of Ahaz and Manasseh, even as early as the days of Abijam of Judah, they were (^{<1152>}1 Kings 15:12,13).

3. JOSIAH PUTTING DOWN CHEMOSH WORSHIP:

Josiah found these abominations of alien worship, which had been introduced by Solomon and added to by Ahaz and Manasseh, flourishing when he came to the throne. Moved by the prohibitions of the Book of the Law (^{<6129>}Deuteronomy 12:29-31; 18:10), Josiah pulled down and defiled the high places and the altars, and in order to make a clean sweep of the idolatrous figures, “he brake in pieces the pillars,” or obelisks, “and cut down the Asherim,” or sacred poles, “and filled their places with the bones of men” (^{<1231>}2 Kings 23:1-20).

4. CHEMOSH AND AMMONITES:

There is one passage where Chemosh is designated the god of the Ammonites (^{<7124>}Judges 11:24). Jephthah is disputing the right of the Ammonites to invade territory which belongs to Israel because Yahweh has given it to them by conquest. And he asks: “Shouldst thou not possess the territory of those whom Chemosh, thy god, dispossesses, and we the territory of all whom Yahweh, our god, dispossesses?” It may be that he is called here the god of the Ammonites by a mere oversight of the historian; or that Moab and Ammon being kindred nations descended from a common ancestor, Lot, Chemosh may in a sense belong to both. We notice, however, that Jephthah’s argument in meeting the claim preferred by the king of Ammon passes on to Israel’s relation to the Moabites and makes mention only of well-known Moabite cities. Chemosh is accordingly named because of his association with Moab, the cities of which are being spoken of, although strictly and literally Milcom should have been named in an appeal addressed as a whole to the Ammonites (^{<7112>}Judges 11:12-28; compare Moore at the place).

5. MOABITE STONE:

The discovery of the Moabite Stone in 1868 at Dibon has thrown light upon Chemosh and the relations of Moab to its national god. The

monument, which is now one of the most precious treasures of the Louvre in Paris, bears an inscription which is the oldest specimen of Semitic alphabetic writing extant, commemorating the successful effort made about 860 or 850 BC by Mesha, king of Moab, to throw off the yoke of Israel. We know from the Old Testament record that Moab had been reduced to subjection by David (~~10RE~~2 Samuel 8:2); that it paid a heavy tribute to Ahab, king of Israel (~~10RE~~2 Kings 3:4); and that, on the death of Ahab, Mesha its king rebelled against Israelite rule (~~10RE~~2 Kings 3:5). Not till the reign of Jehoram was any effort made to recover the lost dominion. The king of Israel then allied himself with the kings of Judah and Edom, and marching against Moab by the way of the Red Sea, inflicted upon Mesha a defeat so decisive that the wrath of his god, Chemosh, could be appeased only by the sacrifice of his son (~~10RE~~2 Kings 3:6 ff).

6. MESHA'S INSCRIPTION AND THE OLD TESTAMENT:

The historical situation described in the Old Testament narrative is fully confirmed by Mesha's inscription. There are, however, divergences in detail. In the Book of Kings the revolt of Mesha is said to have taken place after the death of Ahab. The inscription implies that it must have taken place by the middle of Ahab's reign. The inscription implies that the subjection of Moab to Israel had not been continuous from the time of David, and says that `Omri, the father of Ahab, had reasserted the power of Israel and had occupied at least a part of the land.

7. CHEMOSH IN THE INSCRIPTION:

It is with what the inscription says of Chemosh that we are chiefly concerned. On the monument the name appears twelve times. Mesha is himself the son of Chemosh, and it was for Chemosh that he built the high place upon which the monument was found. He built it because among other reasons Chemosh had made him to see his desire upon them that hated him. It was because Chemosh was angry with his land that `Omri afflicted Moab many days. `Omri had taken possession of the land of Medeba and Israel dwelt in it his days and half his son's days, but Chemosh restored it in Mesha's days. Mesha took `Ataroth which the king of Israel had built for himself, slew all the people of the city, and made them a gazing-stock to Chemosh and to Moab. Mesha brought thence the altar-hearth of Dodo, and dragged it before Chemosh in Kerioth. By command of Chemosh, Mesha attacked Nebo and fought against Israel, and after a

fierce struggle he took the place, slaying the inhabitants en masse, 7,000 men and women and maidservants, devoting the city to `Ashtor-Chemosh and dragging the altar vessels of Yahweh before Chemosh. Out of Jahaz, too, which the king of Israel had built, Chemosh drove him before Mesha. At the instigation of Chemosh, Mesha fought against Horonaim, and, although the text is defective in the closing paragraph, we may surmise that Chemosh did not fail him but restored it to his dominions.

8. PARALLELS BETWEEN INSCRIPTION AND OLD TESTAMENT RECORD:

Naturally enough there is considerable obscurity in local and personal allusions. Dodo may have been a local god worshipped by the Israelites East of the Jordan. Ashtor-Chemosh may be a compound divinity of a kind not unknown to Semitic mythology, Ashtor representing possibly the Phoenician Ashtoreth. What is of importance is the recurrence of so many phrases and expressions applied to Chemosh which are used of Yahweh in the Old Testament narratives. The religious conceptions of the Moabites reflected in the inscription are so strikingly like those of the Israelites that if only the name of Yahweh were substituted for that of Chemosh we might think we were reading a chapter of the Books of Kings. It is not in the inscriptions, however, but in the Old Testament narrative that we find a reference to the demand of Chemosh for human sacrifice. "He took his eldest son," says the Hebrew historian, "that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall. And there was great wrath against Israel: and they departed from him, and returned to their own land" (~~2~~2 Kings 3:27). This appears to indicate that the Israelites had to give up their purpose to fasten the yoke of bondage again upon Mesha and that they returned empty-handed to their own land. But this fortunate result for Moab was due to the favor of Chemosh, and in particular to the human sacrifice by which he was propitiated.

9. ETHICAL CONTRAST:

If we find in these representations of Chemosh in the Old Testament narrative and in Mesha's inscription a striking similarity to the Hebrew conception of Yahweh, we cannot fail to notice the lack of the higher moral and spiritual elements supplied to the religion of Israel by the prophets and indeed from Moses and Abraham downward. "Chemosh," says W. Baudissin, "is indeed the ruler of his people whom he protects as

Yahweh the Israelites, whom he chastises in his indignation, and from whom he accepts horrible propitiatory gifts. But of a God of grace whose long-suffering leads back even the erring to Himself, of a Holy God to whom the offering of a pure and obedient heart is more acceptable than bloody sacrifices, of such a God as is depicted in Israel's prophets and sweet singers there is no trace in the Moabite picture of Chemosh. While Mesha is represented as offering up his own son in accordance with the stern requirements of his religion, Old Testament law-givers and prophets from the beginning condemned human sacrifice" (RE3, article "Kemosh").

LITERATURE.

RE3, article "Kemosh"; Cooke, Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions, "Moabite Stone," 1-14; W. Robertson Smith, Prophets of Israel, 49 ff; Sayce, Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments, 364 ff.

T. Nicol.

CHENAANAH

<ke-na'-a-na> (**h** [kena`anah], feminine form of "Canaan," though others explain it as "toward Canaan"): The name of two men:

(1) The fourth-named of the seven sons of Bilham, son of Jediahel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a leading warrior in the time of David (~~<13710>~~ 1 Chronicles 7:10).

(2) Father of the false prophet Zedekiah, who encouraged Ahab against Micaiah (~~<1221>~~ 1 Kings 22:11,24; ~~<14180>~~ 2 Chronicles 18:10,23).

CHENANI

<ke-na'-ni> (**ynhK**) [kenani], "planted"): One of the names mentioned in ~~<16904>~~ Nehemiah 9:4, in connection with the constitution of "congregation." If the names represent houses or families, eight Levitical houses probably sang some well-known psalm on this occasion. If they are names of individual representatives, they were probably deputed to recite or chant some special prayer in order to lead the worship of the people.

CHENANIAH

<ken-a-ni'-a> (𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤔 [kenanyahu], and 𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤓 [kenanyah], literally “established by God”): Chief of the Levites who was over “the songs,” or “the carrying” (namely, “of the ark”) from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (^{<13472>}1 Chronicles 15:22,27; 26:29).

CHEPHAR-AMMONI

<ke-far-am'-o-ni> (the King James Version Chephar-haammoni; 𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤔 [𐤏𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤔 [kephar ha`ammoni]; Codex Vaticanus, [εφεῖρα καὶ Μονεῖ, Kephaira kai Monei]; A, [ἀφῆραμμίν, Kapherammin], “village of the Ammonites”): A place in the territory of Benjamin (^{<16824>}Joshua 18:24). It may be identical with Kefr`Ana, a ruined site about two miles to the Northeast of Bethel.

CHEPHAR-HAAMONI

<ke-far-ha-am'-o-ni>.

See CHEPHAR-AMMONI.

CHEPHIRAH

<ke-fi'-ra> (𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤔 [ha-kephirah]; Codex Vaticanus, [ἀφεῖρά, Kapheira] (Joshua 9); Codex Alexandrinus has [Chepheira], Codex Vaticanus has [καὶ εῖρά, kai Pheira] (Joshua 18)): One of the cities of the Hivites who by guile made alliance with Israel (^{<18917>}Joshua 9:17). It was in the lot of Benjamin (^{<16826>}Joshua 18:26), and was reoccupied after the return from Babylon (^{<18725>}Ezra 2:25; ^{<16729>}Nehemiah 7:29). It is represented by the modern Kefireh, to the Southwest of Gibeon, and North of Karyat el-`Anab. It stands on high ground, with many ancient remains.

CHERAN

<ke'-ran> (𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤓 [keran]): A Horite clan-name, occurring in the genealogy of Seir, the Horite (^{<10335>}Genesis 36:26), and in the parallel list in ^{<13141>}1 Chronicles 1:41. Dillmann derives it from kar, “a lamb.”

CHERETHITES

<ker'-e-thits> (pytrK][kerethim], ytiK" [ha-kerethi]; [ελεθί, Chelethi] "executioners," "life-guardsmen"): A people in South Palestine whose territory bordered upon that of Judah (<1814>1 Samuel 30:14). In <1816>1 Samuel 30:16 this land is apparently identical with that of the Philistines. In <1516>Ezekiel 25:16 the Philistines and the Cherethites are threatened together; while in Zeph 2:5 the Cherethites are evidently the dwellers in "the land of the Philistines," "the inhabitants of the seacoast." Septuagint in both Ezekiel and Zephaniah renders the name "Cretans." The translators may have been "guided only by the sound." But Zeus Cretagenes in Gaza suggests a connection with the island of Crete. See, however, CAPHTOR. It may be taken as certain that the Cherethites were a Philistine clan. In conjunction with the Pelethites they are frequently named as forming the guard of David (<1018>2 Samuel 8:18, etc.). It was the custom of many ancient monarchs to have a guard of foreign mercenaries.

W. Ewing

CHERISH

<cher'-ish> (^k" S;[cakhan]; [θάλπω, thalpo]): [Cakhan], "to act the friend," "to be useful," is translated "cherish" (<1000>1 Kings 1:2,4); [thalpo], "to warm," "to make warm," "to foster" (<1412>Ephesians 5:29), said of the regard the husband should have for his wife, even as his own flesh which he "nourisheth and cherisheth, even as Christ also the church," and in <1717>1 Thessalonians 2:7, of Paul amongst his converts, "as when a nurse cherisheth her own children."

CHERITH, THE BROOK

<ke'-rith> (tyrK]I j " n'[nachal kerith]; [ειμάρρους ορράθ, Cheimarrhous Chorrhath]): The place where Elijah hid and was miraculously fed, after announcing the drought to Ahab (<1173>1 Kings 17:3). It is described as being "before," that is "east," of Jordan. It cannot therefore be identified with Wady el-Kelt, to the West of Jericho. The retreat must be sought in some recess of the Gilead uplands with which doubtless Elijah had been familiar in his earlier days.

CHERUB

<ke'-rub> (bW̄rK̄)[kerubh], [ερούβ, Cheroub], [αρούβ, Charoub]):

A place in Babylonia from which people whose genealogies had fallen into confusion went up at the return from exile (^{<1929>}Ezra 2:59; ^{<1971>}Nehemiah 7:61); unidentified. In 1 Esdras 5:36 we read “Charaathalan leading them, and Allar,” a phrase that seems to have arisen through confusion of the names in the passages cited above.

CHERUBIC, FORMS IN THE CONSTELLATIONS

<che-roo'-bik>.

See *ASTRONOMY*.

CHERUBIM (1)

<cher'-u-bim>, <cher'-oo-bim> (μybW̄rK̄)[kerubhim], plural of cherub,

bW̄rK̄)[kerubh]): Through the influence of the Septuagint, “cherubim” was used in the earlier English versions, also as a singular, hence, the plural was made to sound “cherubims.” The etymology of the word cannot be ascertained.

1. AS GUARDIANS OF PARADISE:

In ^{<1924>}Genesis 3:24 the cherubim are placed by God, after the expulsion of Adam from the garden of Eden, at the east thereof, together with the flaming sword “to keep the way of the tree of life.” In their function as guardians of Paradise the cherubim bear an analogy to the winged bulls and lions of Babylonia and Assyria, colossal figures with human faces standing guard at the entrance of temples (and palaces), just as in Egypt the approaches to the sanctuaries are guarded by sphinxes. But the Babylonian colossi go by the name of lamassu, or shedu; no designation at all approaching the Hebrew [kerubh] has so far been found in the Assyrian language. Nor are thus named the winged figures, half human and half animal, which in Babylonian and Persian art are found on both sides of the “sacred tree.” Thus, a Babylonian origin of the Hebrew cherubim is neither proved nor disproved. If we look for further analogies which, of course, do not indicate a borrowing on the part of the Hebrews, we may mention the fabulous griffins ([γρύπες, grupes]), usually represented as having the

heads and wings of an eagle and the body and hind quarters of a lion; they were believed by the Greeks to inhabit Scythia, and to keep jealous watch over the gold of that country.

2. THE GARDEN AS THE ABODE OF THE GODS:

If we read between the lines of the Paradise account in Genesis (compare 3:8), the garden of Eden, the primeval abode of man, reveals itself as more than that: it was apparently the dwelling-place of God. In the polytheistic story of the creation of the world and early life of man, which, while in several respects analogous (compare 3:22), is devoid of the more spiritual notions of Hebraism, the garden was the abode of the gods who alone had access to the tree of life from the fruit of which they derived their immortality. Adam, before the fall, is conceived as a superhuman being; for while he is forbidden to taste of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, the way to immortality is open to him; for it is only after transgressing the Divine command that he merits death and becomes mortal. The choice of immortal innocence and mortal knowledge lay before him; he elected death with knowledge.

3. THE CHERUBIM AS ATTENDANTS OF THE DEITY:

The mythical elements of the Paradise story are still more patent in ²⁶⁸¹³Ezekiel 28:13 ff, where the fall of the king of Tyre is likened to that of primeval man. The garden is situated on a holy mountain of Elohim(= God to Ezekiel, but gods in the primitive source), the `mountain of assembly' of ²³¹⁴³Isaiah 14:13, high above the stars in the recesses of the North. It is a wonderful place, adorned with all manner of precious stones. There man, perfect from the day he was created, resplendent with beauty, excelling in wisdom, walks among the fiery stones, like a cherub with outstretched wings. The cherubs are apparently the attendants of the Deity, beauteous angels, of whom man was to be one: but he fell from glory and was hurled from the sanctuary which he had polluted. Some of the angelic attendants of the Deity within are placed in Genesis without, to do service as guardians of the unapproachable holy garden.

4. AS BEARERS OF THE THRONE:

As attendants of God, they bear the throne upon which He descends from His high abode. Thus in the description of a theophany in Psalm 18, we read:

*“He bowed the heavens also, and came down;
And thick darkness was under his feet.
And he rode upon a cherub and did fly;
Yea, he soared upon the wings of the wind.”*
(~~Psalm~~ Psalm 18:9,10)

Hence, the Lord, or, as the fuller title goes, the Lord of Hosts, is repeatedly styled “He that sitteth (throned) above the cherubim” (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 80:1; 99:1; ~~1 Samuel~~ 1 Samuel 4:4, and elsewhere). There is certainly no trace here of bull figures: bulls do not fly. The underlying conception is, it seems, rather that of the storm cloud. Compare ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 104:3:

*“Who maketh the clouds his chariot;
Who walketh upon the wings of the wind.”*

The Hebrew for “chariot” is **bWKR**” [rekhubh], a sort of inverted [kerubh].

5. IN THE VISION OF EZEKIEL:

But the function of the cherubim as bearers and movers of the Divine throne is brought out most clearly in the vision of Ezekiel (chapter 1, with which compare chapter 10). In chapter 1 the prophet designates them as “living creatures” (chayyoth); but upon hearing God’s words addressed to the “man clothed in linen” (10:2) he perceives that the living creatures which he saw in the first vision were cherubim (10:20); hence, in 9:3 the chariot or throne, from which the glory of God went up, is spoken of as a cherub. The following is a description in detail of the cherubim as seen by Ezekiel. They are represented as four living creatures, each with four faces, man, lion, ox (replaced in the parallel chapter by cherub), and eagle (1:10; 10:14), having the figure and hands of men (1:5,8), and the feet of calves (1:7). Each has four wings, two of which are stretched upward (1:11), meeting above and sustaining the “firmament,” that is, the bottom of the Divine throne (1:22; 10:1), while two are stretched downward, conformable the one to the other, so as to cover their bodies (1:11,23). In appearance, the living creatures resemble coals of fire (compare 10:2,6 f, where the “man clothed in linen” is bidden fill both his hands with coals of fire from between the cherubim), burning like torches, the fire flashing up and down among the creatures, a bright fire out of which lightning goes forth (1:13). Thus the creatures run and vanish as the appearance of a flash of lightning (1:14). The cherubim do not turn as they change direction, but

always go straight forward (1:9,17; 10:11), as do the wheels of the cherubic chariot with rings full of eyes round about (1:18; 10:12). The cherubim represent the spirit, or will, in the wheels: at the direction of the spirit, the wheels are lifted up from the bottom and the chariot moves upward (1:19 f; 10:16 f). The cherubim are thus the moving force of the vehicle.

6. RELATION TO SERAPHIM AND OTHER ANGELS:

Ezekiel's cherubim are clearly related to the seraphim in Isaiah's inaugural vision (Isaiah 6). Like the cherubim, the seraphim are the attendants on God as He is seated upon a throne high and exalted; they are also winged creatures: with twain they cover their faces, and with twain they cover their feet, and with twain they fly. Like the Levites in the sanctuary below, they sing a hymn of adoration: "Holy, holy, holy, is Yahweh of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." In the Book of Enoch, the cherubim, seraphim, and ophannim (wheels), and all the angels of power constitute the "host of God," the guardians of His throne, the singers of praise ascribing blessedness to "the Lord of Spirits," with the archangel Gabriel at their head (see 20:7; 40; 61:10 f; 71:7). And so in the Jewish daily liturgy the seraphim, ophannim, and "living creatures" constitute the heavenly choir who, the elect ministers of the Living God, ready to do the will of their maker with trembling, intone in sweet harmony the Thrice-holy. In the Talmud, the cherubim are represented as having the likeness of youths (with a fanciful etymology, **bW**r plus **K**[ke] plus [rubh], "like a youth"; Cukk 5b; Chag 13b), while, according to the Midrash, they have no definite shape, but appear indifferently as men or women, or as spirits and angelic beings (Genesis rabba' 21).

7. IN REVELATION 4:

The "four living creatures" of ~~Rev~~ Revelation 4:6 ff are clearly modeled upon Ezekiel, with supplementary touches from Isaiah. Full of eyes before and behind, they are in the midst of the throne, and round about it. One resembles a lion, the other a calf, and the third a man, and the fourth a flying eagle. Each of the creatures has six wings. "They have no rest day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God, the Almighty, who was and who is and who is to come."

8. ORNAMENTAL CHERUBIM IN THE TEMPLE OF SOLOMON:

In the temple of Solomon, two gigantic cherubic images of olive-wood plated with gold, ten cubits high, stood in the innermost sanctuary (the debhir) facing the door, whose wings, five cubits each, extended, two of them meeting in the middle of the room to constitute the throne, while two extended to the walls (^{<1023>}1 Kings 6:23-28; 8:6,7; ^{<4180>}2 Chronicles 3:10-13; 5:7,8). The Chronicler represents them as the chariot of the Lord (^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 28:18). There were also images of the cherubim carved on the gold-plated cedar planks which constituted the inner walls of the temple, and upon the olive-wood doors (^{<1029>}1 Kings 6:29,35; ^{<4187>}2 Chronicles 3:7); also on the bases of the portable lavers, interchanging with lions and oxen (^{<1072>}1 Kings 7:29-36). According to the Chronicler, they were also woven in the veil of the Holy of Holies (^{<4184>}2 Chronicles 3:14).

9. IN THE TEMPLE OF EZEKIEL:

Ezekiel represents the inner walls of the temple as carved with alternating palm trees and cherubim, each with two faces, the lion looking on one side, the man on the other (^{<2418>}Ezekiel 41:18-25).

10. IN THE TABERNACLE:

In the Tabernacle, there were two cherubim of solid gold upon the golden slab of the "lid," or "mercy-seat," facing each other, with wings outstretched above, so as to constitute a throne on which the glory of the Lord appeared, and from which He spake (^{<12518>}Exodus 25:18-22; 37:7-9; ^{<4089>}Numbers 7:89; ^{<3905>}Hebrews 9:5). There were also cherubim woven into the texture of the inner curtain of the Tabernacle and the veil (^{<12301>}Exodus 26:1,31; 36:8,35). There were no cherubim in the temple of Herod, but the walls were painted with figures of them (see Talmud Yoma' 54a). In the times of Josephus no one knew what the Scriptural cherubim looked like (Ant., VIII, iii, 3).

LITERATURE.

Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, under the word; KAT3, 529 f, and references; commentaries on Genesis and Ezekiel.

Max L. Margolis

CHERUBIM (2)

The cherubic forms in the constellation figures.

See ASTRONOMY, II, 8.

CHESALON

<kes'-a-lon> (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲁⲗⲟⲛ})[kecalon]; [ασλών, Chaslon], [ασαλών, Chasalon]): One of the cities on the Northern boundary of Judah (^{ⲙⲓⲃⲁⲗⲟⲛ}Joshua 15:10). In the 4th century it was a "very large village." It is now Kesla, 2,087 ft. above sea-level, a small village perched on a mountain ridge to the South of Wady el Humar. See Palestine Exploration Fund, III, 25, 26; Sh XVII.

CHESED

<ke'-sed>, <kes'-ed> (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ} " [kasdim]; [άσζαδ, Chaszad]): One of the sons of Nahor and Milcah (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Genesis 22:22); was probably the father of the Casdim. The early Babylonian form Kasdu appears in Assyrian as Kaldu or Kaldu. English Versions of the Bible follows the Assyrian and Greek style of writing the name and uses Chaldees or Chaldeans instead of Casdim. The Chaldeans dwelt in the lower valley of the Euphrates, at the head of the Persian Gulf. Abram came from Ur of the Chaldees (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Genesis 11:28,31; 15:7; ^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Nehemiah 9:7). In ^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Job 1:17 the Casdim are described as invading the land of Uz, the eldest brother of Chesed (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Genesis 22:21,22). In the days of Nebuchadrezzar the Casdim overran Syria and Palestine and carried the people of Judah in successive deportations into captivity (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}2 Kings 24:1 f,10 ff; 25:1 ff). In ^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Daniel 2:2,5 the Casdim are named with the magicians and astrologers as a learned class, skilled in interpretations. Casdim is sometimes used in Hebrew for the land of Chaldea (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲉⲃ}Ezekiel 23:15 f; 11:24).

John Richard Sampey

CHESIL

<ke'-sil>, <kes'-il> (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲓⲗ})[kecil]; A, [ασειρ, Chaseir]): A town in the extreme South of Judah named with Eltolad, Hormah and Ziklag (^{ⲕⲉⲥⲓⲗ}Joshua 15:30). The name does not occur again. In ^{ⲕⲉⲥⲓⲗ}Joshua 19:4 it is

replaced by Bethul Septuagint [**Βαιθήλ**, Baithel]), and in ^{<1040>}1 Chronicles 4:30 by Bethuel. “Chesil” may have arisen from a misreading of the text.

CHESNUT

<ches'-nut>.

See *CHESTNUT*.

CHEST

<chest> (**ʾwṯa**:[ʾaron], **μυζη** [genazim]; [**κιβωτός**, kibotos]):

(1) The ark of the covenant in Old Testament is invariably denoted by the word ‘aron, elsewhere rendered the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “chest.”

See *ARK*.

(2) [ʾAron] is also the word rendered “coffin” (^{<0815>}Genesis 50:26: “and he was put in a coffin in E.”).

See *COFFIN*.

(3) In Kings and Chronicles (^{<1219>}2 Kings 12:9,10; ^{<1218>}2 Chronicles 24:8,10,11) [ʾaron] stands uniformly for a money chest. It is the “chest” that Jehoiada, the priest, placed in the court “beside the altar” and “bored a hole in the lid of” that the priests might “put therein all the money that was brought into the house of Yahweh” (^{<1219>}2 Kings 12:9); and “the chest” that King Joash commanded to be made and set “without at the gate of the house of Yahweh” to receive “the tax that Moses the servant of God laid upon Israel” (^{<0818>}2 Chronicles 24:8,10,11). One feature is common to the thing meant in all these applications — the c. was rectangular in shape, and, most probably in every instance, made of wood.

(4) Josephus (Ant., VI, 1,2) uses the equivalent of the word to denote the “coffer” (^{<0081>}1 Samuel 6:8 ff English Versions), or small chest, in which the princes of Philistia deposited the gold mice.

(5) In New Testament times the “chests” that were provided in the court of the women, in the temple of Herod, to receive the various kinds of money gifts had the exceptional shape of a trumpet (if Sheqalim, vi.5 may

be trusted) — wide at the bottom and gradually narrowing toward the top, hence, called **twōpwo** [shopharoth]. It was into these that the Master was watching the multitude casting in their money when He saw the poor widow cast in her two mites (^{<4124>}Mark 12:41,42).

(6) In ^{<3572>}Ezekiel 27:24, where the prophet is giving an inventory of the merchandise of Tyre, another word entirely is used ([genazim]), and it is rendered in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “chests” (“chests of rich apparel, bound with cords and made of cedar”). According to Cornill, Davidson, Smend and others this rendering is without sufficient support (see Smith, Dictionary of the Bible and commentary in the place cited.).

George B. Eager

CHESTNUT, TREE

<ches'-nut>.

See *PLANE TREE*.

CHESULLOTH

<ke-sul'-oth> (**twōskīh**" [ha-keculloth]; B, [**ασαλώθ**, Chasaloth], A, [**χεσαλώθ**, Achesaloth]): A town on the border of Zebulun (^{<6918>}Joshua 19:18), the same as Chisloth-tabor (^{<6912>}Joshua 19:12). It is represented by the modern village Iksal on the northern edge of Esdraelon, circa 3 miles West of Mt. Tabor.

CHETH

<khath>.

See *CHETH*.

CHETTIIM

<ket'-i-im>, <ket-i'-im> (**μyTKi**[kittim]).

See *KITTIM*.

CHEW; CUD

<choo>, <chu>, (~~hr~~ ~~g~~ ~~o~~ ~~s~~ ~~i~~ ~~s~~ ~~h~~ ~~i~~ ~~l~~ ~~h~~) [ma`aleh gerah], literally “bringing up” (American Revised Versions margin), i.e. “chewing the cud,” from garar, “to roll,” “ruminate”): One of the marks of cleanliness, in the sense of fitness for food, of a quadruped, given in ~~Leviticus~~ ^{<610>} Leviticus 11:3 and ~~Deuteronomy~~ ^{<614>} Deuteronomy 14:6, is the chewing of the cud. Among the animals considered clean are therefore included the ox, the sheep, the goat, the hart, the gazelle, the roebuck, the wild goat, the pygarg, the antelope and the chamois. Several of the forbidden animals are expressly named in the passages, e.g. the camel, the rock-badger, the hare and the swine. In addition to the distinctions between clean and unclean animals mentioned in the Bible, the Talmud points out that the clean animals have no upper teeth, that their horns are either forked, or if not forked they are clear of splinters, notched with scales and round, and that certain portions of the meat of clean animals tear lengthwise as well as across. Many theories have been advanced as to the reasons for the distinctions with regard to the chewing of the cud and the cloven hoof. See the Jewish Encyclopedia under the word “Clean.” The most obvious is that ruminating animals and animals without claws were apparently cleaner-feeding animals than the others.

Nathan Isaacs

CHEZIB

<ke’-zib>.

See *ACHZIB* (1).

CHICKEN

<chik’-’-n>, <chik’-in> (Anglo-Saxon, cicen or cycen; Latin, Gallus ferrugineus; [~~ἀ~~ ~~λ~~ ~~ε~~ ~~κ~~ ~~τ~~ ~~ρ~~ ~~υ~~ ~~ὸ~~ ~~ν~~, alektruon], masculine and fem.): A barnyard fowl of any age. The record is to be found in the books of the disciples, but Jesus is responsible for the only direct mention of chickens in the Bible.

~~Matthew~~ ^{<1237>} Matthew 23:37, contains this: “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!” Luke’s version of the same scene says: “Even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings” (~~Luke~~ ^{<2134>} Luke

13:34). There is no reference to chickens in the Old Testament sufficiently clear to specify our common domestic bird. The many references to “fatted fowl” in these older records, in accordance with the text and the history of the other nations, were pigeons, guineas, ducks, geese and swans. The importation of peafowl by Solomon is mentioned. The cock and hen are distinctive birds and would have been equally a marvel worth recording had they been introduced at that time. From the history of the bird in other countries it is a safe estimate to place their entrance into Palestine between five and six hundred years BC. That would allow sufficient time for them to increase and spread until they would be well known and common enough to be used effectively in the ministry of Jesus Christ. Every historical fact and indication points to the capture and domestication of the red jungle fowl in Burma. The Chinese records prove that they first secured imported fowl from the West in 1400 BC. Their use for food dated from 1200 to 800 BC, in the Book of Manu, but it was specified that only those that ran wild were to be eaten. From these countries they were imported to Greece and Italy, and from there carried south into Palestine. Homer ([?] 10; compare also [alektruon], P 602) names a man Cock, [alektor], which seems to indicate that he knew the bird. Pindar gives them slight mention; Aristophanes wrote of them as “Persian birds,” which indicates that they worked their way westward by importation. I cannot find them in the records of Aristotle, but Aristophanes advanced the idea that not the gods, but the birds were rulers of men in ancient times, and compared the comb of the cock with the crown of a king, and pointed out that when he “merely crows at dawn all jump up to their work” (Aves, 489-90). They were common in Italy in the days of Pliny, who was ten years old at the time of the crucifixion of Christ. Pliny gave many rules for raising chickens, proving that much was known of their habits in his time. Yet so credulous was he and so saturated with superstition, that, mixed with his instructions for preserving eggs, brooding and raising chickens, is the statement that on account of the fighting power of the cocks the lions feared them. He wrote that a man named Galerius in the time of the consuls, Lepidus and Catulus, owned a barnyard fowl that spoke. He names Lenius Strabo as the first man to devise a “coupe” to keep fowl in and “cram” them to fatness. He gave the laws governing the use of fowl at table and recorded that in Egypt eggs were hatched in manure beds, which is conclusive proof that birds had been carried across the Mediterranean several centuries previous. The records of Babylon, 600 BC, contain figures undoubtedly intended for cocks, and they were reproduced in marble in Lycia at that time, In all

these reproductions the birds have the drooping tail of the wild, and there is no record of the date at which they erected the tail, lifted the head and assumed the upright bearing of today.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CHIDE

<chid>: Only in the Old Testament, translating Hebrew **byrl**[ribh], a word which is more frequently rendered “strive.” Since in ^{<0336>}Genesis 31:36; ^{<0708>}Judges 8:1; ^{<0939>}Psalms 103:9, the strife is one of words, it means in these passages, “scold,” or “sharply censure,” and is applied either to mutinous protests and reproaches of inferiors to a superior, or, as in the last of these passages, to rebukes administered by a superior to inferiors.

CHIDON, THE THRESHING-FLOOR OF

<ki'-don>, ([^]dyKi[^]r⁶⁰ [Goren kidhon]; Septuagint B, omits; A has [**ειλώ**, Cheilo]): The place where Uzza perished because he touched the ark (^{<1339>}1 Chronicles 13:9). In ^{<1006>}2 Samuel 6:6 it is called the threshing-floor of Nachon. No name resembling either of these has been discovered.

CHIEF

<chef>: The English word is in the King James Version of Old Testament the translation of some 17 different Hebrew words, most frequently of [ro'sh], “head,” [sar], “prince,” and [re'shith], “beginning.” The principal changes made by the Revised Version (British and American) are:

(1) Hebrew [beth'abh], “house of a father,” being recognized as a technical term denoting a subdivision of a tribe, [ro'sh] is rendered literally “head,” when it occurs in connection with this phrase, so that “chief fathers” (Num 31:26) and “chief of the fathers” (^{<1506>}Ezra 1:5) become “heads of fathers' houses”;

(2) Hebrew [naghidh] and [nasi'] are more accurately translated “prince” in such passages as ^{<1382>}1 Chronicles 5:2; ^{<0432>}Numbers 3:32;

(3) the misinterpretations which brought about the translation “chief” for [’atsilim], “corners,” ^{<2409>}Isaiah 41:9, and for [ma`aleh], “ascent,” in ^{<1423>}2 Chronicles 32:33, are corrected.

In the New Testament “chief” is in most of its appearances the translation of Greek [protos], “first”; the Revised Version (British and American) reads “first” for the King James Version “chief,” “chiefest,” in <4017> Matthew 20:27; <4104> Mark 10:44; <4462> Acts 16:12. The reading in the latter passage is a difficult one, but the King James Version “Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia,” seems to imply a political authority which Philippi did not possess; the Revised Version (British and American) “a city of Macedonia, the first of the district.” Greek [archon], “prince,” “ruler,” is rendered by the King James Version “chief,” by the Revised Version (British and American) “prince,” in <2115> Luke 11:15; the King James Version “chief Pharisees,” the Revised Version (British and American) “rulers of the Pharisees,” in <2441> Luke 14:1.

The original meaning of “chief” having been weakened, the comparative and superlative were admitted into English, the latter only appearing in the King James Version or the Revised Version: <0029> 1 Samuel 2:29; Song 5:10; <4716> 2 Corinthians 11:5, etc. On “chief of Asia” (<4498> Acts 19:31 the King James Version) *see ASIARCH*.

F. K. Farr

CHIEF FRIENDS, GOOD, MEN

See FRIENDS, CHIEF; GOOD, CHIEF; CHIEF.

CHIEF MUSICIAN

<mu-zish'-an>.

See ASAPH.

CHIEF SEATS

<chief sets> ([πρωτοκαθεδρία, protokathedria]): It was one of the reproaches urged by our Lord against the scribes and Pharisees that they loved the chief seats in the synagogues (<4236> Matthew 23:6; <4129> Mark 12:39; <2143> Luke 11:43; 20:46). These were special seats set in front of the ark containing the Scriptures and of the reader's platform, and facing the congregation. They were specially reserved for those who were held in the highest honor in the congregation. There were seventy-one such seats in the great synagogue of Alexandria, which were occupied by the members of the great Council in that city (*see SYNAGOGUE*).

J. Macartney Wilson

CHILD; CHILDREN

<child>, <chil'-dren> (בֶּן [ben], “son,” בְּרִיָּה [bryeh], “child” רֵעַ [re'ar], “lad”; [τέκνον, teknon], [παῖδιον, paidion]): The Hebrews regarded the presence of children in the family as a mark of Divine favor and greatly to be desired (^{<0182>}Genesis 15:2; 30:1; ^{<0011>}1 Samuel 1:11,20; ^{<0078>}Psalms 127:3; ^{<0107>}Luke 1:7,28). The birth of a male child was especially a cause for rejoicing (^{<0088>}Psalms 128:3, Hebrew); more men, more defenders for the tribe. If there were no sons born to a household, that family or branch became lost. If the wife proved childless, other wife or wives might be added to the family (Genesis 16 f). Further, each Jewish mother, at least in later times, hoped that her son might prove to be the Messiah. The custom of Levirate marriage, which was not limited to the Hebrew people, rested on the principle that if a man died childless his brother should marry his widow, the children of such union being considered as belonging to the brother whose name and line were thus preserved from extinction (^{<0085>}Deuteronomy 25:5; ^{<0086>}Genesis 38:26; ^{<0224>}Matthew 22:24).

Children were sometimes dedicated to God, even before their birth (^{<0011>}1 Samuel 1:11). Names often were significant: Moses (^{<0020>}Exodus 2:10); Samuel (^{<0011>}1 Samuel 1:20); Ichabod (^{<0021>}1 Samuel 4:21; compare Genesis 30) (*see* PROPER NAMES). The firstborn son belonged to God (^{<0034>}Numbers 3:44 ff). The ceremony of redeeming the firstborn occurred on the thirtieth day. Friends of the family were invited to a feast, the rabbi also being present. The child was placed in the hands of the priest. The father carried some gold or silver in a cup or vessel. The priest asked the mother whether this was her firstborn, and, on being answered in the affirmative, claimed the child as Yahweh's. The father offered the redemption money, which was accepted in exchange for the child (compare ^{<0018>}1 Peter 1:18). *See* **FIRSTBORN**. Other stages in the life of the child were celebrated with fitting ceremonies. In the fourth year, in Palestine, on the second day of the Passover occurred the ceremony of the first cutting of the boy's hair, the friends sharing the privilege. Sometimes, as in the case of the wealthy, the weight of the child in currency was given as a donation to the poor. In common with the custom of other eastern peoples, male children were circumcised (^{<0172>}Genesis 17:12), the rite being performed on the eighth day.

Early education was cared for in the home, the children growing up more or less with the mother (^{<3061>}Proverbs 6:20; 31:1; ^{<3005>}2 Timothy 1:5; 3:14,15), and the girl continuing with her mother until her marriage. In wealthier families tutors were employed (^{<3272>}1 Chronicles 27:32). Schools for children are first mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XV, x, 5). According to the Talmud the first school for children was established about 100 BC, but in the time of Jesus such schools were common. Children were taught to read and to write even in families of moderate means, these arts being widely diffused as early as 600 BC, if not earlier (^{<2801>}Isaiah 8:1; 10:19). Great stress was laid on the Torah, i.e. the law of Moses. Boys were trained also in farming, the tending of cattle, and in the trades. The religious training of the boy began in his fourth year, as soon as he could speak distinctly. The religious life of the girl also began early. In later times at least children took part in the Sabbath and Passover festivals and boys attended synagogue and school regularly.

Children were subject to the father (^{<4885>}Nehemiah 5:5 marks the extreme), who in turn was bound to protect them, though he himself had the power of life and death (^{<8182>}Leviticus 18:21; 20:2 ff). Respect for and obedience to parents were stoutly upheld by public opinion (^{<1212>}Exodus 20:12; ^{<8516>}Deuteronomy 5:16; compare ^{<1060>}Proverbs 6:20; ^{<3006>}Micah 7:6; ^{<6218>}Deuteronomy 21:18-21; ^{<1215>}Exodus 21:15).

Both the Old Testament and New Testament afford abundant evidence of the strength of the bond that bound the Hebrew family together (^{<0216>}Genesis 21:16; ^{<10833>}2 Samuel 18:33; ^{<1083>}1 Kings 3:23 ff; ^{<1049>}2 Kings 4:19; ^{<2100>}Isaiah 8:4; ^{<8295>}Job 29:5; ^{<0093>}Matthew 19:13; 20:20; ^{<1024>}Mark 9:24; ^{<0088>}Luke 2:48; ^{<8047>}John 4:47; ^{<8023>}Hebrews 2:13; 11:23). The gift of a son from Yahweh was the height of joy; the loss of a child marked the depth of woe. A hint occurs in the custom of naming a man as the father of his firstborn son (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, I, 382), or even the use of the father's name as a surname (Bar-jonah, Bartimeus) and such continues in Syria at the present day. This idea is further instanced in the use, in both Old Testament and New Testament, of the terms to express the relation between God and men (^{<1042>}Exodus 4:22; ^{<6140>}Deuteronomy 14:1; 32:6; ^{<3004>}Jeremiah 3:4; ^{<8120>}Zechariah 12:10; ^{<3006>}Malachi 1:6).

See also FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS; SONS.

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, Hebraische Archäologie, 2nd edition, 1907, 112-23; for rabbinical lore, Friedenberg in Jewish Encyclopedia, IV, 27 f.

W. N. Stearns

Figurative: Child is the English Versions of the Bible rendering of the Greek [τέκνον, teknon]. The corresponding Hebrew words (בֶּן [ben], and בֶּן [yeledh]), are usually translated “son,” but they have practically the same significance in the figurative use of the term. Child is used figuratively to describe:

- (1) An affectionate greeting. Jesus addressed the sick of the palsy as “child” (Mark 2:5 the Revised Version, margin).
- (2) The disciples, or followers, of a teacher. Jesus addressed His disciples as children (Mark 10:24). Paul referred to Timothy as his child (1 Tim 1:2), and also to Onesimus (Philem 1:10). John also designated the disciples to whom he was writing as his children (2 John 1:4). The same use of “children” or “sons” is common in the Old Testament (see 1 Kings 20:35; 2 Kings 2:3,5,7; 4:38). As a term of special endearment, disciples are sometimes called “little children” ([τεκνία, teknia]). Jesus thus addressed His disciples when He was speaking about His departure (John 13:33). Paul thus addressed the Galatians (Galatians 4:19), and that was a favorite expression with John (see 1 John 2:1; 4:4; 5:21). A term that was even more endearing was paidia, which means “little ones” or “babes.” Jesus used this term once in addressing His disciples after His resurrection (John 21:5), and John also used this term occasionally in saluting those to whom he was writing (1 John 2:18).
- (3) Those who belong to God. Children of God is a common expression in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. It is based on the relation between parents and children, and in general describes God’s affection for His own, and their dependence upon Him, and moral likeness to Him. The term is sometimes used of those who are disloyal to God, and they are designated as “rebellious children” (see Isaiah 30:1).

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

- (4) Those who belong to the devil. Those who are like the devil in thought and action are designated as “children of the devil” (1 John 3:10).

(5) One's relation to something to which he belongs, or by which he is dominated in his affection for it. Thus we have

- (a) the children of a city or country (see <4216>Jeremiah 2:16; <4237>Matthew 23:37), and this designates those who belong to that particular city or country;
 - (b) children of wisdom (<4119>Matthew 11:19 the King James Version; <4175>Luke 7:35), and these are the ones whose lives are dominated by wisdom. Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek adopted [ergon] for [teknon] in <4119>Matthew 11:19, but this seems to be without any good reason;
 - (c) children of obedience (1 Pet 1:14), and these are the ones who are eager to obey;
 - (d) children of light (<4188>Ephesians 5:8), and this designates those whose souls are illumined by the light.
- (6) Those who are liable to some particular fate. Thus, we have
- (a) children of cursing, or those who are exposed to cursing (2 Pet 2:14), and
 - (b) children of wrath or those who are exposed to wrath (<4188>Ephesians 2:3).
- (7) Moral likeness or spiritual kinship (<4187>Galatians 3:7 the King James Version; compare <4189>John 8:39; "the children of Abraham"). See secs. (3), (4).

A. W. Fortune

CHILD-BEARING

<child'-bar-ing>: Only in <5425>1 Timothy 2:15: "She shall be saved through her (m "the") child-bearing" ([διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, dia tes teknogonias]). The reference is to the calling of woman as wife and mother, as her ordinary lot in life, and to the anxieties, pains and perils of maternity, as the culmination and representation of the penalties woman has incurred because of the Fall (<4186>Genesis 3:16). "She shall be saved by keeping faithfully and simply to her allotted sphere as wife and mother" (Dummelow). The preposition [dia] is not used here instrumentally, as though child-bearing were a means of her salvation, but locally, as in <4185>1

Corinthians 3:15, “saved so as through fire,” where life is saved by rushing through the flames. The explanation by reference to the incarnation, with an appeal to ~~<804>~~ Galatians 4:4, favored by Ellicott and others, seems very mechanical.

H. E. Jacobs

CHILDHOOD, GOSPELS OF THE

<child'-hood>.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

CHILDREN OF EDEN

<e'-d'-n> (^d[, ynB] [bene `edhen]): In ~~<12912>~~ 2 Kings 19:12; ~~<23712>~~ Isaiah 37:12 “the children of Eden that were in Telassar” are mentioned in connection with “Gozan, and Haran, and Rezep” as having been destroyed by the Assyrians who were before the time of Sennacherib. The expression, “the children of Eden that were in Telassar,” undoubtedly referred to a tribe which inhabited a region of which Telassar was the center. Telassar means “the hill of Asshur” and, according to Schrader, it was a name that might have been given to any place where a temple had been built to Asshur. Inasmuch as Gozan, and Haran, and Rezep were in Mesopotamia it would seem probable that “the children of Eden that were in Telassar” belonged to the same locality. The “children of Eden” is quite probably to be identified with the Bit `Adini of the inscriptions and this referred to a district on the middle Euphrates. According to the inscriptions Gozan, Haran, Rezep, and Bit `Adini were destroyed by Sennacherib’s forefathers, and this is in accord with the account in 2 Kings and Isaiah.

The “Eden” of ~~<35723>~~ Ezekiel 27:23 is usually taken as the name of a place in Mesopotamia with which Tyre had commercial relations, and probably belongs to the region of “the children of Eden,” discussed above.

Some writers think the “Beth-eden” of Amos 15 the Revised Version, margin (the American Standard Revised Version “Aven”) is to be identified with the Bit `Adini of the inscriptions and hence, with “the children of Eden,” but this is doubtful. This was perhaps in Syria in the neighborhood of Damascus.

A. W. Fortune

CHILDREN OF GOD

INTRODUCTION: MEANING OF TERMS:

Children (Sons and Daughters) of God ($\gamma\eta\beta$)[bene] and $\mu\eta\eta\iota\ \alpha'\ \tau\eta\beta$ [benoth 'elohim], literally "sons and daughters of God"; [$\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, tekna theou], and [$\nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, huioi theou]): so the King James Version; but the Revised Version (British and American) translates the latter Greek phrase more accurately "sons of God." Tekna contains the idea of origin or descent, but also that of personal relation, and is often used metaphorically of "that intimate and reciprocal relationship formed between men by the bonds of love, friendship, trust, just as between parents and children" (Grimm-Thayer). [Huioi], too, conveys the ideas of origin, and of personal relation, but the latter in the fuller form in which it appears in mature age. "The difference between [huios] and [teknon] appears to be that whereas teknon denotes the natural relationship of child to parent, [huios] implies in addition to this the recognized status and legal privileges reserved for sons" (Sanday and Headlam, on ~~8:14~~ Romans 8:14). This difference obtains, however, only in a very general sense.

The above phrases denote the relation in which men are conceived to stand to God, either as deriving their being from Him and depending upon Him, or as standing in that personal relation of intimate trust and love toward Him which constitutes the psychological fact of sonship. The exact significance of the expression depends upon the conception of God, and particularly of His Fatherhood, to which it corresponds. It therefore attains to its full significance only in the New Testament, and its meaning in the Old Testament differs considerably, even though it marks stages of development up to the New Testament idea.

I. OLD TESTAMENT TEACHING.

The most primitive form of the idea appears in ~~6:1-4~~ Genesis 6:1-4, where the sons of God by marrying the fair daughters of men become the fathers of the giants.

1. Mythological Survivals:

These were a subordinate order of Divine beings or demi-gods, and the title here may mean no more, although it was probably a survival of an earlier idea of the actual descent of these gods from a higher God. The idea

of a heavenly court where the sons of God come to present themselves before Yahweh is found in quite late literature (<3800> Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; <420> Psalm 29:1; 89:6). In all these cases the phrase implies a certain kinship with God and dependence upon Him on the part of the Divine society around Him. But there is no evidence to show whether the idea of descent of gods from God survived to any extent, nor is there any indication of a very close personal relationship. Satan is unsympathetic, if not hostile. In one obviously polytheistic reference, the term implies a similarity of appearance (<2025> Daniel 3:25). In a secondary sense the titles “gods,” and “sons of the Most High” are given to magistrates, as exercising God’s authority (<4806> Psalm 82:6).

2. Created Sonship:

The idea of creation has taken the place of that of procreation in the Old Testament, but without losing the sense of sonship. “Saith Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker: Ask me concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands” (<2361> Isaiah 45:11). Israel acknowledges the absolute sovereignty of God as her Father and Maker (<2608> Isaiah 64:8). Israel’s Maker is also her Husband, and by inference the Father of her children (<2845> Isaiah 54:5). Since all Israel has one Father, and one God created her, the tribes owe brotherly conduct to one another (<3020> Malachi 2:10). Yahweh upbraids His sons and daughters whom He as their Father bought, made and established. “He forsook God who made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation. Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that gave thee birth” (<4636> Deuteronomy 32:6,15,18 ff). These passages reveal the transition from the idea of original creation to that of making and establishing Israel as a nation. All things might be described as children of God if creation alone brought it to pass, but Israel stands in a unique relation to God.

3. Israel’s Collective Covenant Sonship:

The covenant relation of God with Israel as a nation is the chief form in which man’s sonship and God’s fatherhood appear in the Old Testament. “Israel is my son, my firstborn” (<1042> Exodus 4:22); “When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt” (<2800> Hosea 11:1). And to be children of God involves the obligation to be a holy people (<4640> Deuteronomy 14:1,2). But Israel has proved unworthy of her status: “I have brought up children, and they have rebelled against me” (<2300> Isaiah 1:2,4; 30:1,9). Yet He will have pity upon them: “for I am a father to

Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn” (^{<2610>}Jeremiah 31:9,20). Israel’s unworthiness does not abolish the relation on God’s side; she can therefore return to Him again and submit to His will (^{<2536>}Isaiah 63:16; 64:8); and His pity exceeds a mother’s love (^{<2395>}Isaiah 49:15). The filial relation of Israel to God is summed up and symbolized in a special way in the Davidic king: “I will be his father, and he shall be my son” (^{<1074>}2 Samuel 7:14 = ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 17:13; compare ^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 22:10; 28:6; ^{<1917>}Psalms 2:7).

4. Individual and Personal Relation:

God’s fatherhood to collective Israel necessarily tends to develop into a personal relation of father and son between Him and individual members of the nation. The children of Israel, whatever their number, shall be called “the sons of the living God” (^{<3010>}Hosea 1:10). Yahweh’s marriage relation with Israel as a nation made individual Israelites His children (^{<3019>}Hosea 2:19,20; ^{<3014>}Jeremiah 3:14,22; compare ^{<2800>}Isaiah 50:1; ^{<3160>}Ezekiel 16:20,21; 23:37), and God’s ownership of His children, the individual members of the nation, is asserted (compare ^{<1978>}Psalms 127:3). Chastisement and pity alike God deals forth as Father to His children (^{<1033>}Deuteronomy 1:31; 8:5; ^{<1933>}Psalms 103:13), and these are intimate personal relations which can only obtain between individuals.

5. Universalizing the Idea:

In another direction the idea of God as the father of Israel tends to be modified by the inclusion of the Gentiles. The word “first-born” (in ^{<1022>}Exodus 4:22 and ^{<2610>}Jeremiah 31:9,20) may be only an emphatic form of expressing sonship, or it may already suggest the possibility of the adoption of the Gentiles. If that idea is not present in words, it is an easy and legitimate inference from several passages, that Gentiles would be admitted some day into this among the rest of Israel’s privileges (^{<2395>}Isaiah 19:25; 65:1; ^{<3146>}Zechariah 14:16).

II. NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

1. Physical and Limited Sonship Disappears:

As the doctrine of Divine fatherhood attains its full spiritual and moral significance in the New Testament, so does the experience and idea of sonship. All traces of physical descent have disappeared. Paul’s quotation from a heathen poet: “For we are also his offspring” (^{<4178>}Acts 17:28), whatever its original significance, is introduced by the apostle for the

purpose of enforcing the idea of the spiritual kinship of God and men. The phrase “Son of God” applied to Christ by the Roman centurion (^{<425>}Matthew 27:54; ^{<415>}Mark 15:39) may or may not, in his mind, have involved the idea of physical descent, but its utterance was the effect of an impression of similarity to the gods, produced by the exhibition of power attending His death. The idea of creation is assumed in the New Testament, but generally it is not prominent in the idea of sonship. The virgin birth of Jesus, however, may be understood as implying either the creative activity of the Holy Spirit, or the communication of a preexistent Divine being to form a new human personality, but the latter idea also would involve creative activity in the physical realm (compare ^{<438>}Luke 3:38: “Adam (son) of God”). The limitations of the Old Testament conception of sonship as national and collective disappear altogether in the New Testament; God is father of all men, and of every man. In potentiality at least every man and all men are sons of God. The essence of sonship consists in a personal experience and moral likeness which places man in the most intimate union and communion with God.

2. As Religious Experience, or Psychological Fact:

(1) Filial Consciousness of Jesus.

Divine sonship was first realized and made manifest in the consciousness of Jesus (^{<412>}Matthew 11:27). For Him it meant unbroken personal knowledge of God and communion with Him, and the sense of His love for Him and of His satisfaction and delight in Him (^{<437>}Matthew 3:17; 17:5; ^{<401>}Mark 1:11; 9:7; ^{<432>}Luke 3:22; 9:35). Whether the “voice out of the heavens saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” was objective or not, its message always dwelt in the filial consciousness of Jesus. The Father’s love was to Him a source of knowledge and power (^{<430>}John 5:20), the reward of His self-sacrifice (^{<407>}John 10:17) and the inspiration of His love for men (^{<450>}John 15:9).

Sonship meant for Him His Messianic mission (^{<416>}Matthew 16:16,17). It involved His dependence on the Father and His obedience to Him (^{<459>}John 5:19,30; 8:29), and a resulting confidence in His mission (5:36; 10:36,37). It filled Him with a sense of dignity, power and glory which the Father gave Him, and would yet give in larger measure (^{<413>}Matthew 26:63,14; 16:27; ^{<475>}John 17:5).

(2) Communicated to Men.

Jesus communicated His own experience of God to men (^{<449>}John 14:9)

that they also might know the Father's love and dwell in it (^{<B726>}John 17:26). Through Him and through Him alone can they become children of God in fact and in experience (^{<B112>}John 1:12; 14:6; ^{<B117>}Matthew 11:27). It is therefore a distinctively Christian experience and always involves a relation of faith in Christ and moral harmony with Him. It differs from His experience in one essential fact, at least in most men. It involves an inner change, a change of feeling and motive, of ideal and attitude, that may be compared to a new birth (^{<B33>}John 3:3). Man must turn and return from disobedience and alienation through repentance to childlike submission (^{<B518>}Luke 15:18-20). It is not the submission of slaves, but the submission of sons, in which they have liberty and confidence before God (^{<B106>}Galatians 4:6), and a heritage from Him for their possession (^{<B106>}Galatians 4:6,7; ^{<B187>}Romans 8:17). It is the liberty of self-realization. As sons they recognize their kinship with God, and share his mind and purpose, so that His commands become their pleasure: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous" (^{<B18>}1 John 5:3). They have boldness and access to God (^{<B106>}Ephesians 2:18; 3:12). With this free union of love with God there comes a sense of power, of independence of circumstances, of mastery over the world, and of the possession of all things necessary which become the heirs of God (^{<B106>}Matthew 6:26,32; 7:11). "For whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world" (^{<B18>}1 John 5:4). They learn that the whole course and destiny of creation is for the "revealing of the sons of God" (^{<B89>}Romans 8:19,21).

3. As Moral Condition, or Ethical Fact:

Christ's sonship involved His moral harmony with the Father: "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love" (^{<B50>}John 15:10; 8:53). He accomplished the work which the Father gave Him to do (^{<B74>}John 17:4; 5:19), "becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (^{<B18>}Philippians 2:8). And sonship makes the same demand upon men. The peacemakers and those who forgive like God are His children (^{<B18>}Matthew 5:9,45; ^{<B65>}Luke 6:35). "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these (and these only) are sons of God" (^{<B14>}Romans 8:14). God will be Father to the holy (2 Cor 6:18). The test and mark of the children of God is that they do righteousness and love the brethren (^{<B10>}1 John 3:10). They are blameless and harmless, without blemish, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation (^{<B45>}Philippians 2:15). Therefore their ideal of life is to be "imitators of God" and to walk in love even as Christ

did (^{<481>}Ephesians 5:1). Sonship grows to its consummation as the life grows in the likeness of Christ, and the final destiny of all sons is to be ever like Him (^{<482>}1 John 3:2).

4. As State of Being, or Ontological Fact:

Sonship is properly and primarily a relation, but it may so dominate and transform the whole of a man's life, thought and conduct as to become his essential being, the most comprehensive category under which all that he is may be summed up.

(1) Essence of Christ's Sonship.

It is so that the New Testament comprehends the person of Christ. Everything that He did, He did as God's son, so that He is the Son, always and ever Son. In the beginning, in the bosom of the Father, He is the **ONLY BEGOTTEN** (which see) Son (^{<480>}John 1:1,18). He is born a Son of God (^{<483>}Luke 1:35). He begins life in the things of His Father (^{<484>}Luke 2:49). His whole life is that of the beloved Son (^{<485>}Matthew 3:17; 17:5). As Son of God He dies (^{<486>}Matthew 26:63; ^{<487>}Luke 22:70; ^{<488>}Matthew 27:40,43; compare ^{<489>}John 5:18). In His resurrection He was declared to be the Son of God with power (^{<490>}Romans 1:4); as Jesus the Son of God He is our great high priest in heaven (^{<491>}Hebrews 4:14), and in the glory of His father He will come to judge in the last day (^{<492>}Matthew 16:27).

(2) Men's Sonship.

Unlike Him, men's moral sonship is neither eternal nor universal. Are they therefore sons in any sense always and everywhere? All children are heirs of the kingdom of God and objects of the Father's care (^{<493>}Luke 18:16; ^{<494>}Matthew 18:10). But men may turn away from the Father and become unworthy to be called His sons (^{<495>}Luke 15:13,19). They may become children of the devil (^{<496>}1 John 3:10; ^{<497>}John 8:44), and children of wrath (^{<498>}Ephesians 2:3). Then they lose the actuality, but not the potentiality, of sonship. They have not the experience or character of sons, but they are still moral and rational beings made in the image of God, open to the appeal and influence of His love, and able to "rise and go to their Father." They are objects of God's love (^{<499>}John 15:13; ^{<500>}Romans 5:8) and of His gracious search and seeking (^{<501>}Luke 15:4; ^{<502>}John 11:52). But they are actual sons only when they are led by the Spirit of God (^{<503>}Romans 8:14); and even so their sonship will only be consummated in the resurrection (^{<504>}Romans 8:23; ^{<505>}Luke 20:36).

5. As Relation to God, or Theological Fact:

In the relation of father and son, fatherhood is original and creative. That does not necessarily mean priority in time.

(1) Eternal Generation.

Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation of Christ, by which is meant that God and Christ always stood in the relation of Father and Son to one another, is a just interpretation of the New Testament idea that the Son "was in the beginning with God" ([pros ton Theon]). But Jesus was conscious of His dependence upon the Father and that His sonship was derived from Him (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:19,36). Still more manifest is it that men derive their sonship from God. He made them for Himself, and whatever in human nature qualifies men to become sons of God is the free gift of God. But men in their sin and disobedience could not come to a knowledge of the Father, had He not "sent forth his Son that we might receive the adoption of sons" (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Galatians 4:4,5): "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God" (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 1 John 3:1); "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son" (which see) who gave men "the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name" (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 3:16; 1:12). It is not the children of the flesh but the children of the promise who are children of God (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Romans 9:4). The mere act of birth does not constitute men into children of God, but His covenant of free grace must be added. God being essentially Father made men and the universe, sent His Son and His Spirit, "for the revealing of the sons of God." But they can only know the Father, and realize their sonship when they respond to His manifestation of fatherly love, by faith in God and obedience to Him.

(2) The Work of Grace.

The question whether sonship is natural and universal or conditional upon grace working through faith, does not admit of a categorical answer. The alternatives are not strict antitheses. God does all things as Father. To endow man with rational and moral nature capable of his becoming a son was an act of love and grace, but its whole purpose can be communicated only in response to faith in Christ. But a natural sonship which is not actual is meaningless. A man's moral condition and his attitude toward God are the most essential elements of his nature, for a man's nature is just the sum total of his thoughts, acts and states. If these are hostile or indifferent to God, there is nothing left that can have the reality or bear the name of son.

For if the word son be used of mere creaturehood and potentiality, that is to give it a meaning entirely different from New Testament usage. All men by nature are potential sons, because God has made them for sonship and does all things to win them into their heritage. Men may be sons of God in a very imperfect and elementary manner. The sharp transitions of Pauline and Johannine theology are rather abstract distinctions for thought than actual descriptions of spiritual processes. But Paul and John also contemplate a growth in sonship, “till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” (~~4:13~~ Ephesians 4:13).

See SONS OF GOD.

For lit. and further discussion, see special articles on *ADOPTION*; *GOD*; *JESUS CHRIST*.

T. Rees

CHILDREN OF ISRAEL

<iz'-ra-el> (I aecyllynB) [(bene yisra'el)]: A very common term in both the Old Testament and the New Testament, and it refers to the Israelites as the descendants of a common ancestor, Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel (see **<1324>** Genesis 32:24-32). It was customary to designate the members of the various tribes as the children of the one from whom the tribe originated (see **<4012>** Numbers 1:20-43; **<1103>** Ezra 2:3-61), and it was natural that the people who boasted of Israel as their ancestor should be designated as his children. The first reference to the descendants of Jacob is found in the account of the changing of Jacob's name to Israel, and the purpose is to connect them with the experience in Jacob's life which led to the change in his name: "Therefore the children of Israel eat not the sinew of the hip, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day: because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew of the hip." At the time when this was written "the children of Israel" was a phrase that was commonly applied to the Israelites. In **<1273>** 2 Kings 17:34 they are called "the children of Jacob," and this occurs in connection with the account of the changing of Jacob's name to Israel and is intended to connect them closely with their father Jacob, who was favored of God.

After a time, it is quite likely that the phrase “children of Israel” lost its

peculiar significance and was simply one of the popular terms designating the inhabitants of Palestine, but at first it was intended to connect these people with their ancestor Jacob whose name was changed to Israel. The Jews of the New Testament times connected themselves with Abraham rather than with Jacob (see ^{<408>}John 8:39; ^{<500>}Romans 9:7; ^{<800>}Galatians 3:7, [τέκνα, tekna], or, [υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ, huioi Abraam]).

A. W. Fortune

CHILDREN OF THE BRIDECHAMBER

See BRIDECHAMBER, SONS OF THE.

CHILDREN OF THE EAST

^{<est>} (μδq, ynb)[bene qedhem]): A term which in a general way designated the inhabitants of the country East of Palestine. The Hebrews thought of their own country as occupying the central place, and of the other parts of the world in relation to this. They spoke of the “queen of the south” (^{<122>}Matthew 12:42), and of the “king of the south” (^{<200>}Daniel 11:5,6). They spoke of people coming from “the east and the west” and sitting down with the patriarchs (^{<401>}Matthew 8:11).

The term “children of the east” seems to have been applied to the inhabitants of any part of the country East of Palestine. It is stated that Jacob, when he fled from Esau, “came to the land of the children of the east” (^{<120>}Genesis 29:1), and the place to which he came was Haran in Mesopotamia. In ^{<408>}Jeremiah 49:28 the inhabitants of Kedar are called “the children of the east,” and in later Jewish literature, Kedar is identified with the Arabs (*see* KEDAR). Job was designated as “the greatest of all the children of the east” (^{<800>}Job 1:3), and the land of Uz was mentioned as his home (^{<800>}Job 1:1). While it is impossible absolutely to locate the land of Uz, it must have been on the edge of the desert which was East of Palestine. The children of the east seem to have been famous for their wisdom. It is said that “Solomon’s wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east” (^{<100>}1 Kings 4:30), and “Wise-men from the east” came to Jerusalem seeking the one that was born king of the Jews (^{<400>}Matthew 2:1).

Many of the inhabitants of the east country were regarded as descending from Abraham (see ^{<0256>}Genesis 25:6), and hence, they were related to Israel.

A. W. Fortune

CHILEAB

^{<kil'-e-ab>} (ba| Ki[kil'abh]; [^{<0256>}Δαλουιά, Dalouia], “restraint of father”): A son of David, born to him at Hebron. His mother was Abigail, whom David married after the death of her husband Nabal, the Carmelite (^{<0088>}2 Samuel 3:3). In the corresponding account (^{<0300>}1 Chronicles 3:1) he is called “Daniel,” the meaning of which name (“God is my judge”) points to its having been given in order to commemorate God’s judgment upon Nabal (^{<0259>}1 Samuel 25:39; compare ^{<0306>}Genesis 30:6). Some suppose that he bore both names, but the Septuagint reading here Dalouia (1 Chronicles Damniel), and the identity of the last three letters of the Hebrew word “Chileab” with the first three of the following word, seems to indicate that the text of Samuel is corrupt.

Horace J. Wolf

CHILION

^{<kil'-i-on>} (wQ| Ki[kilyon], “pining,” “wasting away”): One of the two sons of Elimelech and Naomi, “Mahlon and Chilion, Ephrathites of Bethlehem-judah” (^{<0002>}Ruth 1:2). With his mother and brother he came into Moab and there both married Moabite women, Orpah being the name of Chilion’s wife and Ruth that of the wife of Mahlon (4:9,10). Both died early and Orpah remained in Moab while Ruth accompanied Naomi back to Bethlehem. When Boaz married Ruth he “bought all that was Elimelech’s, and all that was Chilion’s, and Mahlon’s, of the hand of Naomi” (4:9).

W. L. Walker

CHILMAD

^{<kil'-mad>} (dm" | Ki[kilmadh]; [^{<0256>}αρμάν, Charman]): A city or district mentioned after Sheba and Asshur as supplying merchandise to Tyre (^{<0273>}Ezekiel 27:23). By changing “m” into “w” (common in Assyrian-

Babylonian) this has been compared with Kalwadha near Bagdad (G. Smith, Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, I, 61; Delitzsch, Paradies, 206), but the identification seems improbable. Though regarded as the name of a country in the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (Charman; Chelmad), there is some doubt whether this view of the word is correct. The Targum substitutes Madhai, "Media," and on this account Mez (Stadt Harran, 24) amends to Kol Madhai, "all Media." The absence of the copula "and" has caused others to further modify the vocalization, and by reading [kelimmudh] instead of Chilmad, the sense "Asshur was as the apprentice of thy trading" (Qimchi, Hitzig, Cornill) is obtained, but is not satisfactory. Probably both text and translation are susceptible of improvement.

T. G. Pinches

CHIMHAM

<kim'-ham> (כִּמְחָם[kimham] (<10657> 2 Samuel 19:37,38) or חִמְחִי[kimhan] (<10690> 2 Samuel 19:40) or כִּמְחֹם[kemohem] (<24117> Jeremiah 41:17 Kt.); this reading, however, may probably be safely ignored): One of the sons of Barzillai the Gileadite, who supported David while the latter was in exile in Mahanaim (<10657> 2 Samuel 19:37). After the death of Absalom, Barzillai was invited to spend the remainder of his life with the king; but he refused, and sent his son Chimham in his stead. From the mention of "the habitation of Chimham, which is by Beth-lehem" (<24117> Jeremiah 41:17 the King James Version), it has been inferred that Chimham received a grant of land from David's patrimony at Bethlehem, which retained his name for at least four centuries. It has been suggested that his name was probably Ahinoam (אֲחִינוֹם[achino'am]).

Horace J. Wolf

CHIMNEY

<chim'-ni>.

See HOUSE.

CHINNERETH OR CHINNEROTH

<kin'-e-reth>, <kin'-e-roth> (tr^Wki[kinnereth] (^{<H817>}Deuteronomy 3:17; ^{<H885>}Joshua 19:35, etc.)), (tw^{On}ki[kinaroth]; Codex Vaticanus, [ενερέθ, Kenereth], Codex Alexandrinus, [ενερόθ, Cheneroth] (^{<H812>}Joshua 11:2)): Taking the order in which the towns are mentioned, this city seems to have lain North of Rakkath (?Tiberias). It may have occupied the site of el-Mejdel, at the Southwest corner of the plain of Gennesaret. From this city the sea took its Old Testament name (^{<H811>}Numbers 34:11, etc.).

CHIOS

<ke'-os>, <ki'-os> ([ίος, Chios]): An island belonging to Turkey in the Aegean Sea, South of Lesbos, and very near the mainland of Asia Minor. Paul's vessel passed it on his last voyage to Jerusalem (^{<H815>}Acts 20:15). The channel here is very picturesque. From Luke's expression, "we came the following day over against Chios," it has been conjectured that they were becalmed; more probably it simply means that, because of the dark moon, they lay at anchor for the night on the Asian coast opposite the island (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, under the word). Herod, when on his way to Agrippa at the Bosphorus, "continued many days at Chios" and conferred many royal benefactions upon the inhabitants (Josephus, Ant, XVI, ii, 2).

The soil is sterile (though well cultivated), the climate mild. Earthquakes are frequent. In the mountains (highest 4,000 ft.) beautiful blue marble with white veins, and excellent potter's clay, were quarried in antiquity. In modern times large quantities of ochre are mined. The chief industry is the culture of the silkworm, the cocoons being sent to Lyons. Oranges, lemons, almonds, brandy, anise, mastich and leather are also exported. The inhabitants, who are almost entirely Greeks, number about 60,000. The capital, Castro, has a population of 15,000. The place where Homer is said to have collected his pupils around him is still pointed out to the traveler at the foot of Mt. Epos, near the coast. It is in reality (probably) a very old sanctuary of Cybele, the Mother of the Gods. The tragic poet Ion, the historian Theopompus and the sophist Theocritus were natives of Chios. The Chians were especially famous for their skill in telling stories, and for their levity. A familiar proverb says that "it is easier to find a green horse than a sober-minded Sciot" (Conybeare and Howson, XX, 549).

The oldest inhabitants of the island were Leleges, Cretans and Carians, who were conquered by the Ionians. The latter made Chios one of the most flourishing states in Ionia. When the Persians overran Asia Minor and oppressed the Greek colonies, the Chians showed a Pan-Hellenic spirit. They surrendered, however, to Cyrus in 546 BC. Nevertheless, 46 years later they joined in the rebellion of Aristagoras against the Persians. In the naval engagement off the island Lade they fought with 100 ships and displayed great bravery. Again they fell into the power of Persia; but after the battle of Mycale (479) the Chians joined the Athenian confederacy. In 412 they sided with the Peloponnesians, in the 19th year of the war which Athens had been waging against Sparta and her allies. For this act of treason the Athenians devastated the island. At the end of the war the Chians revolted from Sparta and, after the battle of Naxos (376), became an ally of Athens once more. Oppressed now by Athens, as she had been by Sparta, Chios made an alliance with Thebes in 363 and defended herself successfully against the Athenian general, Chares; and in 355 Athens was forced to recognize the island's independence. Later the Chians became friends of the Romans and in the war with Mithridates were obliged to surrender their ships to the Pontic king and in addition pay him 2,000 talents.

In 1307 AD Turkish pirates subjugated and laid waste the island. The Turks themselves became masters of Chios in 1566. In the war of the Greek revolution the Chians joined the Greeks (February 1821) but were overpowered by the Turks. The Pasha decreed that the island should be utterly devastated; 23,000 Chians were massacred and 47,000 sold into slavery. Only 5,000 escaped. A second attempt to regain their freedom was made in 1827, but met with failure. When the kingdom of Greece was established two years later, Chios was not included. On April 3, 1881, the island was visited by a terrible earthquake, the city of Castro being almost entirely destroyed.

LITERATURE.

Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of Paul*; W. M. Ramsay, *Paul the Traveler*; G. H. Gilbert, *The Student's Life of Paul* (chiefly concerned with the chronology and order of events in Paul's life); Eckenbrecher, *Die Insel Chios* (1845); Pauli, same person (in the *Mitteilungen der Geogr. Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1880-81).

CHIRP

<cherp> (¹p" x[tsaphaph]): “Chirp” occurs in the King James Version margin and the Revised Version, margin of ^{<2304>}Isaiah 29:4, “Thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper (margin, “chirp”) out of the dust.” The reference is to “the sounds made by wizards and ventriloquists, who imitated the chirping of the bats which was supposed to proceed from the lower world”; hence, for “peep” of the King James Version in ^{<2389>}Isaiah 8:19 we have “chirp” — “wizards, that chirp and that mutter.”

Figurative: We have also in ^{<2304>}Isaiah 10:14 the Revised Version (British and American), in a figurative allusion to young birds, “chirped” instead of “peeped.”

See *CHATTER*.

W. L. Walker

CHISLEU; CHISLEV

<kis'-lu>, <kis'-lev>.

See *KISLEV*.

CHISLON

<kis'-lon>, <kiz'-lon> ([^]wOsKi[kiclon], “strength”): A prince of Benjamin, the father of Elidad (^{<0821>}Numbers 34:21).

CHISLOTH-TABOR

<kis-loth-ta'-bor>, <kiz'-loth>.

See *CHESULLOTH*.

CHITLISH

<kit'-lish> (vyl itKi[kithlish], “separation”; the King James Version Kithlish, the English Revised Version “Chithlish,” [kith'lish]): An

unidentified town named with Lahman and Gederoth in the Shephelah of Judah (^{<1650>}Joshua 15:40).

CHITTIM

^{<kit'-im>}.

See *KITTIM*.

CHIUN (1)

^{<ki'-un>}: Thus Hebrew ^{~WYKi}[kiyun], is transliterated in ^{<3155>}Amos 5:26 the King James Version. The vowels represent an assimilation to some such word as [shiqquts], “detestable thing,” or [gillul], “idol” (properly “a filthy thing”), in consonance with the well-known habit of the punctuators (compare ^{I m}q̄molekh], Molech with the vowels of ^{t v B}q̄bosheth], “shame”). The Syriac version has preserved the correct vocalization; apparently also the Septuagint, albeit the consonants have suffered corruption (so particularly in the Greek manuscripts of ^{<4173>}Acts 7:43). There can be no doubt that we should vocalize ^{~wyK}q̄kewan] = the Assyrian Kai(a)-wanu = Kaiamanu by which at least in late Babylonian Saturn was indicated. The passage in Amos refers to the Saturn worship which appears to have been in vogue in the prophet’s days. The Israelites shall carry with them into exile the images of their gods (render with the margin of the Revised Version (British and American): “Yea, ye shall take up,” etc.). The received vocalization is as old as Aquila and Symmachus.

Max L. Margolis

CHIUN (2)

^{<ki'-un>} (^{<3155>}Amos 5:26 the King James Version): Called in ^{<4173>}Acts 7:43 “Rephan” ([[°] ρεμφάν, Rhemphan]) the planet Saturn.

See *ASTROLOGY*.

CHLOE

^{<klo'-e>} ([^{λ ό η}, Chloe], “a tender shoot”): A woman, presumably a Christian, mentioned only in ^{<4011>}1 Corinthians 1:11. She was a resident either of Corinth or of Ephesus. Paul had been informed by some of her household, probably Christian slaves, of the dissensions in the church at

Corinth. Nothing more is known of her.

CHOBΑ; CHOBΑΙ

<ko'-ba>, <ko'-ba-i> ([ωβά, Choba], Judith 4:4; [ωβαί, Chobai], 15:4 f): A place named along with Jericho, Asora, and the valley of Salem (Judith 4:4; 15:4 f). Reland's (Pal, 721) suggestion of Choabis, which the Peutinger Tables give as 12 Roman miles from Scythopolis, seems probable. It may be identical with el-Mekhubby, about 11 miles from Beisan (Scythopolis), and 3 miles from Tubas.

CHOENIX

<ke'-niks> ([χοῖνιξ, choinix]): A Greek dry measure, almost equal to one quart. Mentioned in the New Testament only in ~~Revelation~~ Revelation 6:6, where the Revised Version, margin would read "choenix" instead of the indefinite translation "measure." The verse is then obviously a threat of famine.

CHOICE

<chois>.

See *CHOOSE; WILL*.

CHOKΕ

<chok> ([πνίγω, pnigo], and its compounds): Is used in its primary sense of "to strangle," or "to suffocate," in describing the fate of the swine (~~Luke~~ Luke 8:33 the King James Version). The Revised Version (British and American) has "drowned," but "choked" is the correct rendering of the Greek word.

Figurative: It is used in the sense of "to strangle" "smother," "suffocate," as if by depriving of breath, in describing the fate of the young grain growing in the midst of thorns (~~Matthew~~ Matthew 13:7). The figurative is carried a little farther still in describing the way the word, planted in the heart, is overcome by the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches (~~Matthew~~ Matthew 13:22).

A. W. Fortune

CHOLA

<ko'-la> ([ωλά, Chola]; the King James Version, Cola): This names occurs only with that of Chobai (*see* CHOBA) in Judith 15:4. It may be identical with the modern [Ka`un], between [el-Mekhubby] and [Beisan].

CHOLER

<kol'-er>: Lit. "bile," is used in the sense of a disease ([χολέρα, cholera]) (Sirach 31:20; 37:30), and in the sense of bitter anger (rṛm;[marar]) (^{<287>}Daniel 8:7; 11:11 English Versions of the Bible, the American Standard Revised Version "anger").

CHOOSE; CHOSEN

<chooz>, <cho'-z'-n> (rj " B;[bachar], l b" q;[qabhal], arB; [bara'], hrB;[barah]; [ἐκλέγω, ek-lego]):

The words denote an act of comparison of two or more objects or persons, the preference and selection of one, or of a few out of a larger number for a certain purpose, function, position or privilege.

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Human Choice:

For [bachar] and its derivatives: men choosing wives (^{<1082>}Genesis 6:2); Lot choosing the cities of the Plain (^{<1031>}Genesis 13:11); often of kings and generals choosing soldiers for their prowess (e.g. ^{<1270>}Exodus 17:9; ^{<1083>}Joshua 8:3; ^{<1032>}1 Samuel 13:2; ^{<1009>}2 Samuel 10:9; 17:1). The word [bachar] is often used for "young men," as being choice, in the prime of manhood. The most important uses of [bachar] are these: of Israel choosing a king (^{<1088>}1 Samuel 8:18; 12:13); of moral and religious choice: choosing Yahweh as God (^{<1245>}Joshua 24:15,22), or other gods (^{<1088>}Judges 5:8; 10:14); the way of truth (^{<1080>}Psalms 119:30); to refuse the evil and choose the good (^{<1075>}Isaiah 7:15,16); compare David's choice of evils (^{<1042>}2 Samuel 24:12).

2. God Chooses King of Israel:

A leading idea is that of God choosing Moses as leader (^{<0465>}Numbers 16:5,7; 17:5); the Levites to the priesthood (^{<0028>}1 Samuel 2:28; ^{<4291>}2 Chronicles 29:11); Saul as king (^{<0124>}1 Samuel 10:24), David (^{<0062>}2 Samuel 6:21; ^{<1113>}1 Kings 11:34), Solomon (^{<1386>}1 Chronicles 28:5). All this follows from theocratic idea that God rules personally over Israel as His chosen people.

3. God Chooses Jerusalem:

A more important, but still subsidiary, idea is that of Yahweh choosing Jerusalem as the place of His habitation and worship (^{<5115>}Deuteronomy 12:5; and 20 other times, ^{<0127>}Joshua 9:27; ^{<1084>}1 Kings 8:44,48; ^{<1223>}Psalms 132:13; ^{<3017>}Zechariah 1:17; 2:12; 3:2). This was the ruling idea of Josiah's reformation which was instrumental in putting down polytheistic ideas and idolatrous practices in Israel, and was therefore an important factor in the development of Hebrew monotheism; but it was an idea that Hebrew monotheism had to transcend and reject to attain its full growth. "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father" (^{<0021>}John 4:21).

4. Election of Israel:

But the fundamental idea of choosing, which governs all others in the Old Testament, is that of God choosing Israel to be His peculiar people. He chose Abraham, and made a covenant with him, to give him the land of Canaan (^{<1407>}Nehemiah 9:7 ff): "For thou art a holy people unto Yahweh thy God: Yahweh thy God hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth because Yahweh loveth you, and because he would keep the oath which he sware unto your fathers" (^{<0006>}Deuteronomy 7:6-8). Historically this idea originated in the old conception of Yahweh as the tribal God of Israel, bound to her by natural and indissoluble ties (*see GOD*). But as their conception of Yahweh became more moral, and the idea of His righteousness predominated, it was recognized that there was no natural and necessary relation and harmony between Israel and Yahweh that accounted for the favor of a righteous God toward her, for Israel was no better than her neighbors (Amos 1; 2). Why then was Yahweh Israel's God, and Israel His people?

5. *Yahweh's Grace:*

It was by an act of free choice and sovereign grace on God's part. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" (~~308D~~ Amos 3:2). In Hosea the relation is described under the figure of a marriage tie. Yahweh is Israel's husband: and to realize the force of the figure, it is necessary to recall what ancient and oriental marriage customs were. Choice and favor were almost entirely made by the husband. The idea of the covenant which Yahweh out of His free grace made with Israel comes to the forefront in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Because He loved her, and for no other reason, He has chosen Israel to be His peculiar people. In Isaiah 40 through 66 the idea is carried farther in two directions:

(1) **An Act of Sovereignty:**

Yahweh's gracious choice of Israel rests ultimately on His absolute sovereignty: "O Jacob my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen: thus saith Yahweh that made thee, and formed thee from the womb" (~~2340B~~ Isaiah 44:1,2; compare ~~2329G~~ Isaiah 29:16; ~~2488G~~ Jeremiah 18:6; ~~2364B~~ Isaiah 64:8). For Israel's deliverance Cyrus and his world-empire are in Yahweh's hands as clay in the potter's hands (~~2389D~~ Isaiah 45:9,10).

(2) **For Mankind's Sake:**

"Israel is elect for the sake of mankind." This is the moral interpretation of a choice that otherwise appears arbitrary and irrational. God's purpose and call of salvation are unto all mankind. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else" (~~2362D~~ Isaiah 45:22). And Israel is His servant, chosen, the messenger He sends, "to bring forth justice to the Gentiles" (~~2340B~~ Isaiah 42:1,19; 43:10,12). The idea is further developed in the conception of the SERVANT OF YAHWEH (which see) as the faithful few (or one) formed "from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him," "for a light to the Gentiles," God's "salvation unto the end of the earth" (~~2340B~~ Isaiah 49:1-6; 52:13 through 53:12) (compare Isaiah's doctrine of the Remnant: Shearjashub; also, the righteous, the godly, the meek, in Pss; and see Skinner, Isaiah, II, xxx ff). As the conception of personality and of individual relation and responsibility to God developed from Ezekiel onward, together with the resulting doctrine of personal immortality, the conditions were prepared for the application of the idea of election to individuals (compare ~~2358B~~ Psalm 65:4).

Coordinate with the idea of God choosing Israel runs the complementary idea that Israel should prove faithful to the covenant, and worthy of the choice. God has chosen her, not for any merit in her, but of His free grace, and according to His purpose of salvation, but if Israel fails to respond by faithful conduct, fitting her to be His servant and messenger, He may and will cast her off, or such portion of her as proves unworthy. See Oehler, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 256 ff, 287 f.

Three other Hebrew words expressing choice in minor matters are: [qabhal], for David's choice of evils (^{<3211>}1 Chronicles 21:11); [bara'], to mark out a place (^{<3219>}Ezekiel 21:19), to select singers and porters for the temple (^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 9:22; 16:41); [barah], to choose a man to represent Israel against Goliath (^{<0778>}1 Samuel 17:8).

II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. Various Meanings:

The whole conception of God, of His relation to Israel, and of His action in history indicated above, constituted the religious heritage of Jesus Christ and His disciples. The national consciousness had to a considerable extent given place to that of the individual; and salvation extended beyond the present life into a state of blessedness in a future world. But the central ideas remain, and are only modified in the New Testament in so far as Jesus Christ becomes the Mediator and Agent of God's sovereign grace. [Eklego] and its derivatives are the words that generally express the idea in the New Testament. They are used

- (1) of the general idea of selecting one out of many (^{<0247>}Luke 14:7);
- (2) of choosing men for a particular purpose, e.g. of the church choosing the seven (^{<4065>}Acts 6:5); of the choice of delegates from the Council of Jerusalem (^{<4152>}Acts 15:22,25; compare ^{<0789>}2 Corinthians 8:19), [cheirotoneo]; choose by vote (the Revised Version (British and American) "appoint") (compare ^{<4104>}Acts 10:41), [procheirotoneo];
- (3) of moral choice (^{<4133>}Mark 13:20): "Mary hath chosen the good part" (^{<0202>}Luke 10:42);
- (4) of Christ as the chosen Messiah of God (^{<0235>}Luke 23:35; ^{<0104>}1 Peter 2:4 the King James Version);
- (5) of Christ choosing His apostles (^{<0263>}Luke 6:13; ^{<0150>}John 6:70; 13:18; 15:16,19; ^{<4002>}Acts 1:2,24); Paul (^{<4095>}Acts 9:15; compare 22:14 the King

James Version), [procheirizomai]; Rufus (~~<513>~~ Romans 16:13); and Paul chose Silas (~~<4150>~~ Acts 15:40), [epilego];

(6) of God

(a) choosing Israel (~~<4137>~~ Acts 13:17; compare ~~<5911>~~ Romans 9:11),
(b) choosing the Christian church as the new Israel (1 Pet 2:9 the King James Version),

(c) choosing the members of the church from among the poor (~~<5015>~~ James 2:5), the foolish, weak and despised (1 Cor 1:27-28),

(d) choosing into His favor and salvation a few out of many: “Many are called, but few are chosen” (~~<4016>~~ Matthew 20:16 (omitted in the Revised Version (British and American))); ~~<4024>~~ Matthew 22:14); God shortens the days of the destruction of Jerusalem “for the elect’s sake, whom he chose” (~~<4130>~~ Mark 13:20).

2. Of God’s Free Grace:

In ~~<4004>~~ Ephesians 1:4-6 every phrase tells a different phase of the conception:

(1) God chose (and foreordained) the saints in Christ before the foundation of the world;

(2) according to the good pleasure of His will;

(3) unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself;

(4) to be holy and without blemish before Him in love;

(5) to the praise of the glory of His grace;

(6) which He freely bestowed on them in the Beloved. And in ~~<6174>~~ Revelation 17:14, the triumphant church in heaven is described as “called and chosen and faithful.” God’s sovereign choice governs the experience and testing of the saints at every point from beginning to end.

Thus in the New Testament as in the Old Testament

(1) God’s covenant of grace is free and unconditional. It is unto all men, now as individuals rather than nations, and without distinction of

race or class. It is no less free and sovereign, because it is a father's grace.

(2) Israel is still a chosen race for a special purpose.

(3) The church and the saints that constitute it are chosen to the full experience and privileges of sonship.

(4) God's purpose of grace is fully revealed and realized through Jesus Christ.

3. Ultimate Antinomies:

This doctrine raises certain theological and metaphysical difficulties that have never yet been satisfactorily solved.

(1) How can God be free if all His acts are preordained from eternity? This is an antinomy which indeed lies at the root of all personality. It is of the essence of the idea of personality that a person should freely determine himself and yet act in conformity with his own character. Every person in practice and experience solves this antinomy continually, though he may have no intellectual category that can coordinate these two apparently contradictory principles in all personality.

(2) How can God be just, if a few are chosen and many are left? And

(3) How can man be free if his moral character proceeds out of God's sovereign grace? It is certain that if God chose all or left all He would be neither just nor gracious, nor would man have any vestige of freedom.

4. Election Corresponds to Experience:

The doctrine describes accurately

(a) the moral fact, that some accept salvation and others reject it;

(b) the religious fact that God's sovereign and unconditional love is the beginning and cause of salvation. The meeting-point of the action of grace, and of man's liberty as a moral and responsible being, it does not define. Nor has the category as yet been discovered wherewith to construe and coordinate these two facts of religious experience

together, although it is a fact known in every Christian experience that where God is most sovereign, man is most free.

For other passages, and the whole idea in the New Testament, *see* ELECTION.

T. Rees

CHOP

(*crP*;*[paras]*):

Figurative: This word, meaning “to cut in pieces,” “to distribute,” often translated “spread,” is rendered “chop” in ^{<318B>}Micah 3:3, they “chop them in pieces, as for the pot,” figuratively for the destruction of God’s people through the cruel exactions of their rulers.

CHORASHAN

<kor-ash’-an>, *<ko-ra’-shan>*.

See CORASHAN.

CHORAZIN

<ko-ra’-zin> ([*οραζίν*, Chorazin], ^{<0112>}Matthew 11:21; [*οραζίν*, Chorazin], ^{<0103>}Luke 10:13; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek [*οραζείν*, Chorazein]): A city whose name appears only in the woe pronounced against it by Christ (^{<0112>}Matthew 11:21; ^{<0103>}Luke 10:13). Its appearance there, however, shows that it must have been a place of some importance, and highly privileged by the ministry of Jesus. It was already deserted in the time of Eusebius, who places it 2 miles from Capernaum (Onomasticon, under the word). We can hardly doubt that it is represented by the extensive ruins of Kerazeh, on the heights to the north of Tell Chum. It is utterly desolate: a few carved stones being seen among the heaps. There are traces of a Roman road which connected the ancient city with the great highway between north and south which touched the lake shore at [Khan Minyeh].

W. Ewing

CHORBE

<kor'-be> ([**ορβέ**, Chorbe]; the King James Version Corbe): Head of a family which returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:12). The name apparently corresponds to Zaccai in ^{<1510>}Ezra 2:9 and ^{<1574>}Nehemiah 7:14.

CHOSAMAEUS

<kos-a-me'-us> (A, [**Σίμων οσαμαῖος**, Simon Chosamaïos]; B, [**οσάμαος**, Chosamaos]): Occurs in 1 Esdras 9:32 as the name of one of the sons of Annas. But in the parallel passage (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:31) the name is simply [Shimeon] followed by “Benjamin, Malluch, Shemariah,” which are omitted in 1 Esdras. The Septuagint of ^{<1508>}Ezra 10:31 has [**Σεμεών**, Semeon], followed by the three omitted names. The difference may have arisen from a mistake of a copyist, or from the use of an imperfect MS.

CHOSEN

<cho'-z'-n>.

See CHOOSE.

CHOZEBA

<ko-ze'-ba> (**abl** **zk** [kkozebha'], “deceitful”): Same as **ACHZIB** and **CHEZIB** (which see).

CHRIST AS KING, PRIEST, PROPHET

See under several titles; also CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

CHRIST, JESUS

See JESUS CHRIST.

CHRIST, THE EXALTATION, OF

<egz-ol-ta'-shun>:

This term is given to that condition of blessedness, glory and dominion into which our Lord entered after the completion of His earthly career of humiliation and suffering, and which is to be regarded as the reward of His

meritorious obedience, and the issue of His victorious struggle, and at the same time the means of His prosecution and completion of His work as Redeemer and Saviour of the world. The classic passage of Scripture, rich in suggestion, and the source of much controversy in the development of Christian theology, is ^{<544>}Philippians 2:5-11. The word “exalted” of 2:9, [ὕπερ ὧ, *huperupsoo*], occurs only in this place in the New Testament and, like its Latin representative, is limited to ecclesiastical use. Compare ^{<549>}Romans 14:9; ^{<619>}Ephesians 1:19-23; ^{<602>}1 Peter 3:21,22.

Christ’s Exaltation includes His Resurrection, Ascension, Session at the right hand of God, and Advent as Judge and Consummator of the world’s redemption.

I. THE RESURRECTION.

1. Its Glorification of Christ:

The historic place and validity of this event will be found under other heads; our concern is with the event as it relates to the glorification of our Lord.

(1) It revealed His power over death.

(2) It confirms all His claims to Divine Sonship.

(3) It attests His acceptance and that of His work by God.

(4) It crowns the process of the redemption of the world.

(5) It forms the beginning of that new creation which is life eternal, and over which death can have no power.

(6) It is the entrance of the Son of God into the power and glory of the New Kingdom, or the restored Kingdom of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe. The following Scriptures among many others may be consulted: ^{<6018>}Revelation 1:18; ^{<4124>}Acts 2:24; ^{<5006>}Romans 1:4; ^{<651>}1 Corinthians 15:20; ^{<6525>}John 5:25; ^{<6025>}Romans 4:25; ^{<606>}Romans 6:4,5; ^{<5012>}Colossians 2:12; ^{<1080>}Philippians 3:10; ^{<616>}Romans 6:9.

2. Resurrection Body — Identity, Change, Present Locality:

An interesting and important question arises in connection with Christ’s exaltation, relating to the nature of the body of the risen Lord. It was clearly identical with that of His natural life. It was recognized by the marks which were upon it: ^{<4269>}Luke 24:39,40; ^{<6314>}John 20:24-29. It

received food: ^{<243>}Luke 24:43 (compare 24:30; ^{<212>}John 21:12,13; ^{<4104>}Acts 10:41). Nevertheless it was changed. After the resurrection, it was not at once recognized: ^{<315>}John 20:15; 21:7; ^{<243>}Luke 24:31. It appeared under apparently new conditions of relation to material substance: ^{<319>}John 20:19; ^{<243>}Luke 24:36. It suddenly became visible, and as suddenly vanished. These facts suggest what reverently may be surmised as to its exalted condition. The apostle's declaration as to the resurrection-body of the redeemed furnishes some hints: ^{<655>}1 Corinthians 15:35-49; compare ^{<102>}Philippians 3:21. We may cautiously, from the history of the resurrection and the Pauline doctrine, conclude, that our Lord still possesses a human body. It is of material substance, with new properties. It occupies space. It was seen by Paul, by Stephen, by the seer of the Apocalypse. It is glorious, incorruptible, spiritual.

3. The Agent of the Resurrection:

By whom was the resurrection effected? It is referred by some Scriptures to God. See ^{<960>}Psalms 16:10 (compare ^{<427>}Acts 2:27,31); and the distinct affirmation by Peter (^{<412>}Acts 2:32). Paul declares that Christ was "raised through the glory of the Father" (^{<3104>}Romans 6:4). In ^{<3119>}Ephesians 1:19,20, it was the mighty power of God which was wrought in Christ "when he raised him from the dead." Elsewhere it is ascribed to Christ Himself. He declared: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (^{<319>}John 2:19). In ^{<3107>}John 10:17,18, our Lord declares: "I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." The efficient agent is said, according to the generally received reading of ^{<3102>}Romans 8:2, to have been the Spirit of God, and thus the resurrection is referred to each person of the Godhead. The doctrine of the Lutheran church refers the act to the human power of the Lord Himself, which by incarnation had been endowed with attributes of Deity. This view consists with their teaching of the omnipresence of the body of Jesus (see below on the section "Ascension").

II. THE ASCENSION OF OUR LORD.

1. Its Actuality:

The exaltation of Christ consisted further in His ascension. Some have held that the resurrection and ascension of Jesus ought to be regarded as aspects of the same event. But Mary saw the risen Lord, though she was forbidden to touch Him, for "I am not yet ascended unto the Father: but go

unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend," etc. (~~407~~ John 20:17). This, compared with the invitation to Thomas to touch Him, eight days later, suggests something in the ascension added to that which the resurrection implied, and the general thought of the church has consistently regarded the latter as a further step in the exaltation of the Lord.

2. General Doctrine of the Church:

The fact of ascension is recorded in ~~4169~~ Mark 16:19, and ~~4280~~ Luke 24:50,51, and with greater detail in ~~4000~~ Acts 1:9-11. According to these accounts, the ascension was seen by the disciples, and this suggests that heaven is a locality, where are the angels, who are not ubiquitous, and where Christ's disciples will find the place which He declared He was going to prepare for them (~~4942~~ John 14:2). Heaven is also undoubtedly referred to as a state (~~4006~~ Ephesians 2:6; ~~4083~~ Philippians 3:20), but Christ's body must be in some place, and where He is, there is Heaven.

3. Lutheran Doctrine:

This is certainly the doctrine of the church in general, and seems to be consistent with the Scriptural teaching. But the Lutherans have maintained that the ascension of the Lord merely involved a change of state in the human nature of Christ. He possessed during His life on earth the Divine attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience, but He voluntarily abstained from their exercise. But at His ascension He returned to the full use of these powers. The ascension is Christ's return to immensity. The community of natures gave these Divine qualities to the humanity of Jesus, which Luther declared involved its ubiquity, and that as He was at the right hand of God, and God was everywhere, so Christ in His human personality was in no specific place but everywhere. This omnipresence is not of the infinite extension of the body of the Lord, but He is present as God is everywhere present in knowledge and power.

4. Theory of Laying Aside the Existence-Form of God:

Another theory of the ascended humanity-of the Lord depends upon the conception of the Son of God laying aside at incarnation the "existence-form of God," and while affirming that Christ's body is now in a definite place, it proceeds to hold that at the ascension the accidental and variable qualities of humanity were laid aside, and that He dwells in heaven as a glorified man. Ebrard says: "He has laid aside forever the existence form of God, and assumed that of man in perpetuity, in which form by His Spirit He governs the church and the world. He is thus dynamically present to all

His people.” This form of doctrine seems to involve as the result of the incarnation of the Son of God His complete and sole humanity. He is no more than a man. The Logos is no longer God, and as the ascension did not involve the reassumption of the “existence-form of God,” Christ in glory is only a glorified man.

5. Necessity:

The ascension was necessary, in conformity with the spiritual character of the kingdom which Christ founded. Its life is that of faith, not sight. A perpetual life of even the resurrected Christ on earth would have been wholly inconsistent with the spiritual nature of the new order. The return of Christ to the special presence of God was also part of His high-priestly service (*see CHRIST, OFFICES OF*) and His corporal absence from His people was the condition of that gift of the Spirit by which salvation was to be secured to each believer and promulgated throughout the world, as declared by Himself (~~<BKT>~~ John 16:7). Finally, the ascension was that physical departure of the Lord to the place which He was to prepare for His people (~~<B4D>~~ John 14:2,3). The resurrection was this completion of the objective conditions of redemption. The ascension was the initial step in the carrying out of redemptive work in the final salvation of mankind.

III. EXALTATION COMPLETED AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.

1. Its Significance:

The term “the right hand of God” is Scriptural (~~<407>~~ Acts 7:55,56; ~~<B84>~~ Romans 8:34; ~~<40D>~~ Ephesians 1:20; ~~<S00B>~~ Hebrews 1:3; 10:12; 12:2; ~~<402>~~ 1 Peter 3:22) and expresses the final step in the Lord’s exaltation. Care must be taken in the use of the expression. It is a figure to express the association of Christ with God in glory and power. It must not be employed as by Luther to denote the relation of the body of Christ to space, neither must it be limited to the Divine nature of the [Logos] reinstated in the conditions laid aside in incarnation. Christ thus glorified is the God-man, theanthropic person, Divine and human.

2. Its Essential Necessity:

This exaltation is based upon the essential glory of the Son of God, who “being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person sat down on the right hand” (~~<S00B>~~ Hebrews 1:3 the King James Version). It

is the claim which the Lord makes for Himself in His prayer (~~4870~~ John 17:4,5), and is thus specifically declared in ~~4976~~ Philippians 2:6-11: "God highly exalted Him." But in His glory Christ received the power universal and Divine. In ~~4012~~ Ephesians 1:20-22 His supreme dignity and power are affirmed "far above every name," "all things under His feet" (compare ~~8008~~ Hebrews 2:8; ~~4657~~ 1 Corinthians 15:27; ~~4092~~ 1 Peter 3:22). Christ at the "right hand of God" is the highly suggestive picture of His universal dominion asserted by Himself (~~4088~~ Matthew 28:18): "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." It is vain to speculate upon the relation of Christ's nature in this exalted state. We cannot distinguish between the human and Divine. We can only believe in, and trust and submit to the One Glorified Person who thus administers the kingdom in perfect harmony with its Divine laws in all the ages, and His own revelation of the will of God, as given to man in His own earthly career: pitiful, tender, serving, helping, restoring, saving, triumphant. The exaltation is for His mediatorial and finally saving work. He is the Head of His church; He is the Lord of angels and men; He is the Master of the ages.

IV. THE SECOND ADVENT.

The exaltation of Christ is to be completed by His coming again at the close of the dispensation, to complete His redemptive work and judge the world, and so to establish the final Kingdom of God. This belief has found a place in all the ecumenical symbols. Theology has ever included it in its eschatology. It is clear that the apostles and the early church expected the second coming of the Lord as an immediate event, the significance of which, and especially the effect of the nonfulfillment of which expectation, does not fall within the province of this article to consider. The various theories of the Parousia, the different ideas as to the time and the form of the second Advent, do not concern its relation to the exaltation of the Lord. Whenever and however He may return; whether He is ever coming to the church and to the world, His visible or His spiritual presence, do not affect the fact that He has been exalted to the position of ultimate Lord and final judge of men. We may therefore define this crowning condition of exaltation as:

1. Reality:

An advent, real, personal and visible. We must guard against the extremes of limiting this advent on the one side to a final particular event, on the other to those critical and catastrophic movements in world history which

have led to the extension of God's kingdom and a virtual judgment of men. The Lord is ever coming, and also He will return. See ~~<4011>~~ Acts 1:11; ~~<2724>~~ Luke 17:24; ~~<4240>~~ Matthew 24:30; 25:31; ~~<2912>~~ Luke 19:12; ~~<1030>~~ Matthew 13:40,41,49; ~~<2008>~~ Luke 18:8; ~~<4158>~~ John 5:28,29; 6:40,54; 21:22; ~~<4081>~~ Acts 3:20; ~~<5010>~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:10; ~~<8028>~~ Hebrews 9:28; ~~<5088>~~ James 5:8; ~~<6014>~~ Jude 1:14; ~~<6128>~~ 1 John 2:28; ~~<6100>~~ Revelation 1:7. The reality and visibility of the advent depend upon the personal and abiding relation of the Lord to the world-redemption. Christianity is not merely a spiritual dynamic drawn from a series of past events. It is the living relation of the complete humanity of the redeemed to the God man, and must therefore be consummated in a spiritual and material form. The ultimate of Christianity is no more docetic than was its original. A reverent faith will be satisfied with the fact of the glory whenever it shall arrive. The form and time are unrevealed. Preparation and readiness are better than speculation and imaginary description.

2. Judgment:

The Judgment is clearly taught by Scripture. our Lord declares that He is appointed Judge. (~~<4152>~~ John 5:22; 9:39). Paul teaches that we must "all stand before the judgment-seat of God" (~~<6140>~~ Romans 14:10). Here again there is the suggestion of the judgment which is ever being made by the Lord in His office as Sovereign and Administrator of the kingdom; but there is also the expectation of a definite and final act of separation and discernment. Whatever may be the form of this judgment (and here again a wise and reverent silence as to the unrevealed is a becoming attitude for the believer), we are sure that He who will make it, is the glorified Word incarnate, and it will be the judgment of a wisdom and justice and love that will be the complete glory of the Christ.

See also ASCENSION; JUDGMENT; PAROUSIA; RESURRECTION.

L. D. Bevan

CHRIST, HUMANITY OF

See HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

CHRIST, INTERCESSION OF.

See INTERCESSION OF CHRIST.

CHRIST, OFFICES OF

<of'-is-is>.

GENERAL TITLES OF OUR LORD:

This term has been used by theologians to describe the various characters of our Lord's redemptive work. Many appellative and metaphorical titles are found in Scripture for Christ, designative of His Divine and human natures and His work: God (^{<608>}John 20:28); Lord (^{<124>}Matthew 22:43,14); Word (^{<608>}John 1:1,14); Son of God (^{<187>}Matthew 3:17; ^{<135>}Luke 1:35; ^{<115>}Colossians 1:15; ^{<131>}1 John 5:20); Firstborn from the dead (^{<118>}Colossians 1:18); Beginning of the Creation of God (^{<114>}Revelation 3:14); Image of God (2 Cor 4:4); Express Image of His Person (^{<103>}Hebrews 1:3 the King James Version); Alpha and Omega (^{<108>}Revelation 1:8; 22:13); Son of Man (^{<183>}Matthew 8:20; ^{<151>}John 1:51; ^{<176>}Acts 7:56); Son of David (^{<127>}Matthew 9:27; 21:9); Last Adam (1 Cor 15:45,47); Captain of Salvation (^{<120>}Hebrews 2:10 margin) ; Saviour (^{<121>}Luke 2:11; ^{<142>}John 4:42; ^{<151>}Acts 5:31); Redeemer (^{<151>}Isaiah 59:20; ^{<124>}Titus 2:14); Author and Perfector of Faith (^{<122>}Hebrews 12:2); Light of the World (^{<182>}John 8:12); Lamb of God (^{<123>}John 1:29,36); Creator of all things (^{<108>}John 1:3,10); Mediator (1 Tim 2:5); Prophet (^{<185>}Deuteronomy 18:15; ^{<149>}Luke 24:19); Great High Priest (^{<144>}Hebrews 4:14); King (^{<133>}Luke 1:33; ^{<174>}Revelation 17:14; 19:16); Way, Truth and Life (^{<146>}John 14:6). These and many others express the mediatorial office of the Lord. As mediator, He stands between God and Man, revealing the Father to man, and expressing the true relation of man to God. The term (Greek [μεσίτης, mesites]), moreover, signifies messenger, interpreter, advocate, surety or pledge in ^{<119>}Galatians 3:19,20, where a covenant is declared to be assured by the hand of one who intervenes. Thus the covenant is confirmed and fulfilled by Him who secures that its stipulations should be carried out, and harmony is restored where before there had been difference and separation (1 Tim 2:5; ^{<186>}Hebrews 8:6; 9:15; 12:24). Thus is expressed the purpose of God to redeem mankind by mediation.

I. CHRIST'S MEDIATION EXPRESSED IN THE SPECIFIC OFFICES.

In presenting a systematic idea of this Redemptive Work of Christ by Mediation, Christian thought gave to it a harmonious character by choosing the most general and familiar titles of the Lord as the most

inclusive categories expressive of the mode of Redemption. These were prophetic, priestly and regal.

Historical Review of the Theory:

The first trace of this division is found in Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I, 3, and his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, IV, 15. It was accepted very largely in the Greek church, and continues to be used by Russian ecclesiastical writers. The Roman church has not so generally followed it, though it is found in the writings of many Roman theologians. The earlier reformers, especially Lutheran, ignored it. But Gerhard employed it and the Lutheran theologians followed his example, although some of these repudiated it, as Ernesti, Doderlein and Knapp. Calvin employed the division in his *Institutes*, II, 15. It was incorporated in the Heidelberg Catechism and has been adopted by most theologians of the Reformed church and by English and American divines. In Germany most theological writers, such as Deuteronomy Wette, Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Nitzsch, Ebrard, adopt it, affirming it as expressive of the essential quality of the work of redemption, and the most complete presentment of its contents. The justification of this position is found in the important place occupied in the progress of revelation by those to whom were entrusted the duties of teaching and leading men in relation to God in the offices of priest, prophet and king. Even the modern development of Christian thought which extends the view of Divine dealing with man over the entire race and its religious history, not excluding those who would find in the most recent conditions of the world's life the outworking of the will of God in the purposes of human salvation, cannot discover any better form of expressing Christ's relation to man than in terms of the prophetic, the priestly and the governmental offices. The prophet is the instrument of teaching: the priest expresses the ethical relation of man to God; while the king furnishes the typical form of that exercise of sovereign authority and Providential direction which concerns the practical life of the race.

II. THE THREEFOLD OFFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

From the close relation which Jesus in both His person and work bore to the Old Testament dispensation, it is natural to turn to the preparatory history of the early Scriptures for the first notes of these mediatorial offices. That the development of the Jewish people and system ever moved toward Christ as an end and fulfillment is universally acknowledged. The

vague and indeterminate conditions of both the religious and national life of Israel manifest a definite movement toward a clearer apprehension of man's relationship to God. Nothing is more clear in Israel's history than the gradual evolution of official service both of church and state, as expressed in the persons and duties of the prophet, the priest and the king. The early patriarch contained in himself the threefold dignity, and discharged the threefold duty. As the family became tribal, and the tribe national, these duties were divided. The order of the household was lost for a while in the chaos of the larger and less homogeneous society. The domestic altar was multiplied in many "high places." Professional interpreters of more or less religious value began to be seers, and here and there, prophets. The leadership of the people was occasional, ephemeral and uncertain. But the men of Divine calling appeared from time to time; the foundation work of Moses was built on; the regular order of the worship of Yahweh, notwithstanding many lapses, steadily prevailed. Samuel gave dignity to his post as judge, and he again beheld the open vision of the Lord; he offered the appointed sacrifices; he established the kingly office; and although he was not permitted to see the family of David on the throne, like Moses he beheld afar off the promised land of a Divinely appointed kingdom. With the accession of the Davidic house, the three orders of God's service were completely developed. The king was seated on the throne, the priest was ministering at the one altar of the nation, the prophet with the Divine message was ever at hand to teach, to guide and to rebuke.

The Failure of the Offices to Secure Their Desired Ends:

Notwithstanding this growth of the special institutions — prophet, priest and king — the religious and national condition was by no means satisfactory. The kingdom was divided; external foes threatened the existence of the nation; idolatry was not extinguished, and the prophets who were true to Yahweh were compelled to warn and rebuke the sins of the rulers and the people, and even to testify against the priests for their unfaithfulness to the truth and purity of the religion which they professed. The best hopes of Israel and the Divine promises seem thus to be contradicted by the constant failure of the people to realize their best ideals. Hence, slowly arose a vague expectation of reform. The idea of the better condition which was coming grew ever more distinct, and settled down at length to Israel's Messianic hope, expressed in various forms, finally converging to the looking for of one who should in some mysterious

way gather into himself the ideas which belonged especially to the three great offices.

III. THE PROPHET.

In this article we are concerned only with the offices as they tend to their fulfillment in Christ. For the more general treatment of each office, reference must be made to the special articles.

The Forecast of the True Prophet:

The first appearance of the idea of the special prophet of Yahweh is in ~~(5815)~~Deuteronomy 18:15. Moses had been sent by the people to hear the Lord's words on their behalf (~~(1209)~~Exodus 20:19; ~~(8572)~~Deuteronomy 5:27); and this incident in the later passage of ~~(5815)~~Deuteronomy 18:15-22 is connected with the promise of a prophet, while at the same time reference is made to the general fact of prophecy and the conditions of its validity and acceptance. Here we find the germ of the expectation of the Prophet, which occupied so large a place in the mind of Israel. In the act of the people sending Moses to receive the word, and Yahweh's promise to send a prophet whom they would accept, we see also the suggestion of a distinction between the first dispensation and the latter. The Divine promise was to the effect that what was given by Moses God would consummate in a prophetic revelation through a person. The conception of this personality is found in the second part of Isaiah (40 through 66). Isaiah's mission was vain, ~~(2404)~~Isaiah 49:4, but the coming one shall prevail, 49 through 53 ([passim]). But the success of this servant of Yahweh was not to be only as a prophet, but by taking on himself the penalty of sin (53:5), and by being made an offering for sin; and as Mighty Victor triumphing over all foes (53:10-12), the dignities of whose kingship are set forth in various parts of the prophetic writings. Thus the general effect of the course of the earlier revelation may be summed up in this prophetic ministry with which has been combined a priestly and a royal character. It was an ever-advancing manifestation of the nature and will of God, delivered by inspired men who spake at sundry times and in divers manners, but whose message was perfected and extended by Jesus Christ (~~(8000)~~Hebrews 1:1), who thus became the Prophet of the Lord.

IV. CHRIST THE PROPHET.

Christ's ministry illustrates the prophetic office in the most extensive and

exalted sense of the term. He was designed and appointed by the Father (^{<260b>}Isaiah 61:1,2; compare ^{<241b>}Luke 4:16-21; ^{<407b>}Matthew 17:5). In ^{<401b>}1 Corinthians 1:30, Christ is declared to be made to us wisdom. His intimate knowledge of God (^{<401b>}John 1:18; ^{<4012>}Matthew 11:27; ^{<416b>}John 16:15), the qualities of His teaching dependent upon His nature, both Divine and human (^{<403b>}John 3:34); His authority (^{<400b>}John 1:9,17,18; ^{<404b>}Luke 4:18-21); His knowledge of God (^{<412b>}Mark 12:29; ^{<404b>}John 4:24; ^{<4012>}Matthew 11:25; ^{<417b>}John 17:11,25; ^{<408b>}Matthew 18:35) — these all peculiarly fitted Christ to be the Revealer of God. Besides His doctrine of God, His ministry included the truth concerning Himself, His nature, claims, mission, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the religious life of man. He taught as none other the foundation of religion, the facts on which it was based, the essence of Divine service, the nature of sin, the grace of God, the means of atonement, the laws of the kingdom of God and the future state. By the acknowledgment of even those who have denied His Divine nature and redemptive work, He has been recognized as the Supreme Moral Teacher of the world. His claim to be the Prophet is seen in that He is the source of the ever-extending revelation of the eternal. His own words and works He declared were only part of the fuller knowledge which would be furnished by the system which He established (^{<409b>}Luke 9:45; 18:34; ^{<412b>}John 12:16; 14:26; 15:26; 16:12,13,14).

1. Christ's Manner of Teaching:

How remarkable was His method of teaching! Parable, proverb, absolute affirmation, suggestion, allusion to simple objects, practical life — these all made His teaching powerful, easily understood, living; sometimes His action was His word — and all with a commanding dignity and gracious winsomeness, that was felt by His hearers and has ever been recognized (^{<407b>}Matthew 7:29). So perfect and exalted was the teaching of Jesus that many have supposed that revelation ceased with Him, and the immediate followers whom He especially inspired to be His witnesses and interpreters. Certainly in Him the prophetic ministry culminated.

2. Christ as Prophet in His Church:

An important aspect of Christ's prophetic office is that of His relation to the church as the source, through the instrumentality of His Spirit, of ever-enlarging knowledge of Divine truth which it has been able to gain. This is the real significance of the claim which some churches make to be the custodians and interpreters of the tradition of faith, with which has also

gone theory of development — not as a human act but as a ministration of the Lord through His Spirit, which is granted to the church. Even those who hold that all Divine truth is to be found in the sacred Scriptures have yet maintained that God has much truth still to bring out of His word by the leading and direction of the Spirit of Jesus. The Scripture itself declares that Christ was the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world (~~FOOD~~ John 1:9). He Himself promised that the Spirit which He would give would guide His followers into all truth (~~BIGB~~ John 16:13). The apostles claimed to receive their teaching and direction of the church from the Lord (1 Cor 11:23). The testimony of Jesus is definitely declared to be the spirit of prophecy (~~GGID~~ Revelation 19:10). Indeed, all the apostolic writings in almost every line affirm that what they teach is received from the Spirit, who is the Spirit of the Lord.

V. THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

1. Judaic Priesthood:

For the history of the development of the priesthood of Israel on which our Lord's High-Priesthood is ideally based, reference must be made to the article especially dealing with that subject. The bearings of that institution upon the work of Jesus as Redeemer alone fall under this section. Judaism like all religions developed an extensive system of priestly service. As the moral sense of the people enlarged and became more distinct, the original simplicity of sacrifice, especially as a commensal act, in which the unity of the celebrants with each other and with God was expressed, was expanded into acts regularly performed by officials, in which worship, thanksgiving, covenant and priestly expiation and atonement were clearly and definitely expressed. The progress of sacrifice may be seen in the history of the Old Testament from Cain and Abel's (~~004B~~ Genesis 4:3,4), Noah's (~~008D~~ Genesis 8:20), Abraham's covenant (~~015D~~ Genesis 15:9-18), etc., to the elaborate services of the Mosaic ritual set forth in Lev, the full development of which is found only in the later days of Israel. When Christ appeared, the entire sacerdotal system had become incorporated in the mind, customs and language of the people. They had learned more or less distinctly the truth of man's relation to God in its natural character, and especially in that aspect where man by his sin had separated himself from God and laid himself open to the penalty of law. The conception of priesthood had thus grown in the consciousness of Israel, as the necessary instrument of mediation between man and God. Priestly acts were performed on behalf of the worshipper. The priest was to secure for man the Divine favor. This

could only be gained by an act of expiation. Something must be done in order to set forth the sin of man, his acknowledgment of guilt, the satisfaction of the law, and the assurance of the Divine forgiveness, the restored favor of God and finally the unity of man and God.

2. Sacrificial Relations of Christ in the Gospels:

That the work of Christ partook of the nature of priestly service is already indicated by references in the Gospels themselves. He was called "Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (^{<402>}Matthew 1:21). Salvation from sin, in the habit of thought at which the Jew had arrived, must have expressed itself most clearly in the symbolic signification of the sacrifices in the temple. Thus in the very name which our Lord received His priesthood is suggested. The frankincense of the Magi's offering is not without its mystical meaning (^{<401>}Matthew 2:11). Some may find in the Baptist's words, "baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire" (^{<401>}Matthew 3:11), a suggestion of priestly action, for the understanding of John's declaration must be found in the conventional ideas of the Jewish thought of the period, determined as they undoubtedly were by the history of priestly service in the past and the fully developed ritual of the temple. The baptizing of the proselyte was not necessarily a priestly act, as indeed we cannot be certain that the baptism was always necessary at the introduction of a proselyte into the Jewish church. But the association of circumcision with the initiation of the proselyte certainly introduced the priest, and the sprinkling of the congregation by the priest was a familiar part of his official duties. It is quite probable therefore that John's use of the expression carried with it something of the sacerdotal idea.

3. Christ's Ethical Teaching Affected by Sacrificial Ideas:

The spirit of our Lord's teaching, as seen in the Sermon on the Mount, etc., as it reflects the thought of the Galilean ministry, may be regarded as prophetic rather than priestly. Still the end of the teaching was righteousness, and it was impossible for a Jew to conceive of the securing of righteousness without some reference to priestly administration and influence. The contrast of the effect of Christ's teaching with that of the scribes (^{<402>}Matthew 7:29) keeps us in the vicinity of the law as applied through the sacerdotal service of which the scribes were the interpreters and teachers, and surely therefore a hint of our Lord's relation to priesthood may have found its way into the minds of His immediate

hearers. He was careful to recognize the authority of the priest (~~4084~~Matthew 8:4).

The doctrine of sacrifice emerges somewhat more distinctly in the reference to the cross, which our Lord associates with the thought of finding life by losing it (~~4064~~Matthew 16:24,25), and when the taking up the cross is interpreted by following Christ, and this hint is soon followed by Christ's distinct reference to His coming sufferings (~~4070~~Matthew 17:9,12), more definitely referred to in ~~4072~~Matthew 17:22,23. Now the object of the work of the Lord takes clearer form. The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost (~~4081~~Matthew 18:11 the American Revised Version, margin). As the time of the catastrophe drew nearer, the Lord became still more distinct in His references to His coming death (~~4083~~Matthew 20:18,19), and at length declares that "the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many" (~~4083~~Matthew 20:28). our Lord's quotations (~~4092~~Matthew 21:42; 23:39) concerning the rejected "corner stone," and the Blessed One "that cometh in the name of the Lord" (~~4082~~Psalms 118:22,26), are drawn from a psalm filled with the spirit of the priestly service of the temple, and in their reference to Himself again illustrate the ever-increasing recognition of His priesthood. He also uses the official term "Christ" (Messiah, the anointed one) more frequently (~~4095~~Matthew 24:5,23,14). On the eve of the betrayal and trial the crucifixion is clearly foretold (~~4089~~Matthew 26:2); and the death (~~4092~~Matthew 26:12). The full significance of the death is asserted at the institution of the Lord's Supper. The bread is "my body," the wine is "my blood of the new covenant," and it is declared to be "poured out for many unto remission of sins" (~~4095~~Matthew 26:26-28 margin).

4. Mutual Confirmations of the Synoptics:

A similar succession of ideas of our Lord's priestly work may be found in the other gospels (see ~~4008~~Mark 1:8,44; 8:29; see below on the significance of the term Christ; 8:31,34; 9:9,10). The inability of the disciples to understand the life that was to follow death here is indicated — the truth of the gospel of death and resurrection so closely bound up with the conception of sacrifice, where the blood is the life which given becomes the condition of the new union with God, being thus revealed by Christ as the initial doctrine to be continuously enlarged (9:31; 10:21,33,14,45; 11:9; 12:10; 13:21,22; 14:8,22-25,61,62). In Luke the priestly "atmosphere" is introduced in the earliest part of the narrative, the history of Zacharias and

Elisabeth giving emphasis to the setting of John's own mission (Luke 1). The name Jesus (^{<Q13>} Luke 1:31); the special relation of the new kingdom to sin, necessarily connected with sacrifice in the mind of a priest, found in Zacharias' psalm (^{<Q17>} Luke 1:77,78); the subtle suggestion of the Suffering One in the "also" of ^{<Q15>} Luke 2:35 the King James Version (the American Standard Revised Version omits) shows that the third Gospel is quite in line with the two other Synoptics (see also ^{<Q18>} Luke 3:3; 5:14). The claim to forgive sins must have suggested the sacrificial symbol of remission (^{<Q13>} Luke 5:24; 9:23; 13:35; 14:27; 18:31; 20:14; 22:19,20; 24:7,26,46,47). In the Fourth Gospel, we have the word of the Baptist, "Behold, the Lamb of God" (^{<Q12>} John 1:29,36), where Christ's relation to sin is distinctly expressed (*see* LAMB OF GOD) — the baptism in the Spirit (^{<Q13>} John 1:33). It is highly probable that the apostle John was the "other" of the two disciples, (1:40) and, having heard the Baptist's words, is the only evangelist who records them, thus introducing from his personal knowledge the sacrificial idea earlier into his history than the Synoptics. Christ declares that He will give His life for the life of the world (6:51). The entire passage (6:47-65) is suffused with the conception of "life for life," one of the elements constituting the conception of the sacrificial act. In 8:28 (compare 3:14; 12:32) Christ predicts His crucifixion. The Good Shepherd gives His life for the sheep (10:15). In 10:17,18, Christ claims the power to lay down His life and to take it again. He is the sacrifice and the Sacrificer.

5. The Dual Outgrowth of Sacrifice, the Victim and Sacrificer:

Here appears for the first time the double relation of Christ to the sacrificial idea, worked out in the later thought of the church into the full significance of our Lord's priestly office. In ^{<Q15>} John 11:25,26 Christ is the source of life, and life after death. It is hardly possible that this conception should not have, even if remotely suggested, some reference to the significance of sacrifice; for in the sacrifices the Divine claim for the blood, as specially to be set apart as the Divine portion, was ever present. God ever claimed the blood as His; for to Him the life was forfeited by sin. And moreover He alone possesses life and gives it. Of that forfeit and that Divine sovereignty of life, sacrifice is the expression. This is fully realized and made actual in Christ's life and death for man, in which man shares by His unity with Christ. Man at once receives the penalty of sin in dying with Christ, and rises again into the new life which our Lord opened, and of which He is the ceaseless energy and power through the spirit of God. The emergence of

this idea is illustrated by the evangelist in the sayings of Caiaphas, where as the high priest of the nation he gives, though unconsciously, a significant expression to the truth that it was “expedient” that Jesus ‘should die for the nation and for the children of God everywhere scattered’ (11:47-52). Here the symbolic significance of sacrifice is practically realized: death in the place of another and the giving of life to those for whom the sacrifice was offered. The vitalizing power of Christ’s death is asserted in the discourse following the visit of the Greeks (12:24-33). The idea of life from the dying seed is associated with the conception of the power of attraction and union by the cross. The natural law of life through death is thus in harmony with the gift of life through sacrifice involving death. That sacrifice may be found much more widely than merely in death, is shown by the law of service illustrated in the washing of the disciples’ feet (13:14-17); and this is declared to spring out of love (15:13). For the priestly ideas of our Lord’s prayer (John 17) *see* INTERCESSION; INTERCESSION OF CHRIST; PRAYERS OF CHRIST.

6. Christ’s Priesthood in the Apostolic Ministry and Epistles:

Christ’s priestly office finds illustration in the Acts of the Apostles, in the apostolic declaration of Christ’s Messianic office, not only Lord, but also Christ the Anointed One (~~412B~~ Acts 2:36). Peter’s reference to the stone which completed the temple, the service of which was essentially sacrificial, as the Symbol of Christ, the Crown of that Spiritual Temple (~~411B~~ Acts 4:11); Philip’s application of the passage in Isaiah of the sheep led to the slaughter (~~2810~~ Isaiah 53:7,8) to our Lord (~~418B~~ Acts 8:32,35); Peter’s discourse to Cornelius, culminating in the remission of sins through Christ (~~410B~~ Acts 10:43) — all indicates the steady growth in the apostolic ministry of the conception of our Lord’s priestly office. The idea takes its most distinct form in Paul’s sermon at Antioch (~~413B~~ Acts 13:38,39). The necessity of Christ’s death and resurrection was the essence of Paul’s message (~~417B~~ Acts 17:3). And in the address to the elders, the church is declared to have been purchased by God with His own blood (~~418B~~ Acts 20:28).

As the epistles express the more elaborated thought of the apostolic ministry, the sacrifice of our Lord naturally finds more definite exposition, and inasmuch as He was both active and passive in the offering of Himself, the conception of sacrifice branches into the twofold division, the object offered, and the person offering. It must never be forgotten, however, that the thought of Christ’s sacrifice even when thus separated into its two

great divisions necessarily involves in each conception the suggestion of the other: God setting Him forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood (^{<4825>}Romans 3:25). He was delivered for our offenses and raised for our justification (^{<4805>}Romans 4:25). Through Him we have access to the conditions of justification and peace (^{<4810>}Romans 5:2). Christ died for the ungodly, and we are justified by His blood (^{<4818>}Romans 5:8,9). The conception of life both as forfeit from man and gift by God, expressed by sacrifice, runs through the reasoning of Romans 8 (see especially 8:11,32-34, where Christ who died for man rises from the dead, and becomes the intercessor; the victim and the High Priest are thus united in the Lord, and thus He becomes full expression and supplier of the love of God which is the perfect life). In ^{<4812>}1 Corinthians 1:23 Paul affirms the preaching of the cross as the center of his message. The subject of his teaching was not merely Christ, but Christ and Him crucified (1 Cor 2:2). In ^{<4817>}1 Corinthians 5:7 Christ is declared to be the Passover, and sacrificed for us (1 Cor 10:16-18). The manifestation of the death of the Lord by the bread and wine is given in the account of the institution of the Supper (1 Cor 11:26). In ^{<4813>}1 Corinthians 15:3 Christ is said expressly to have died for our sins. Christ's sacrifice lies at the basis of all the thought of the Galatian epistle (1:4; 2:20; 3:13).

In Ephesians we have the definite statement of redemption through the blood of Christ (^{<4807>}Ephesians 1:7). Christ's humiliation to the cross is given in ^{<5018>}Philippians 2:8; community with Christ's death, one of the important elements of sacrifice, in ^{<5010>}Philippians 3:10,11. Forgiveness, the essence of redemption, is declared to be through the blood of Christ (^{<5014>}Colossians 1:14). Peace is secured through the blood of the cross, and reconciliation (^{<5010>}Colossians 1:20); the presentation of us in Christ's flesh through death, holy and unblamable and unprovable to God (^{<5012>}Colossians 1:22). The community of sacrifice sets forth the oneness of believers with Christ (^{<5016>}Colossians 3:1-4). Christ is declared to be the one Mediator between God and man, who gave Himself a ransom for all (1 Tim 2:5,6).

7. The Crowning Testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews:

The chief source of the priestly conception of our Lord is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ is declared to have by Himself purged our sins (^{<5003>}Hebrews 1:3); to taste of death for every man (^{<5009>}Hebrews 2:9); that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest to make reconciliation for the sins of the people (^{<5017>}Hebrews 2:17; compare ^{<5018>}Hebrews 3:1); the

community of sacrifice (^{<8814>}Hebrews 3:14); our great High Priest has passed into the heavens (^{<8044>}Hebrews 4:14); His pitifulness (4:15); the authority and power of Christ's priesthood fully set forth (Hebrews 5). Christ was made a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek (^{<8816>}Hebrews 5:6). The priesthood of Christ being of the order of Melchizedek is more excellent than the Aaronic priesthood (Hebrews 7). Christ's priesthood being eternal, that of the Aaronic is abolished (Hebrews 8). Christ's high-priesthood is made effectual by His own blood; and He entered once for all into the holy place, and has become the Mediator of a New Covenant (^{<8911>}Hebrews 9:11-15). Christ is forever the representative of man in heaven (^{<8924>}Hebrews 9:24-28). Christ by the sacrifice of Himself forever takes away sin, and has consecrated the new and living way to God (Hebrews 10). He is the Mediator of the New Covenant (^{<8824>}Hebrews 12:24). The entire Epistle is steeped in the conception of Christ's priesthood.

In ^{<6002>}1 Peter 1:2 the sacrificial element appears in the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The sufferings of the Lord were prophesied, the spirit of the Anointed One signifying what the prophets desired to know (1:11); the redemption by the precious blood of Christ is of "a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1:19); the priesthood of believers was through Christ (2:5), who carried up our sins in his body to the tree (2:24 the Revised Version, margin).

In the Johannine writings we have the cleansing from sin by the blood of Jesus Christ (^{<6007>}1 John 1:7). Christ is said to have laid down His life for us (^{<6116>}1 John 3:16). The sacrifice as well as the teaching of Christ is insisted on in the coming by blood as well as by water (^{<6116>}1 John 5:6).

The appearance of Christ in ^{<6013>}Revelation 1:13 is high-priestly; His robe is the talar, the high-priestly garment. The sacrificial place of Christ is indicated by "a Lamb as though it had been slain" (^{<6116>}Revelation 5:6,9,12). The repeated title of Christ throughout the Apocalypse is The Lamb.

8. Christ's Relation to Sin Expressed in Sacrificial Terms:

This review of the Scripture teaching on priesthood clearly indicates the development of thought which led to the affirmation of our Lord's priestly office. He came to put away sin. The doctrine of sin was intimately associated with the priestly service of the temple. The sacrifices were in

some cases sin offerings, and in these there ever appeared, by the function of the blood which is the life, the fatal loss of life by sin, the punishment of which was the withdrawal of the Divine gift of life. The life was always in the sacrifice reserved for God. It was natural therefore when Christ appeared that His work in taking away sin should have been interpreted in the light of sacrificial thought. We find the idea steadily developed in the New Testament. He was the sacrifice, the Lamb of God. The question as to who offered the sacrifice was answered — Himself. Then He became in the conception of apostolic teaching, especially emphasized in the Epistle to the He, the priest as well as the sacrifice. This was at length completely defined in theology of the church, and has generally been accepted as setting forth an important aspect of our Lord's redemptive work.

VI. CHRIST'S KINGLY OFFICE.

The Breakdown of the Secular Monarchy:

The association of rule with the redemption of mankind was early found in Divine revelation. It is in the Protevangelium of ^{<0085>}Genesis 3:15; the covenant with Abraham contains it (^{<0227>}Genesis 22:17,18); the blessing of Jacob reflects it (^{<0490>}Genesis 49:10). After the successive attempts to establish a visible and earthly monarchy, its settlement in the family of David was associated with Divine premonitions of continued and gracious royalty (^{<0078>}2 Samuel 7:18-29; 23:1-7; Psalms 2; 45; 72; 110). The failure of the earthly monarchy and the fatal experiences of the kingdom turned the thought of the devout, especially guided by prophetic testimony, to a coming king who should restore the glory of the Davidic house and the people of Israel. Here and there the conception appears of the more extended reign of the Coming One, and the royal authority finds a growing place in the prophetic Scriptures (^{<2001>}Isaiah 2:1-4; 9:6,7; 11:1-10; 42:1-4; 52:13-15; 53:12; 60; ^{<2025>}Jeremiah 23:5,6; 30:18-24; ^{<2044>}Daniel 2:44; 7:9-14,27; ^{<3001>}Micah 5:1-4; Zechariah 3). The postexilic conception of the king became one of the supreme and most active ideas in the Jewish mind. The reign of the Messiah was to be earthly, and all nations were to be subject to the Jew. The Jews of Palestine seem to have retained the more patriotic and the more material form of the idea (see 1 Macc 14:41), while the Egyptian and dispersed Jews began to regard the more spiritual character of the coming Messiah. References to the future blessedness of Israel under the restored royalty do not appear so largely in the Apocrypha writings which it must be remembered reflect chiefly their Egyptian-Jewish sources.

Still there are some passages of interest (Baruch 4:21-5; Tobit 13; Ecclesiasticus 35:18,19; 36:11-16; 47:11,22). In the New Testament we have references to the strong expectation of the restored royalty and kingdom (~~314~~ John 1:49; 6:15; 12:12-15; ~~4006~~ Acts 1:6). Christ's kingship was speedily recognized by those who saw His works of power, and acknowledged His authority. He Himself clearly claimed this authority (~~4128~~ Matthew 22:43-45; ~~6836~~ John 18:36,37). It was however not a kingdom based upon material and external power and rule, but on the foundation of truth and righteousness. The Kingdom of Heaven or of God is familiar to every reader of the words of Jesus. It was thus He described the new order which He had come to establish, of which He was to be the Lord and Administrator; not an earthly dominion after the fashion of this world's kingdoms; it was to be the rule of mind and of spirit. It was to be extended by ethical forces, and the principle of its authority was centered in Christ Himself. It was to be developed on earth but perfected in the future and eternal life. Some divines have distinguished Christ's regal power as that of nature, that of grace, that of glory. Many believe that there is to be a personal visible reign of Christ upon the earth. Some hold that this will be produced by His advent prior to an age of millennial glory. Other views regard the advent as the close of earthly conditions and the final judgment.

VII. THE MESSIANIC BASIS OF THE THREEFOLD OFFICE OF THE LORD.

That the developments of Jewish thought centered round what may conveniently be called the idea of the Messiah is plain to any student of the Old Testament and other Jewish writings. They sprang from the ethical and theological ideas of this people, interpreted by and expressed in their political and religious forms, and continually nurtured by their experiences in the varied course of their national life. The essence of Messianic belief was a personal deliverer. Jewish history had always been marked by the appearance and the exploits of a great man. The capacity of the production of exceptional and creative individuals has been the characteristic of the race in all its ages. A judge, a lawgiver, a teacher, a seer, a king — each had helped, or even saved the people in some critical period. Each had added to the knowledge of God, whether received or rejected by the people. The issues of such service had remained, enshrined in a growing liturgy, or made permanent in a finally centralized and unified ritual, recorded in chronicle and lyric. The hope of Israel at one time did not take the completely personal form; indeed, it is probably easy to exaggerate the

Messianic element as we look back from the perfect realization of it, in the Christian revelation and history. Much that has been called Messianic has been the result of reading into the Old Testament what has been derived from Christian thought and experience. Zephaniah has been described as a picture of Israel's restoration and triumph. Yet apparently it has no reference to the personal element. Still the "Messiah" begins to appear in the prophetic writings (see above), especially in the royal elements of His office. It is at this point that the meaning of the term is to be considered. "Yahweh's anointed" is found as applied to a king, and is familiar in this use in the Old Testament. But anointing belonged to the priesthood and to the prophetic order, if not actually, at least metaphorically, as setting apart (see ^{<1196>}1 Kings 19:16; ^{<1945>}Psalm 105:15; ^{<2301>}Isaiah 61:1). And the word Messiah (Christ) the Anointed, came to be used for that conception of a person, perhaps first employed definitely (^{<2024>}Daniel 9:24-26), who should be the Deliverer of the Jews and even still more widely, a Redeemer. In the age immediately preceding the Christian, the idea had taken possession not only of the Jews, but also of the Samaritans (^{<4025>}John 4:25); and was not altogether unknown in Gentile thought; e.g. Sib Or, iii.97; Virgil Ecl. iv. It involves certainly the prophetic and royal offices and, in the idea of a Suffering Servant, was closely allied to the objects of the sacrificial order. The claim of Jesus to be the Christ, and the recognition of this claim by His followers and apostles, gave a new meaning to the teaching of the Old Testament, and the writings lying outside the canon, but which were familiar to the people. Especially was the suffering and death of the Lord and its relation to sin the occasion of a new Understanding of the Mosaic and later-developed sacrificial system. Jesus as the Offerer of Himself perfected the function of the priest, as He became the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. He thus completed the threefold ministry of the Messiah as the Prophet who reveals, the Priest who offers and intercedes, the King who rules. In Him the offices are commingled. He rules by His sacrifice and His teaching; He reveals by His Kingship and His offering. The offices spring from both His person and His work, and are united in the final issue of the salvation of the world.

See also EXALTATION OF CHRIST; INTERCESSION OF CHRIST.

LITERATURE.

Euseb., HE, I,3; Aug., Deuteronomy civ. Dei, x. 6; Catech. Council of Trent; Calvin, Instit., II, 15; Heidelb. Catech. Ans. 31 and Reformed

Liturg; Thanksgiving aft. Inft. Bapt.; J. Gerhard, Loci Theolog; Spener, Catechism.; Ernesti, Deuteronomy officio Christi triplici; Knapp, Theology, section 107; Ebrard, Herzog Realencyc., under the word Further discussion is found in the standard theologies, as Pye Smith, First Lines, and Scrip. Teatim. to the Messiah; Hodge, Shedd, Weiss, Biblical Theol. of the New Testament, Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics. See also Higginson, Ecce Messias; Moule's brief but suggestive statement in Outlines of Christian Doctrine; Ritschl, A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, especially Introduction; Dorner, The Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

L. D. Bevan

CHRIST, PERSON OF

See PERSON OF CHRIST.

CHRIST, TEMPTATION OF

See TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

CHRISTIAN

<*kris'-chan*>, <*kris'-ti-an*> ([ριστιανός, Christianos]):

1. HISTORICITY OF ^{<41126>}ACTS 11:26:

The word Christian occurs only three times in the New Testament (^{<41126>}Acts 11:26; 26:28; and ^{<41146>}1 Peter 4:16). The first passage, ^{<41126>}Acts 11:26, gives the origin of the term, "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." The older generation of critical scholars disputed the historicity of this statement. It was argued that, had the term originated so early, it must have been found far more frequently in the records of early Christianity; sometimes also that the termination [-ianus] points to a Latin origin. But there is general agreement now that these objections are groundless. The historicity of the Lukan account is upheld not only by Harnack, but by the more radical Knopf in Die Schriften des New Testament, edited by Johannes Weiss. In early imperial times, the adjectival termination [-ianos] was widely diffused throughout the whole empire. Originally applied to the slaves belonging to the great households, it had passed into regular use to denote the adherents of an individual or a party. A Christian is thus simply an adherent of Christ. The name belongs, as

Ramsay says, to the popular slang, as indeed sect and party names generally do. It is only after a considerable interval, and very often under protest, that such names are accepted as self-designations.

2. OF PAGAN ORIGIN:

The name, then, did not originate with the Christians themselves. Nor would the Jews have applied it to the followers of Jesus, whose claim to be the Christ they opposed so passionately. They spoke of the Christians as “the sect of the Nazarenes” (~~4015~~ Acts 24:5); perhaps also as “Galileans,” a term which the emperor Julian attempted later vainly to revive. The word must have been coined by the heathen population of Antioch, as the church emerged from the synagogue, and a Christianity predominantly Gentile took its place among the religions of the world.

3. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO THE NAME:

Perhaps the earliest occurrence of Christian as a self-designation is in Didache 12:4. In the Apologists and Ignatius on the other hand the word is in regular use. 1 Peter simply takes it over from the anti-Christian judicial procedure of the law courts, without in any way implying that the Christians used it among themselves. There is every probability, however, that it was the danger which thus began at an early date to attach to the name which commended it to the Christians themselves as a title of honor. Deissmann (Licht vom Osten, 286) suggests that Christian means slave of Christ, as Caesarian means slave of Caesar. But the word can scarcely have had that fullness of meaning till the Christians themselves had come to be proud of it.

According to tradition, Luke himself belonged to Antioch. In ~~4117~~ Acts 11:27,28 Codex Bezae (D) reads “There was much rejoicing, and when we had assembled, there stood up,” etc. In view of the greater authority now so frequently accorded to the so-called Western text, we cannot summarily dispose of such a reading as an interpolation. If the historian was not only an Antiochene, but a member of the original Gentile Christian church, we have the explanation alike of his interest in the origin of the name Christian, and of the detailed precision of his information.

4. WAS “CHRISTIAN” THE ORIGINAL FORM?:

In all three New Testament passages the uncorrected Codex Sinaiticus reads “Chrestian.” We know from many sources that this variant was

widely current in the 2nd century. Blass in his edition of Acts not only consistently reads “Chrestian,” but conjectures that “Chrestian” is the correct reading in Tacitus (Annals, xv.44), the earliest extra-Biblical testimony to the word. The Tacitus manuscript has since been published in facsimile. This has shown, according to Harnack (Mission and Expansion (English translation), I, 413, 414), that “Chrestian” actually was the original reading, though the name “Christ” is correctly given. Harnack accordingly thinks that the Latin historian intended to correct the popular appellation of circa 64 AD, in the light of his own more accurate knowledge. “The common people used to call them ‘Chrestians,’ but the real name of their founder was Christ.” Be this as it may, a confusion between “Christos” ([Christos]) and the familiar Greek slave name “Chrestos” ([chrestos]) is more intelligible at an early date than late r, when Christianity was better known. There must have been a strong tendency to conform the earlier witnesses to the later, familiar, and etymologically correct, usage. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the original scribe of Codex Sinaiticus retains “Chrestian.” On the whole it seems probable that this designation, though bestowed in error, was the original one.

5. THE CHRISTIANS AND THE EMPIRE:

The fuller discussion of this subject more appropriately falls under the articles dealing with the relation of the church and empire. Suffice it here to say that Paul apparently hoped that by his acquittal the legal position of Christianity as a *religio licita* would be established throughout the empire, and that 1 Peter belongs to a time when the mere profession of Christianity was a crime in the eyes of the state, but that in all probability this was a new position of affairs.

6. SOCIAL STANDING OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS:

That early Christianity was essentially a movement among the lower non-literary classes has been rightly emphasized — above all by Deissmann. This is a circumstance of the utmost importance for the correct understanding of the early history of our faith, though probably Deissmann in some degree exaggerates and misplaces the significance. Is it correct to say, for example, that “primitive Christianity was relatively indifferent to politics, not as Christianity, but as a movement of the humbler folks, whose lot on the whole had certainly been lightened by the Empire” (Licht vom

Osten, 254)? Very probably however the difficulties of the Pauline Gentilemission were appreciably increased by the fact that he touched a lower social stratum than that of the original Jewish Christianity of Palestine. No class more resents being associated in any way with the “submerged masses” than the self-respecting peasant or artisan, who seems to have formed the backbone of the Palestine church. The apostle had consequently to fight against social, no less than racial and religious, prejudices.

7. CHRISTIAN SELF-DESIGNATIONS:

The Christians originally called themselves “Disciples,” a term afterward restricted to personal hearers of the Lord, and regarded as a title of high distinction. The ordinary self-designations of the apostolic age are “believers” (~~4614~~ Acts 5:14; ~~5042~~ 1 Timothy 4:12), “saints” (~~4903~~ Acts 9:13,12,41; ~~5007~~ Romans 1:7), “brethren” (~~4008~~ Acts 6:3; 10:23, etc.), “the elect” (~~5082~~ Colossians 3:12; ~~5100~~ 2 Timothy 2:10), “the church of God” (~~4008~~ Acts 20:28 margin), “servants (slaves) to God” (~~4622~~ Romans 6:22; ~~4026~~ 1 Peter 2:16). The apostolic authors refer to themselves as “servants (slaves) of Christ Jesus” (~~5000~~ Philippians 1:1). Other expressions are occasionally met with, of which perhaps the most significant is: Those “that call upon the name of the Lord” (~~4094~~ Acts 9:14; ~~5002~~ Romans 10:12,13; ~~4002~~ 1 Corinthians 1:2). Compare Pliny’s report to Trajan (Epistles, X, 97): “They affirmed that they had been wont to assemble and address a hymn to Christ as to a god.”

LITERATURE.

The most recent discussion of the names of Christian believers, including “Christian,” is in Harnack’s *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, English translation (2nd edition, 1908), I, 399 ff. See also EB, HDB, DCG, with the lit. there cited. On the social status of the early Christians, compare Orr’s *Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity*; on the religious significance of the name, *see* CHRISTIANITY.

John Dickie

CHRISTIANITY

<kris-chan'-i-ti>, <kris-chi-an'-i-ti>, <kris-ti-an'-i-ti>
([ριστιανισμός, Christianismos]):

I. IN PRINCIPLE AND ESSENCE.

1. Early Use of Term:

Unlike “Christian” (the King James Version), the term “Christianity,” so far as is known, was first used by the Christians themselves, but does not occur in the New Testament. It is exactly parallel to Judaism (“the Jews’ religion”), found not only in ~~ROM~~ Galatians 1:13,14, but in 2 Macc 2:21, etc. Our earliest authority for the word “Christianism” is Ignatius of Antioch. Christian is now a title of honor, and the Christian’s glory is “to live according to Christianity” (Ignatius, Ad mages, 10).

2. New Testament Implications: Messiahship — Resurrection — Redemption:

While, however, the name is foreign to the New Testament, the New Testament is by universal consent our most important source of information regarding the thing. Christianity arose out of the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth, who claimed to be “the Christ.” During Jesus’ lifetime this claim was admitted by a circle of adherents, in whose view, afterwards, it was triumphantly vindicated by His resurrection from the dead. By resurrection He “was declared to be the Son of God with power” (~~ROM~~ Romans 1:4). With this was united from the first the recognition of Christ as the God-sent Redeemer, through whom has come to the world forgiveness, reconciliation with God and Divine spiritual power.

Pauline Summaries.

One of the oldest summaries of Christianity is that of Paul in ~~ACT~~ 1 Corinthians 15:3,1: “For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures.” Of similar purport are the apostle’s words in ~~2COR~~ 2 Corinthians 5:18,19: “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 unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses.” From this reconciliation springs the new life of believers (Romans 6; ~~2COR~~ 2 Corinthians 5:14-17).

3. Did Jesus Claim to Be Christ?:

More recently some have denied that Jesus advanced any such claim to Messiahship, but always upon purely arbitrary and subjective grounds. On the one hand these writers have been profoundly impressed by the grandeur of Jesus’ character; on the other they have looked upon the claim to stand

in such a unique relation to God and man as unfounded or meaningless. They have sought, accordingly, to escape the difficulty by denying that Jesus regarded Himself as the Anointed of the Lord (thus, e.g. Wrede). Sometimes they have gone the length even of affirming that Jesus was not so regarded by His personal disciples. Divine honors were accorded Him only gradually, as the memory of what He actually was faded away, and an idealization begotten of Christian faith took its place. The notion of Messiah is merely a piece of Jewish folklore. This position in its distinctively modern form has been answered, it seems to us, with absolute conclusiveness, by Professor James Denney in his *Jesus and the Gospel*. In a historical point of view, nothing in Jesus' life is more certain than that He regarded Himself as the Christ, the culmination and fulfillment of the Divine revelation given to Israel. This conviction of His is the point round which His whole message revolves. The most recent New Testament theology, that, e.g. of Dr. Paul Feine (1910), rightly starts from Jesus' Messianic consciousness, and seeks to understand His whole teaching in the light of it. Doubtless, like everything else which Jesus touched, the concept of Messiahship becomes transmuted and glorified in His hands. our Lord was in no way dependent upon current beliefs and expectations for the content of His Messianic consciousness. But is it likely that His followers, without His authority, would have attributed Messiahship to one so utterly unlike the Messiah of popular fancy?

4. The Resurrection:

The New Testament proves not only that the Christians from the very outset were fully persuaded, on what they regarded as adequate grounds in history and experience, that their Lord had risen from the dead, but also that this conviction mastered them, giving direction and purpose to their whole lives. Historical Christianity was erected on the foundation of a Risen Lord.

Its Evidence.

On this point Professor Denney says (*Jesus and the Gospel*, 111): "The real historical evidence for the resurrection is the fact that it was believed, preached, propagated, and produced its fruit and effect in the new phenomenon of the Christian church, long before any of our gospels were written. Faith in the resurrection was not only prevalent but immensely powerful before any of our New Testament books were written. Not one of them would ever have been written but for that faith. It is not this or that

in the New Testament — it is not the story of the empty tomb, or of the appearing of Jesus in Jerusalem or in Galilee — which is the primary evidence for the resurrection: it is the New Testament itself. The life that throbs in it from beginning to end, the life that always fills us again with wonder, as it beats upon us from its pages, is the life which the Risen Saviour has quickened in Christian souls. The evidence for the resurrection of Jesus is the existence of the church in that extraordinary spiritual vitality which confronts us in the New Testament. This is its own explanation of its being.”

5. Two Contrasted Estimates of our Lord's Person:

The best Christian thought of our day has no more difficulty than had the apostles in holding and establishing what Principal Forsyth fitly calls “the superhistoric finality of Christ.” In the very nature of the case, wherever the problem of our Lord's person has been seriously faced, there have always been two distinct estimates of His value, that of assured faith, based upon personal experience of His redemptive power, and that of mere externalism.

(1) The Non-Believing Estimate — not Truly Historical:

The latter or non-believing estimate has no more right now to call itself “historical” or “scientific,” than it had, nearly nineteen hundred years ago, to crucify the Lord of glory. The priests doubtless thought that they understood Jesus better than the ignorant, deluded Galileans. Yet the boldest champion of “the religio-historic method” would scarcely claim that theirs was the correct judgment. As a matter of fact, the so-called critical school are no more free from presuppositions than is the most thoroughgoing traditionalist. Nor have they a monopoly either of historical knowledge or of critical acumen. No truths are accessible to them which are not equally available for the Christian believer. No proof exists, beyond their own unsupported assertions, that they are better interpreters of the common truth. On the other hand, that whole range of experience and conviction into which the Christian believer finds the supreme assurance of the truth of his religion is to them a sealed book. Surely, then, it is the height of absurdity to maintain that the external, non-believing, estimate of our Lord's person is likely to be the more correct one. From the standpoint of Christian faith, such an external estimate is necessarily inadequate, whether it finds expression in a mechanical acceptance of the whole

ecclesiastical Christology, or in the denial that such a person as Jesus of Nazareth ever lived.

(2) The Believing Estimate — Relation to Experience:

The believing estimate of our Lord's person is the essence of Christianity as a historical religion. But according to the New Testament this estimate is itself Divinely-inwrought and Divinely attested (~~467~~ Matthew 16:17; ~~428~~ 1 Corinthians 12:3; ~~602~~ 1 John 4:2,3). It presupposes the perfect objective self-manifestation of God in Jesus Christ on the one hand, and the subjective appropriation of this revelation by faith on the other. No argument against the reality of the revelation can be built upon the fact, generally acknowledged by Christian theologians nowadays, that the Deity of our Lord and the supernatural origin of our religion can neither be proved nor disproved independently of one's personal attitude to Christianity. This follows necessarily from the nature of the apprehension of Divine truth. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. There can be no impersonal knowledge of religious, any more than of ethical and aesthetic, truth. In these realms another's knowledge has no real meaning for anyone till he has felt its power and tested it in his own experience. Evangelical Christians do not accept the Deity of the Lord as the cardinal article of their religious faith on any merely external authority whether of Scripture or of tradition, or even of His own recorded words apart from experience of Christ. They accept it precisely as they accept the authority of Scripture itself, because of the witness of the Spirit with their spirits. The combined testimony of Scripture and tradition is confirmed in their religious life, when by receiving Jesus as our Lord and Saviour they experience the Christian power. This power is the great experienced reality in the light of which alone the other realities become intelligible. "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see" (~~402~~ John 9:25). "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (~~408~~ John 6:68).

6. Christianity an Experience of Salvation:

The true church of Christ consists of all who have experienced the power of Christ, delivering them from the guilt, the stain, and the dominion of sin and bringing the peace of God into their souls. Nothing less than this is either the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or the historic faith of Christendom, or a religion adequate to human need. The Christian doctrine is partly the assertion of the reality of this power, partly its interpretation. Facts of history and theological propositions are vital to our

faith, just in proportion as they are vitally related to this power. The Christian essentials are those elements, historical and dogmatic, without which Christianity would lose in whole or in part its living power to reconcile sinful man to the all-righteous, loving God.

7. Jesus and the Gospel:

Thus Jesus Himself belongs to His gospel. He is the heart and core of it. Christianity is both a rule of life and a doctrine. But in its inmost nature and being it is neither an ethic, nor a theology, but a religion — a new relation to God and man, Divinely mediated through Jesus Christ in His life, death and resurrection. As many as receive Him, to them gives He the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on His name, who are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God (John 1:12). He brings man to God by bringing God to man, and the power of God into man's sin-stained life.

8. New Testament Types of Doctrines:

It can scarcely be claimed that New Testament Christianity was in a theological point of view absolutely homogeneous. Various types can be distinguished with more or less clearness; even the ordinary reader feels a difference of theological atmosphere between e.g. Romans and James. This is inevitable, and need occasion no perplexity to Christian faith. All theology is partly interpretation — the relation of universal and eternal reality to personal thought. Hofmann rightly says that genuine Christian faith is one and the same for all, but that everyone must have his own theology, if he is to have any at all. In all genuine serious thought there is a personal element not precisely the same for any two individuals. It is possible to find in the New Testament foreshadowings of all the great distinctive types of historic Christianity. But the essential purpose of the New Testament is to make Christ real to us, to proclaim reconciliation to God through Him, and to convey the Christian power to our lives. The New Testament everywhere exhibits the same Christ, and bears witness to the same redeeming, life-transforming power.

9. Naturalistic Interpretations — the Religio-Historic School:

The attempt has often been made to explain Christianity as the natural product of contemporary forces intellectual and religious — most recently by the so-called “religio-historic school.” But at most they have only shown that the form in which the religious concepts of primitive

Christianity found articulate expression was to some extent influenced ab extra, and that the earliest Christians were in their general intellectual outlook the children of their own time. They have not proved that the distinctive content of Christianity was derived from any external source. They have not even realized what they have to prove, in order to make good their contention. They have done nothing to account for the Christian power on their principles.

LITERATURE.

See the New Testament Theologies, especially that of Feine (1910); Seeberg, Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion (English translation very incorrect, 1908); Seeberg's Lehrbuch d. Dogmengeschichte, 2nd edition I, 1908; Brown, Essence of Christianity, New York, 1902; W. N. Clarke, What Shall We Think of Christianity? New York, 1899; above all Denney, Jesus and the Gospel (1909), and Forsyth, Person and Place of Jesus Christ (1909).

John Dickie

II. HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL.

In its historical and doctrinal relations, developments, and influence, and its connection with the successive phases of human thought, Christianity presents many points of interest, only the more prominent of which can here briefly be touched upon.

1. "Religion of Christ" and "The Christian Religion":

A convenient starting-point is the well-known distinction of Lessing (Fragment in Works, XI, 242 ff) between "the religion of Christ" and "the Christian religion" — a distinction which still exactly marks the attitude to Christianity of the modern so-called "historical" school. By "the religion of Christ" is meant the religion which Christ Himself acknowledged and practiced as man; by "the Christian religion" is meant the view which regards Christ as more than man, and exalts Him as an object of worship. From this standpoint the problem for the historian is to show how the religion of Christ came to develop into the Christian religion — in modern speech, how the "Jesus of history" became the "Christ of faith."

(1) The Historical Jesus Is Supernatural.

It has already been pointed out (under I above) that the view of Jesus on which the assumed contrast rests is not one truly historical. The fallacy lies in regarding the Jesus of history as simply a man among men — holier, diviner in insight, but not essentially distinguished from the race of which He was a member. This is not the Christ of apostolic faith, but as little is it the picture of the historical Jesus as the Gospels actually present it. There, in His relations alike to God and to man, in His sinlessness, in His origin, claims, relation to Old Testament revelation, judgeship of the world, in His resurrection, exaltation, and sending of the Spirit, Jesus appears in a light which it is impossible to confine within natural or purely human limits. He is the Saviour who stands over against the race He came to save. It is the same fallacy which under-lies the contrast frequently sought to be drawn between the religious standpoints of Christ and Paul. Paul never for an instant dreamed of putting himself on the same plane with Christ. Paul was sinner; Christ was Saviour. Paul was disciple; Christ was Lord. Paul was weak, struggling man; Christ was Son of God. Jesus achieved redemption; Paul appropriated it. These things involved the widest contrasts in attitude and speech.

(2) Essence of Christianity in Redemption.

Though, therefore, Christ, in His relations of love and trust to the Father, and perfection of holy character, necessarily ever remains the Great Exemplar to whose image His people are to be conformed (Romans 8:29), in whose steps they are to follow (1 Pet 2:21), it is not correct to describe Christianity simply as the religion which Christ practiced. Christianity takes into account also the work which Christ came to do, the redemption He achieved, the blessings which, through Him, are bestowed on those who accept Him as their Saviour, and acknowledge Him as their Lord. Essentially Christianity is a religion of redemption; not, therefore, a religion practiced by Jesus for Himself, but one based on a work He has accomplished for others. Experimentally, it may be described as consisting, above all, in the joyful consciousness of redemption from sin and reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ, and in the possession of a new life of sonship and holiness through Christ's Spirit. Everything in the way of holy obedience is included here. This, at least, reduced to its simplest terms, is undeniably what Christianity meant for its first preachers and teachers, and what historically it has meant for the church ever since.

2. Modern Definitions:

Definitions of Christianity are as numerous as the writers who treat of the subject; but one or two definitions may be glanced at as illustrative of the positions above assumed. As modern types, Schleiermacher and Ritschl may be selected in preference to writers of more conspicuous orthodoxy.

(1) Schleiermacher:

Schleiermacher, in his *Der Christliche Glaube*, has an interesting definition of Christianity. Christianity he speaks of as “a form of monotheistic faith, of the teleological order of religion (i.e. in which the natural is subordinated to the moral), the peculiarity of which, in distinction from other religions of this type, essentially is, that in it everything is referred to the redemption accomplished through Jesus of Nazareth” (section 11). As, in general, Schleiermacher’s merit is recognized to lie in his bringing back, in a time of religious decay, the person of Christ to a central place in His religion, so here his true religious feeling is manifested in his fixing on the reference to redemption by Christ as the distinctive thing in Christianity.

(2) Ritschl:

Ritschl’s definition is more complicated, and need not here be cited in full (compare his *Justif. and Recon.*, III; English translation, 13). The important point is that, like Schleiermacher, Ritschl gives, together with the idea of the kingdom of God, an essential place to the idea of redemption in the conception of Christianity. “Christianity,” he says, “so to speak, resembles not a circle described from a single center, but an ellipse which is determined by two foci” (Jb., 11). The idea of the kingdom of God furnishes the teleological, the idea of redemption the religious, element in Christianity. There is truth in this; only it is to be remembered that the kingdom of God, as representing the end, can only, in a world of sin, be into existence through a redemption. Redemption, therefore, still remains the basal conception.

3. Place in Historical Religions:

In the enlarged view of modern knowledge, Christianity can be no longer regarded in isolation, but is seen to take its place in the long series of historical religions. It appears, like these other religions, in a historical context; has, like some of them, a personal founder; claims, as they also do, or did, the allegiance of multitudes of the population of the world; presents

in externals (e.g. the possession of Scriptures), sometimes in ideas, analogies to features in these religions. For this reason, an influential modern school is disposed to treat Christianity, as before it, the religion of Israel, as simply one of these historical religions — "nothing less, but also nothing more" — explaining it from the inherent laws of religious development, and rejecting the idea of any special, authoritative revelation. Sacred books are pitted against sacred books; moral codes against moral codes; Jesus against founders of other religions; gospel stories against legends of the Buddha; ideas like those of the virgin birth, the incarnation, the resurrection, against seeming parallels on other soils. For examination of the principal of these alleged resemblances, *see COMPARATIVE RELIGION*.

(1) This Place Unique.

Here it is desirable to look at the place of Christianity in the series of historical religions in certain of its wider aspects. The uniqueness of Christ's religion, and justification of its claim to a special, Divine origin, will only appear the more clearly from the comparison. In general, it need only be remarked that no other religion in the world has ever even professed to present a plain, historically developed, progressive revelation, advancing through successive stages in the unfolding of a Divine purpose of grace, till it culminates in the appearance of a person, life, character and work, like that of Jesus Christ; not in one single instance.

(2) Universality of Christianity.

A distinction is commonly made between national and universal religions, and Christianity is classed as one of the three universal religions — the other two being Buddhism and Mohammedanism (compare e.g. Kuenen's Hibbert Lectures on National Religions and Universal Religions). There is certainly agreement in the fact that the two religions named with Christianity are not "national" religions; that they are "universal," in the sense in which Christianity is, may be denied. Neither Buddhism nor Mohammedanism has any fitness to become a religion for the world, nor, with all their remarkable extension, have they succeeded in establishing themselves, as Christianity has done, in East and West, in Old World and in New. Mohammed boasted that he would plant his religion wherever the palm tree grew (Palgrave), and this still marks very nearly the range of its conquests. It is not a revivifying influence, but a blight on all higher civilization. It degrades woman, perpetuates slavery, fosters intolerance,

and brings no real healing for the spiritual woes of mankind. Buddhism, again, notwithstanding its wide spread in China and neighboring lands, has in it no real spring of moral progress, and is today withering up at the root. Its system of “salvation” — attainment of Nirvana — is not for the many but the few. It has not a message for all men alike. Buddha does not profess that all can accept his method, or ought to be asked to do so. For the multitude it is impossible of attainment. In practice, therefore, instead of one, he has three codes of duty — one for the laity, who continue to live in the world; one for the monks, who do not aspire to Arahatship or sainthood: and one for those who would reach the goal of Nirvana. These last are very few; only two cases are specified, besides Buddha himself, of success in this endeavor. In contrast with these Christianity approves itself as a strictly universal religion — the only religion of its kind in the world. In its doctrines of the one God and Father, and of the brotherhood of all mankind; its teaching on universal need through sin, and universal provision for salvation in Christ; its gospel of reconciliation addressed to all; its pure spirituality in worship and morality; its elevating and emancipating tendency in all the relations of human life, it approves itself as a religion for all sections and races of mankind, for all grades of civilization and stages of culture, appealing to that which is deepest in man, capable of being understood and received by all, and renewing and blessing each one who accepts and obeys it. The history of missions, even among the most degraded races, in all parts of the globe, is the demonstration of this truth. (On the universalism of Christianity, compare Baur, *Church History of the First Three Centuries*, I, Pt 1.)

(3) The Absolute Religion.

It is the custom, even in circles where the full supernatural claims of Christianity are not admitted, to speak of Christ’s religion as, in comparison with others, “the absolute religion,” meaning by this that in Christianity the true idea of religion, which in other faiths is only striven after, attains to complete and final expression. Hegel, e.g. speaks of Christianity as the “Absolute or Revealed Religion” in the sense that in it the idea is discovered of the essential unity of God and man (thus also T. H. Green, E. Caird, etc.); others (e.g. Pfleiderer) in the meaning that it expresses the absolute “principle” of religion — a Divine sonship. Christianity also claims for itself, though in a more positive way, to be the absolute religion. It is the final and perfect revelation of God for which not only revelation in Israel, but the whole providential history of the race, was

a Divinely ordained preparation (~~8004~~Galatians 4:4). It is absolute in the sense that a larger and fuller revelation than Christ has given is not needed, and is not to be looked for. Not only in this religion is all truth of Nature about God's being, attributes and character, with all truth of Old Testament revelation, purely gathered up and preserved, but in the person and work of the incarnate Son a higher and more complete disclosure is made of God's Fatherly love and gracious purposes to mankind, and a redemption is presented as actually accomplished adequate to all the needs of a sinful world. Mankind can never hope to attain to a higher idea of God, a truer idea of man, a profounder conception of the end of life, of sin, of duty, a Diviner provision for salvation, a more perfect satisfaction in fellowship with God, a grander hope of eternal life, than is opened to it in the gospel. In this respect again, Christianity stands alone (compare W. Douglas Mackenzie, *The Final Faith, a Statement of the Nature and Authority of Christianity as the Religion of the World*).

(4) Religion of Redemption.

A third aspect in which Christianity as a historical religion is sometimes regarded is as a religion of redemption. In this light a comparison is frequently instituted between it and Buddhism, which also in some sort is a religion of redemption. But the comparison brings out only the more conspicuously the unique and original character of the Christian system. Buddhism starts from the conception of the inherent evil and misery of existence, and the salvation it promises as the result of indefinitely prolonged striving through many successive lives is the eternal rest and peace of non-being; Christianity, on the other hand, starts from the conception that everything in its original nature and in the intent of its Creator is good, and that the evil of the world is the result of wrong and perverted development — holds, therefore, that redemption from it is possible by use of appropriate means. And redemption here includes, not merely deliverance from existing evils, but restoration of the Divine likeness which has been lost by man, and ultimate blessedness of the life everlasting. Dr. Boyd Carpenter sums up the contrast thus: "In Buddhism redemption comes from below; in Christianity it is from above; in Buddhism it comes from man; in Christianity it comes from God" (*Permanent Elements in Religion*, Introduction, 34).

4. Development and Influence:

Christianity, as an external magnitude, has a long and chequered history, into the details of which it is not the purpose of this article to enter. Ecclesiastical developments are left untouched. But a little may be said of its outward expansion, of the influences that helped to mould its doctrinal forms, and of the influence which it in turn has exercised on the thought and life of the peoples into whose midst it came.

(1) Expansion of Christianity.

From the first Christianity aimed at being a world-conquering principle. The task it set before itself was stupendous. Its message was not one likely to commend it to either Jew or Greek (1 Cor 1:23). It renounced temporal weapons (in this a contrast with Mohammedanism); had nothing to rely on but the naked truth. Yet from the beginning (Acts 2) it had a remarkable reception. Its universal principle was still partially veiled in the Jewish-Christian communities, but with Paul it freed itself from all limitations, and entered on a period of rapid and wide diffusion.

(a) Apostolic Age:

It is the peculiarity of the Pauline mission, as Professor W. M. Ramsay points out, that it followed the great lines of Roman communication, and aimed at establishing itself in the large cities — the centers of civilization (Church in Roman Empire, 147, etc.). The Book of Acts and the Epistles show how striking were the results. Churches were planted in all the great cities of Asia Minor and Macedonia. In Rome Tacitus testifies that by the time of Nero's persecution (64 AD) the Christians were a "great multitude" ("ingens multitudo" (Annals xv.44)).

(b) Succeeding Period:

Our materials for estimating the progress of Christianity in the post-apostolic age are scanty, but they suffice to show us the church pursuing its way, and casting its spell alike on East and West, in centers of civilization and dim regions of barbarism. In the last quarter of the 2nd century great churches like those of Carthage and Alexandria burst into visibility, and reveal how firm a hold the new religion was taking of the empire. Deadly persecution could not stop this march of the church to victory. From the middle of the 3rd century there is no question that it was progressing by leaps and bounds. This is the period in which Harnack puts its great

expansion (Expansion, II, 455, English Translation). On the back of the most relentless persecution it had yet endured, the Diocletian, it suddenly found itself raised by the arms of Constantine to a position of acknowledged supremacy. By this time it had penetrated into all ranks of society, and reckoned among its adherents many of noblest birth.

(c) Modern Missions:

It is unnecessary to trace the subsequent course of Christianity in its conquest of the northern nations. For a time the zeal for expansion slumbered, but, with the revival of the missionary spirit at the close of the 18th century, a new forward movement began, the effects of which in the various regions of the heathen world are only now beginning to be realized. It is impossible to read without a thrill what was accomplished by the pioneers of Christian missions in the South Seas and other early fields; now the tidings of what is being done in India, China, Japan, Korea, Africa and elsewhere, by Christian preaching and education, awaken even more astonishment. Countries long closed against the gospel are now opened, and the standard of the cross is being carried into all. The church is arousing to its missionary obligations as never before. Still, with all this progress, immense obstacles remain to be overcome. Including all the populations of nominally Christian lands, the adherents of the Christian religion are reckoned to amount only to some 560,000,000, out of a total of over 1,600,000,000 of the population of the world (Hickmann). This looks discouraging, but it is to be remembered that it is the Christian peoples that represent the really progressive portion of the human race.

(2) Doctrinal Shaping:

The doctrinal shaping of Christianity has taken place largely as the result of conflict with opposing errors. First, as was inevitable, its conflict was waged with that narrowest section of the Jewish-Christian community — the Ebionites of early church history — who, cleaving to circumcision, disowned Paul, and insisted that the Gentiles should observe the law (~~cf~~ Galatians 5:13,14; *see EBIONITES*). These, as a party of reaction, were soon left behind, and themselves fell under heretical (Essenian) influences.

(a) Gnosticism:

A more formidable conflict was that with Gnosticism — the distinctive heresy of the 2nd century, though its beginnings are already within the

apostolic age (compare Lightfoot, Colossians). This strange compound of oriental theosophy and ideas borrowed from Christianity (*see Gnosticism*) would have dissolved Christ's religion into a tissue of fantasies, and all the strength and learning of the Church were needed to combat its influence. Its opposition was overruled for good in leading to a fixing of the earliest creed (*see Apostles' Creed*), the formation of an authoritative New Testament canon (*see Bible; Canon*), and the firm assertion of the reality of Christ's humanity.

(b) Monarchianism:

Christianity had now entered the world of Greek thought, and ere long had contests to sustain within its own borders. First came assaults (3rd century) on the idea of the Trinity in what are known as the Monarchian heresies — the assertion that the Father Himself was incarnate and suffered in Christ (Patripassianism), or that the Trinity consisted only in “modes” of the Divine self-revelation (Sabellianism).

(c) Arianism:

These were hardly repelled when a yet greater danger overtook the church in the outbreak (318 AD) of the violent Arian controversy, the Son Himself being now declared to be a creature, exalted, before all worlds, but not truly of the nature of God. The commotion produced by this controversy led to the summoning of the first ecumenical council — that of Nicea (325 AD), and the framing of the Nicene Creed, affirming the full deity of the Son. A like controversy about the Spirit (the Macedonian, 4th century), led to the confirming of this creed, and adoption of additional clauses, at the Council of Constantinople (381 AD).

(d) Sin and Grace:

The doctrine of the Trinity was now settled, but new controversies speedily sprang up — in the West on sin and grace (Pelagius and Augustine) (411-18 AD), and in the East in the long series of controversies known as the Christological, bearing on the right apprehension of the person of Christ (4th to 7th centuries): as against Pelagius, who denied original sin, and affirmed man's natural ability to keep the whole law of God, Augustine vindicated the complete dependence of man on the grace of God for his salvation.

(e) Person of Christ:

And as against errors successively denying the reality of a human soul in Jesus (Appollinarianism), dissolving the unity of His person (Nestorianism, condemned at Ephesus, 431 AD), or conversely, fusing together the Divine and human into one nature (Eutychianism, Monophysitism), the church maintained, and embodied in a Creed at Chalcedon (451 AD), the integrity of the two natures, Divine and human, in the one Divine person of the Lord. These decisions are upheld by all branches of the church — Greek, Latin, Protestant.

(f) The Atonement:

The medieval scholastic period made one great advance in the attempt of Anselm in his *Cur Deus Homo* (1089) to lay deep the foundations of a doctrine of atonement in the idea of the necessity of a satisfaction for human sin: Abelard, on the other hand, denied the need of satisfaction, and became the representative of what are known as moral theories of the atonement. It was reserved for the Protestant Reformers, however, to bring this doctrine to its true bearing, as furnishing the ground for man's free justification before God in his union with Christ, who had made full satisfaction for his guilt. There have been many theories of atonement, but the idea that Christ has "satisfied Divine justice" is too firmly imbedded in all the Reformation creeds, and has too profound a Scriptural support, to be removed.

(g) The Reformation:

The 16th century Reformation, on its outward side, was a revolt against the errors and corruptions of the papacy, but in its positive aspect it may be described as the reassertion of the sole mediatorship of Christ (as against priestly intervention), the sole authority of Scripture (as against tradition), and justification by faith alone (as against salvation by works of merit). The schism meant a separation of the great Protestant communities and nations from the church of Rome, which, by its claim of papal supremacy, had already separated from itself the great Greek communion.

(h) Lutheran and Reformed:

Within Protestantism itself a difference of genius between the Swiss and German Reformers, with divergences of view on the sacraments, led to the

formation of two main types — the Lutheran (German) and the Reformed (Swiss) — and between these two, as respects theology and church order, later Protestantism has mostly been divided. Luther represented the one; Calvin for long was the chief name in the other. With the rise of Arminianism and other forms of dissent from the peculiarities of Calvinism, the aspect of Protestantism became more variegated. Of the later divisions, producing the numerous modern sects which yet own allegiance to the common head (Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc.), it is not necessary here to speak. The unity of spirit revealed in creed, worship and combined endeavors in Christ's service goes deeper than all outward differences.

(3) Its Influence.

Christianity preaches a kingdom of God, or supremacy of God's will in human hearts and human affairs, by which is meant, on its earthly side, nothing less than a complete reconstruction of society on the two great bases of love to God and love to man — "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth" (~~and~~ Matthew 6:10). The influence of Christianity is paramount in all the great advances that have been made in the moral and social amelioration of the state of mankind.

(a) The Ancient World:

It was so undoubtedly in the ancient world. The world into which Christianity came was one fast sinking into dissolution through the weight of its own corruptions. Into that world Christianity brought a totally new idea of man as being of infinite dignity and immortal worth. It restored the well-nigh lost sense of responsibility and accountability to God; breathed into the world a new spirit of love and charity, and created that wealth of charitable and beneficent institutions with which Christian lands are now full (Lecky speaks of it as "covering the globe with countless institutions of mercy, absolutely unknown in the whole pagan world," *History of Morals*, II, 91); set up a new moral ideal and standard of integrity which has acted as an elevating force on moral conceptions till the present hour; restored woman to her rightful place as man's helpmeet and equal; created the Christian home; gave the slave an equal place with his master in the kingdom of God, and struck at the foundations of slavery by its doctrines of the natural brotherhood and dignity of man; created self-respect, and a sense of duty in the use of one's powers for self-support and the benefit of others; urged to honest labors; and in a myriad other ways, by direct

teaching, by the protest of holy lives, and by its general spirit, struck at the evils, the malpractices, the cruelties of the time.

(b) The Modern World:

Despite many failures, and gross backslidings in the church itself, these ideas, implanted in the world, and liberating other forces, have operated ever since in advancing the progress of the race. They exist and operate far beyond the limits of the church. They have been taken up and contended for by men outside the church — by unbelievers even — when the church itself had become unfaithful to them. None the less they are of Christian parentage. They lie at the basis of our modern assertion of equal rights, of justice to the individual in social and state arrangements, of the desire for brotherhood, peace and amity among classes and nations. It is Christian love which is sustaining the best, purest and most self-sacrificing efforts for the raising of the fallen, the rescue of the drunkard, the promotion of enlightenment, virtues, social order and happiness. It is proving itself the grand civilizing agency in other regions of the world. Christian missions, with their benign effects in the spread of education, the checking of social evils and barbarities, the creation of trade and industry, the change in the status of women, the advance in social and civilized life, generally, is the demonstration of it (see Dennis, *Christian Missions and Social Progress*).

(c) Testimony of Professor Huxley:

Professor Huxley will not be regarded as a biased witness on behalf of Christianity. Yet this is what he writes on the influence of the Christian Scriptures, and his words may be a fitting close to this article: “Throughout the history of the western world,” he says, “the Scriptures, Jewish, and Christian, have been the great instigators of revolt against the worst forms of clerical and political despotism. The Bible has been the Magna Charta of the poor, and of the oppressed; down to modern times no state has had a constitution in which the interests of the people are so largely taken into account, in which the duties, so much more than the privileges, of rulers are insisted upon, as that drawn up for Israel in Deuteronomy and Lev; nowhere is the fundamental truth that the welfare of the State, in the long run, depends upon the uprightness of the citizen so strongly laid down. Assuredly the Bible talks no trash about the rights of man; but it insists upon the equality of duties, on the liberty to bring about that righteousness

which is somewhat different from struggling for `rights'; on the fraternity of taking thought for one's neighbor as for one's self."

LITERATURE.

See works cited in Part I above; also Kuenen, Hibbert Lectures for 1882, National Religions and Universal Religions; W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire; M. Dods, Mohammed, Buddha, and Christ; on early expansion of Christianity, Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity, and Orr, Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity; on the essence of Christianity, W. Douglas Mackenzie, The Final Faith; on the influence of Christianity, C. L. Brace, Gesta Christi; Uhlhorn, Christian Charity in the Ancient Church; C. Schmidt, Social Results of Early Christianity; Lecky, History of European Morals; Dennis, Christian Missions and Social Progress; Reports of World Miss. Conference, 1910.

James Orr

CHRISTOLOGY

<kris-tol'-o-ji>.

See PERSON OF CHRIST.

CHRISTS

<krists>.

See CHRISTS, FALSE; MESSIAH.

CHRISTS, FALSE

<fols> ([εὐδόχριστοι, pseudo-christoi]).

1. CHRIST'S WARNINGS:

In His discourse on the last things, uttered by Him on the Tuesday of the week of His Passion, Jesus solemnly forewarned His disciples that many would come in His name, saying "I am the Christ," who would deceive many; that there would arise false Christs and false prophets, who would show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect; that, therefore, if any man said to them, "Lo, here is the Christ," or

“Lo, there,” they were not to believe it (^{<1245>}Matthew 24:5,11,23-25; ^{<1136>}Mark 13:6,21-23; ^{<218>}Luke 21:8).

2. EARLY NOTICES:

The warning was needed. Deuteronomy Wette, Meyer, and others have, indeed, pointed out that there is no historical record of anyone expressly claiming to be the Christ prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. This, however, is probably only in appearance (compare Lange, Commentary on ^{<1245>}Matthew 24:3). Edersheim remarks: “Though in the multitude of impostors, who, in the troubled time between the rule of Pilate and the destruction of Jerusalem, promised Messianic deliverance to Israel, few names and claims of this kind have been specially recorded, yet the hints in the New Testament, and the references, however guarded, in the Jewish historian, imply the appearance of many such seducers” (Jesus the Messiah, V, chapter vi; in 1906 edition, II, 446). The revolts in this period were generally connected with religious pretensions in the leaders (Josephus, BJ, II, xiii, 4 — “deceived and deluded the people under pretense of Divine inspiration”), and, in the fevered state of Messianic expectation, can hardly have lacked, in some instances, a Messianic character. Judas of Galilee (^{<4157>}Acts 5:37; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, i, 1, 6; BJ, II, viii, 1) founded a numerous sect (the Gaulonites) by many of whom, according to Origen (Hom on Lk, 25), he was regarded as the Messiah (compare DB, under the word). The Theudas of ^{<4156>}Acts 5:36, “giving himself out to be somebody,” may or may not be the same as the Theudas of Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 1), but the latter, at least, made prophetic claims and deluded many. He promised to divide the river Jordan by a word. Another instance is the “Egyptian” for whom Paul was mistaken, who had made an “uproar” (^{<4218>}Acts 21:38; the Revised Version (British and American) “sedition”) — one of a multitude of “impostors and deceivers,” Josephus tells us, who persuaded multitudes to follow them into the wilderness, pretending that they would exhibit wonders and signs (Ant., XX, viii, 6). This Egyptian was to show them that, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem would fall down (BJ, II, xiii, 5). Of another class was the Samaritan Dositheus, with whom Simon Magus was said to be connected (see refs to Eusebius, Origen, Hippolytus, Clementine writings, etc., in DB, under the word). He is alleged to have been regarded as “the prophet like unto Moses,” whom God was to raise up.

3. BAR-COCHBA:

The most celebrated case of a false Christ is that of Bar-Cochba (to give the name its usual form), the leader of the great insurrection under Hadrian in 132 AD (Eus., HE, IV, 6; for Jewish and other authorities, see the full account in Schurer, HJP, I, 2, pp. 297 ff, English Translation). The insurrection was on a scale which it required the whole force of the Roman empire to put down (compare Schurer). The leader's own name was Simon, but the title, "Bar-Cochba" ("son of a star"), was given him with reference to the prophecy in ^{<0247>}Numbers 24:17 of the star that should come out of Jacob. Rabbi Akiba, the most celebrated doctor of his time, applied this prophecy, with that in ^{<3006>}Haggai 2:6,7, to Simon, and announced him as the Messiah. He is commonly known in Jewish literature as Barcosiba, probably from his birthplace. Immense multitudes flocked to his standard, and the Christians in Palestine were severely persecuted. Coins were issued in his name. After tremendous efforts the rebellion was crushed, and Jerusalem was converted into a Roman colony (Aelia Capitolina), which Jews were forbidden to enter.

4. JEWISH PSEUDO-MESSIAHS:

Among the Jews themselves, in later times, many pseudo-Messiahs have arisen. An interesting account of some of these is given by Mr. Elkan Adler in his Introduction to the volume, Aspects of the Hebrew Genius (London, Routledge, 1910). "Such there had been," this writer says, "from time to time ever since the destruction of the Temple." In the 16th and 17th centuries, however, the belief in pseudo-Messiahs took new and remarkable shapes. Among the names mentioned is that of David Reubeni, or David of the tribe of Reuben (1524), who ultimately fell a sacrifice to the Inquisition. Under his influence a Portuguese royal secretary, Diego Pires, adopted the Jewish faith, changed his name to Solomon Molko, and finally proclaimed himself the Messiah. In 1529 he published some of his addresses under the title of The Book of Wonder. He was burned at the stake at Mantua. "Other Kabbalists, such as Isaac Luria and Chajim Vital and Abraham Shalom, proclaimed themselves to be Messiahs or forerunners of the Messiah, and their works and manuscripts are still piously studied by many oriental Jews." The chief of all these false Messiahs was Sabbatai Zevi, born at Smyrna in 1626. "His adventures," it is said, "created a tremendous stir in western Europe." He ultimately became an apostate to Islam; notwithstanding which fact he had a line of

successors, in whom the sect of Donmeh, in Salonica, continue to believe. Another mentioned is Jacob Frank, of Podolia, who revealed himself in 1755 as the Holy Lord, in whom there dwelt the same Messiah-soul that had dwelt in David, Elijah, Jesus, Mohammed, Sabbatai Zevi, and his followers. Jewish literature in the 18th century is full of controversial writing connected with Sabbatianism. As a special source of information on modern false Messiahs among the Jews, Lange mentions the serial [Dibhre ‘emeth], or Words of Truth (Breslau, 1853-54).

James Orr

CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF

<kron'-i-k'-ls> (μῡμῡḡ" yrḇḏl [dibhere ha-yamim], “The Words of the Days”; Septuagint [παραλειπομένων, paraleipomenon]:

1. THE NAME:

The analogy of this title to such English words as diary, journal, chronicle, is obvious. The title is one which frequently appears in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. It is used to denote the records of the Medo-Persian monarchy (Est 2:23; 6:1; 10:2), and to denote public records, either Persian or Jewish, made in late postexilic times (<1022> Nehemiah 12:23), and to denote public records of King David (<1372> 1 Chronicles 27:24). But its most common use is to denote the Judahite and Israelite records referred to in the Books of Kings as sources (<1148> 1 Kings 14:19; 15:7 and about 30 other places). The references in Kings are not to our present Books of Chronicles, for a large proportion of them are to matters not mentioned in these. Either directly or indirectly they refer the reader to public archives.

As applied to our present Books of Chronicles this title was certainly not intended to indicate that they are strictly copies of public documents, though it may indicate that they have a certain official character distinguishing them from other contemporary or future writings. The Greek title is [Paraleipomenon], “Of Things that have been Left Untold.” Some copies add “concerning the kings of Judah,” and this is perhaps the original form of the title. That is, the Greek translators thought of Chronicles as a supplement to the other narrative Scriptural books. Jerome accepted the Greek title, but suggested that the Hebrew title would be better represented by a derivative from the Greek word [chronos], and that this

would fit the character of the book, which is a chronicle of the whole sacred history. Jerome's suggestion is followed in the title given to the book in the English and other languages.

2. THE POSITION OF CHRONICLES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In most of the VSS, as in the English, the Books of Chronicles are placed after the Books of Kings, as being a later account of the matters narrated in Kings; and Ezra and Nehemiah follow Chronicles as being continuations of the narrative. In the Hebrew Bibles the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah and 1 and 2 Chronicles are placed last. By common opinion, based on proof that is entirely sufficient, the three books constitute a single literary work or group of works, by one author or school of authors. It is convenient to use the term "the Chronicler" to designate the author, or the authors if there were more than one.

3. TWO BOOKS, OR ONE?:

It is the regulation thing to say that 1 and 2 Chronicles were originally one book, which has been divided into two. The fact is that Chronicles is counted as one book in the count which regards the Old Testament as 22 or 24 books, and as two books in the count which regards the whole number of books as 39; and that both ways of counting have been in use as far back as the matter can be traced. Both ways of counting appear in the earliest Christian lists, those of Origen and Melito, for example. 1 Chronicles closes with a summary which may naturally be regarded as the closing of a book.

4. THE CONTENTS:

With respect to their contents the Books of Chronicles are naturally divided into three parts. The first part is preliminary, consisting mostly of genealogical matters with accompanying facts and incidents (1 Chronicles 1 through 9). The second part is an account of the accession and reign of David (1 Chronicles 10 through 29). The third part is an account of the events under David's successors in the dynasty (2 Ch).

The genealogies begin with Adam (~~<300>~~1 Chronicles 1:1) and extend to the latest Old Testament times (1 Chronicles 9; compare Nehemiah 11, and the latest names in the genealogical lines, e.g. ~~<339>~~1 Chronicles 3:19 ff). The events incidentally mentioned in connection with them are more numerous

and of more importance than the casual reader would imagine. They are some dozens in number. Some of them are repeated from the parts of the Old Testament from which the Chronicler draws as sources — for example, such statements as that Nimrod was a mighty one, or that in the time of Peleg the earth was divided, or the details concerning the kings of Edom (~~<100>~~ 1 Chronicles 1:10,19,43 ff; compare ~~<1008>~~ Genesis 10:8,25; 36:31 ff). Others are instances which the Chronicler has taken from other sources than the Old Testament — for instance, the story of Jabez, or the accounts of the Simeonite conquests of the Meunim and of Amalek (~~<1040>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:9,10,38-43).

The account in Chronicles of the reign of David divides itself into three parts. The first part (1 Chronicles 10 through 21) is a series of sections giving a general view, including the death of Saul, the crowning of David over the twelve tribes, his associates, his wars, the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, the great Davidic promise, the plague that led to the purchase of the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. The second part (1 Chronicles 22 through 29:22a) deals with one particular event and the preparations for it. The event is the making Solomon king, at a great public assembly (~~<1320>~~ 1 Chronicles 23:1; 28:1 ff). The preparations for it include arrangements for the site and materials and labor for the temple that is to be built, and the organizing of Levites, priests, singers, doorkeepers, captains, for the service of the temple and the kingdom. The third part (~~<1322>~~ 1 Chronicles 29:22b-30) is a brief account of Solomon's being made king "a second time" (compare 1 Kings 1), with a summary and references for the reign of David.

The history of the successors of David, as given in 2 Chronicles, need not here be commented upon.

5. SOURCES BIBLICAL AND EXTRA-BIBLICAL:

The sources of the Books of Chronicles classify themselves as Biblical and extra-Biblical. Considerably more than half the contents come from the other Old Testament books, especially from Sam and Ki. Other sources mentioned in the Books of Chronicles are the following:

(1) The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (~~<4011>~~ 2 Chronicles 16:11; 25:26; 28:26; 32:32).

(2) The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah (~~<1407>~~ 2 Chronicles 27:7; 35:27; 36:8).

(3) The Book of the Kings of Israel (~~<1408>~~ 2 Chronicles 20:34).

(4) The Book of the Kings (~~<1407>~~ 2 Chronicles 24:27).

It is possible that these may be four variant forms of the same title. It is also possible that they may be references to our present Books of Ki, though in that case we must regard the formulas of reference as conventional rather than exact.

(5) The Book of the Kings of Israel (~~<1390>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:1), a genealogical work.

(6) The Midrash of the Book of the Kings (~~<1407>~~ 2 Chronicles 24:27).

(7) The Words of the Kings of Israel (~~<1438>~~ 2 Chronicles 33:18), referred to for details concerning Manasseh.

Observe that these seven are books of Kings, and that the contents of the last three do not at all correspond with those of our Biblical books. In the seventh title and in several of the titles that are yet to be mentioned it is commonly understood that “Words” is the equivalent of “acts” or “history”; but it is here preferred to retain the form “Words,” as lending itself better than the others to the syntactical adjustments.

(8) The Words of Samuel the Man of Vision and the Words of Nathan the Prophet and the Words of Gad the Seer (~~<1399>~~ 1 Chronicles 29:29) are perhaps to be counted as one work, and identified with our Books of Judges and Samuel.

(9) The Words of Nathan the Prophet (~~<1409>~~ 2 Chronicles 9:29; compare ~~<1114>~~ 1 Kings 11:41-53). Source concerning Solomon.

(10) The Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite (~~<1409>~~ 2 Chronicles 9:29; compare ~~<1119>~~ 1 Kings 11:29 ff; 14:2 ff, etc.). Solomon.

(11) The Visions of Jedo the Seer (~~<1409>~~ 2 Chronicles 9:29; compare 1 Kings 13). Solomon.

(12) The Words of Shemaiah the Prophet (^{<4125>}2 Chronicles 12:15; compare ^{<4122>}1 Kings 12:22 ff). Rehoboam.

(13) “Shemaiah wrote” (^{<4346>}1 Chronicles 24:6). David.

(14) Iddo the Seer in Reckoning Genealogies (^{<4425>}2 Chronicles 12:15). Rehoboam.

(15) “The Words (The History) of Jehu the son of Hanani, which is inserted in the Book of the Kings of Israel” (^{<4434>}2 Chronicles 20:34; compare ^{<4140>}1 Kings 16:1,7,12). Jehoshaphat.

(16) “The rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the Prophet, the son of Amoz, write” (^{<4432>}2 Chronicles 26:22; compare ^{<2300>}Isaiah 1:1; 6).

(17) “The Vision of Isaiah in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel” (^{<4432>}2 Chronicles 32:32; compare 2 Kings 18 through 20; Isaiah 36 through 39, etc.). Hezekiah.

(18) The Words of the Seers (^{<4439>}2 Chronicles 33:19 margin). Manasseh.

(19) References to “Lamentations,” and to “Jeremiah” etc. (^{<4435>}2 Chronicles 35:25). Josiah.

(20) The Midrash of the Prophet Iddo (^{<4432>}2 Chronicles 13:22). Abijah.

These numbers, from 12 to 20, are referred to as works of prophets. At first thought there is plausibility in the idea that the references may be to the sections in Samuel and Kings where these several prophets are mentioned; but in nearly all the cases this explanation fades out on examination. The Chronicler had access to prophetic writings not now known to be in existence.

(21) Liturgical writings of David and Solomon (^{<4434>}2 Chronicles 35:4; compare ^{<4340>}Ezra 3:10). Josiah.

(22) Commandments of David and Gad and Nathan (^{<4425>}2 Chronicles 29:25). Hezekiah.

(23) The Commandment of David and Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun (^{<4435>}2 Chronicles 35:15). Josiah.

(24) Chronicles of King David (~~<1372>~~ 1 Chronicles 27:24).

(25) Last Words of David (~~<1372>~~ 1 Chronicles 23:27).

Add to these many mentions of genealogical works, connected with particular times, those for example of David, Jotham, Jeroboam II (~~<1312>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:22; 5:17), and mentions of matters that imply record-keeping, from Samuel and onward (e.g. ~~<1335>~~ 1 Chronicles 26:26-28). Add also the fact that the Chronicler had a habit, exhibited in Ezra and Nehemiah, of using and quoting what he represents to be public documents, for example, letters to and from Cyrus and Artaxerxes and Darius and Artaxerxes Longimanus (~~<1500>~~ Ezra 1:1; 6:3; 4:7,17; 5:6 ; 6:6; 7:11; ~~<1617>~~ Nehemiah 2:7). It is no exaggeration to say that the Chronicler claims to have had a considerable library at his command.

6. NEHEMIAH'S LIBRARY:

If such a library as this existed we should perhaps expect to find some mention of it somewhere. Such a mention I think there is in the much discussed passage in 2 Macc 2:13-15. It occurs in what purports to be a letter written after 164 BC by the Maccabean leaders in Jerusalem to Aristobulus in Egypt. The letter has a good deal to say concerning Nehemiah, and among other things this: "And how he, founding a library, gathered together the books about the kings and prophets, and the (books) of David, and letters of kings about sacred gifts." It says that these writings have been scattered by reason of the war, but that Judas has now gathered them again, and that they may be at the service of Aristobulus and his friends.

This alleged letter contains statements that seem fabulous to most modern readers, though they may not have seemed so to Judas and his compatriots. Leaving out of view, however, the intrinsic credibility of the witness, the fitting of the statement into certain other traditions and into the phenomena presented in Chronicles is a thing too remarkable to neglect. In the past, men have cited this passage as an account of the framing of a canon of Scripture — the canon of the Prophets, or of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. But it purports to be an account of a library, not of a body of Scripture; and its list of contents does not appear to be that of either the Prophets or the Hagiographa or both. But it is an exact list of the sources to which the author (or authors) of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah claim to have access — "books about the kings" (see above, Numbers 1

through 7), “and prophets” (Numbers 8 through 20), “and of David” (Numbers 21 through 25 ff), “and letters of kings about sacred gifts” (those cited in Ezra and Nehemiah). The library attributed to Nehemiah corresponds to the one which the Chronicler claims to have used; and the two independent pieces of evidence strongly confirm each the other.

7. THE WAY OF USING THE BIBLICAL SOURCES:

The method in which the Biblical sources are used in Chronicles presents certain remarkable features. As a typical instance study 1 Chronicles 10 in comparison with 1 Samuel 31. ~~<3100>~~1 Chronicles 10:1-12 is just a transcription, with slight changes, of the passage in Samuel. A large part of Chronicles is thus made up of passages transcribed from Samuel and Kings. The alternative is that the Chronicler transcribed from sources which had earlier been transcribed in Samuel and Kings, and this alternative may in some cases be the true one.

This phenomenon is interesting for many reasons. It has its bearings on the trustworthiness of the information given; a copy of an ancient document is of higher character as evidence than a mere report of the contents of the document. It has a bearing on questions concerning the text; are the texts in Kings and Chronicles to be regarded as two recensions? It is especially interesting as illustrating the literary processes in use among the writers of our Scriptures.

It is sometimes said that they used their sources not by restating the contents as a modern compiler would do, but by just copying. It would be more correct to say that they do this part of the time. In 1 Chronicles 10 the copying process ceases with 10:12. In 10:13 and 14 the Chronicler condenses into a sentence a large part of the contents of 1 Samuel; one clause in particular is a condensation of 1 Samuel 28. So it is with other parts. ~~<3100>~~1 Chronicles 1:1-4 is abridged from Genesis 5 at the rate of a name for a section; so is ~~<3102>~~1 Chronicles 1:24-27 from ~~<0110>~~Genesis 11:10-26. In the various parts of Chronicles we find all the methods that are used by any compiler; the differentiating fact is simply that the method of transcribing is more used than it would be by a modern compiler.

In the transcribed passages, almost without exception, there has been a systematic editorial revision. Words and clauses have been pruned out, and grammatical roughness smoothed away. Regularly the text in Chronicles is somewhat briefer, and is more fluent than in Samuel or Kings. If we give

the matter careful attention we will be sure that this revisional process took place, and that it accounts for most of the textual differences between Chronicles and the earlier writings, not leaving many to be accounted for as corruptions.

8. ADDITIONS BY THE CHRONICLER:

Of course the most significant changes made by the Chronicler are those which consist in additions and omissions. It is a familiar fact that the added passages in Chronicles which bulk largest are those which deal with the temple and its Worship and its attendants — its priests, Levites, musicians, singers, doorkeepers. Witness for example the added matter in connection with the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, the preparations for the temple, the priests' joining Rehoboam, the war between Abijah and Jeroboam, the reforms under Asa and Jehoshaphat, details concerning Uzziah, Hezekiah's passover, the reform of Manasseh, the passover of Josiah (1 Chronicles 15 through 16; 22 through 29; ~~41113~~ 2 Chronicles 11:13-17; 13; 14; 15; 17; 19; 20; 26:16-21; 29 through 31; 33:10-20; 35). It has been less noticed than it should be that while the Chronicler in these passages magnifies the ceremonial laws of Moses, he magnifies those of David yet more.

Next in bulk comes the added genealogical and statistical matter, for example, the larger part of the preliminary genealogies, details as to David's followers, Rehoboam's fortified cities and family affairs with details concerning the Shishak invasion, Asa's military preparations and the invasion by Zerah, with numbers and dates, Jehoshaphat's military arrangements, with numbers, Jehoram's brothers and other details concerning him, Uzziah's army and his business enterprises (1 Chronicles 2 through 9; 12; 27; ~~41115~~ 2 Chronicles 11:5-12,18-23; 12:3-9; 14:3-15; 17:1-5,10-19; 21; 26:6-15).

The Chronicler is sometimes spoken of as interested in priestly affairs, and not in the prophets. That is a mistake. He takes particular pains to magnify the prophets (e.g. ~~41111~~ 2 Chronicles 20:20; 36:12,16). He uses the word "prophet" 30 times, and the two words for "seer" (chozeh and ro'eh) respectively 5 and 11 times. He gives us additional information concerning many of the prophets — for example, Samuel, Gad, Nathan, Ahijah, Shemaiah, Hanani, Jehu, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah. He has taken pains to preserve for us a record of many prophets concerning whom we should otherwise be ignorant — Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, Jedo (~~41119~~ 2 Chronicles

9:29), Iddo, the Oded of Asa's time, Jahaziel the son of Zechariah, Eliezer the son of Dodavah, two Zechariahs (^{<120>}2 Chronicles 24:20; 26:5), unnamed prophets of the time of Amaziah (^{<125>}2 Chronicles 25:5-10,15,16), Oded of the time of Ahaz (^{<130>}2 Chronicles 28:9).

In addition, however, to the materials that can be thus classified, it is the method of the Chronicler to preserve interesting incidents of all kinds by working them into his narrative. When he reaches Jair in his genealogical list, he finds himself in possession of a bit of information not contained in the older writings, and he inserts it (^{<132>}1 Chronicles 2:21 ff). He is interested to keep alive the memory of the "families of scribes which dwelt at Jabez" (^{<135>}1 Chronicles 2:55). He has found items concerning craftsmen, and concerning a linen industry, and a potters' industry, and he connects these with names in his list (^{<134>}1 Chronicles 4:14,21,23). He has come across a bit of a hymn in the name of Jabez, and he attaches the hymn to his list of names as an annotation (^{<130>}1 Chronicles 4:9,10). There are matters concerning the sickness and the burial of Asa, and concerning the bad conduct of Joash after the death of Jehoiada, and concerning constructions by Hezekiah (^{<142>}2 Chronicles 16:12,13; 24:15-27; 32:27-30), that seem to the Chronicler worth preserving, though they are not recorded in the earlier writings. The fruits of the habit appear, in many scores of instances, in all parts of the Books of Chronicles.

9. OMISSIONS BY THE CHRONICLER:

As the Books of Chronicles thus add matters not found in the older books, so they leave out much that is contained in the Books of Samuel and Kings. Here, however, the question should rather be as to what the Chronicler has retained from his sources than as to what he has omitted. He writes for readers whom he assumes to be familiar with the earlier books, and he retains so much of the older narrative as seems to him necessary for defining the relations of his new statements of fact to that narrative. From the point where the history of David begins he has omitted everything that is not strictly connected with David or his dynasty — the history of northern Israel as such, the long narratives concerning the prophets, such distressing affairs as those of Amnon and Absalom and Adonijah and the faithlessness of Solomon, and a multitude of minor particulars. We have already noticed his systematic shortening of the passages which he transcribes.

10. THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL SOURCES:

There are two marked phenomena in the parts of Chronicles which were not taken from the other canonical books. They are written in later Hebrew of a pretty uniform type; many parts of them are fragmentary. The Hebrew of the parts that were copied from Samuel and Kings is of course the classical Hebrew of those books, generally made more classical by the revision to which it has been subjected. The Hebrew of the other parts is presumably that of the Chronicler himself. The difference is unmistakable. An obvious way of accounting for it is by supposing that the Chronicler treated his Scriptural sources with especial respect, and his other sources with more freedom. We will presently consider whether this is the true account.

There are indications that some of the non-Biblical sources were in a mutilated or otherwise fragmentary condition when the Chronicler used them. Broken sentences and passages and constructions abound. In the translations these are largely concealed, the translators having guessed the meanings into shape, but the roughnesses are palpable in the Hebrew. They appear less in the long narratives than in the genealogies and descriptive passages. They are sometimes spoken of as if they were characteristic of the later Hebrew, but there is no sense in that.

For example, most of the genealogies are incomplete. The priestly genealogies omit some of the names that are most distinguished in the history, such names as those of Jehoiada and two Azariahs (^{<1218>}2 Kings 11:9, etc.; ^{<1217>}2 Chronicles 26:17; 31:10). Many of the genealogies are given more than once, and in variant forms, but with their incompleteness still palpable. There are many breaks in the lists. We read the names of one group, and we suddenly find ourselves in the midst of names that belong to another group, and with nothing to call attention to the transition. The same phenomena appear in the sections in ^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 23:2-27. These contain a succession of matters arranged in absolutely systematic order in classes and subclasses, while many of the statements thus arranged are so fragmentary as to be hardly intelligible. The most natural explanation of these phenomena assumes that the writer had a quantity of fragments in writing — clay tablets, perhaps, or pottery or papyrus, or what not, more or less mutilated, and that he copied them as best he could, one after another. A modern writer, doing such work, would indicate the lacunae by dots or dashes or other devices. The ancient copyist simply wrote the bits

of text one after another, without such indications. In regard to many of the supposable lacunae in Chronicles scholars would differ, but there are a large number in regard to which all would agree. If someone would print a text of Chronicles in which these should be indicated, he would make an important contribution to the intelligibility of the books.

11. THE OBJECT IN WRITING THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES:

On the basis of these phenomena what judgment can we form as to the purposes for which the books of Chronicles were written? There are those who find the answer to this question a very simple one. They say that the interests of the writer were those of the temple priesthood, that it seemed to him that the older histories did not emphasize these interests as they ought, and that he therefore wrote a new history, putting into it the views and facts which he thought should be there. If this statement were modified so as not to impugn the good faith of the Chronicler, it would be nearly correct as a statement of part of his purpose. His purpose was to preserve what he regarded as historical materials that were in danger of being lost, materials concerning the temple-worship, but also concerning a large variety of other matters. He had the historian's instinct for laying hold of all sorts of details, and putting them into permanent form. His respiration from God (we do not here discuss the nature of that inspiration) led him this way. He wanted to save for the future that which he regarded as historical fact. The contents of the book, determined in part by his enthusiasm for the temple, were also determined in part by the nature of the materials that were providentially at his disposal. There seems also to have been present in his consciousness the idea of bringing to completion the body of sacred writings which had then been accumulating for centuries.

As we have seen, the Greek translators gave to the Books of Chronicles a title which expressed the idea they had of the work. They regarded it as the presentation of matters which had been omitted in the earlier Scriptures, as written not to supersede the older books, but to supplement them, as being, along with Ezra and Nehemiah, a work that brought the Scriptures up to date, and made them complete.

12. THE TEXT:

The text of the Books of Chronicles has been less carefully preserved than that of some other parts of the Old Testament. Witness for example the

numbers 42 and 8 for the ages of Ahaziah and Jehoiachin (~~4212~~ 2 Chronicles 22:2; compare ~~1286~~ 2 Kings 8:26; ~~4819~~ 2 Chronicles 36:9; compare ~~1248~~ 2 Kings 24:8). There is no proof, however, of important textual corruption. As we have seen, the fragmentary character of certain parts is probably in the main due to exactness in following fragmentary sources, and not to bad text; and the differences between Samuel or Kings and Chronicles, in the transcribed passages, are mostly due to intended revision rather than to text variations.

13. CRITICAL ESTIMATES:

In critical discussions less semblance of fair play has been accorded to Chronicles than even to most of the other Scriptures. It is not unusual to assume that the Chronicler's reference to sources is mere make-believe, that he "has cited sources simply to produce the impression that he is writing with authority." Others hurry to the generalization that the Books of Kings mentioned in Chronicles (see Numbers 1 through 7 above) are all one work, which must therefore have been an extensive Midrash (commentary, exegetical and anecdotal) on the canonical Books of Kings; and that the references to prophetic writings are to sections in this Midrash; so that practically the Chronicler had only two sources, the canonical books and this midrashic history of Israel; and that "it is impossible to determine" whether he gathered any bits of information from any other sources.

Into the critical theories concerning Chronicles enters a hypothesis of an earlier Book of Kings that was more extensive than our present canonical books. And in recent publications of such men as Buchler, Benzinger and Kittel are theories of an analysis of Chronicles into documents — for example, an earlier writing that made no distinction between priests and Levites, or an earlier writing which dealt freely with the canonical books; and the later writing of the Chronicler proper.

What we know in the matter is that three sets of authors combined in producing the Books of Chronicles — first, the men who produced the canonical sources, second, the men who produced the other sources, and third, the man or men who directly or indirectly put the contents of these sources together into the book which we have. We have no means of knowing what most of the intermediate processes were, and it is superlatively useless to guess. It is gratuitous to say that the mention of

sources in Chronicles is not made in good faith. It is probable that among the sources were Midrashim that were nearly contemporaneous. It is exceedingly improbable that none of the sources mentioned were genuine and ancient. All probabilities agree to the effect that the returned exiles and their near descendants were likely to study the ancient history of their race, and to gather materials for that purpose. As we have seen, the phenomena of the book indicate the presence of an antiquarian motive which was sure to be interested in genuine items of evidence from the remote past.

14. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP:

The current opinion sixty years ago was that the Books of Chronicles and the whole Old Testament were completed about 404 BC, near the time when Artaxerxes Mnemon succeeded Darius Nothus. The statement now fashionable is that the Books of Chronicles were completed not later than about 250 BC, and this constantly degenerates into the statement that they were written about 250 BC or later. In fact, they were completed within the lifetime of Nehemiah, not later or not much later than 400 BC.

In discussing this we cannot ignore the fact that Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah are one work, or, if you prefer, one series. The closing verses of 2 Chronicles duplicate the opening verses of Ezr. This is not, probably, an inadvertent repetition. The Books of Chronicles were written later than the other parts of the series. The closing verses are the Chronicler's notification to his readers that he has brought up the earlier history to the point at which he had previously begun the narrative in Ezr. The testimony concerning Ezra and the "men of the Great Synagogue" and Nehemiah and their work on the Scriptures does not deserve the contempt with which some persons treat it. We know nothing concerning the Great Synagogue as an organization, but we know much concerning the succession of men, from Daniel to Simon the Just, who are called the men of the Great Synagogue. The old traditions do not say that Ezra was the founder of the succession, but they make him the typical person in it. Two bits of tradition are not necessarily inconsistent if one attributes work to Ezra which the other attributes to the men of the Great Synagogue. The regulation remark that tradition attributes Biblical work to Ezra and not to Nehemiah is untrue. Nehemiah was one of the men of the Great Synagogue, and prominent as such. He is introduced to us as a handsome boy, a king's favorite, coming to Jerusalem in 444 BC. In 433 BC he returned to the king. After an unknown interval of time he came back to Judea, and

presumably spent the remainder of his long life there, dying some years or sortie decades after 400 BC.

15. EVIDENCE AS TO DATE AND AUTHORSHIP:

The placing of the work of the Chronicles at the close of the Hebrew Scriptures is in itself of the nature of testimony. The men who placed it there testify thereby to their belief that these are the latest writings of the Old Testament aggregate. We are familiar with the testimony of Babha' Bathra' to the effect that most of the later books of the Old Testament were due to the men of the Great Synagogue and to Ezra, but that Nehemiah completed the Books of Chronicles. We cannot avoid including the Chronicles among the 22 books which Josephus says were written before the death of Artaxerxes Longimanus (Apion, I, 8). Of course the limit of time here really intended by Josephus is not the death of Artaxerxes, but the lifetime of men who were contemporary with him — that of Nehemiah, for example. We have already noted the testimony concerning Nehemiah's library (2 Macc 2:13-15). The time when the library was being gathered was the most likely time for it to be used as the Chronicler has used it. Add the recapitulation in Ecclesiasticus (44 through 49), which mentions Nehemiah latest in its list of Old Testament worthies.

Internal marks, also, justify the conclusion that the work of the Chronicler was complete before Nehemiah died. The abundant presence of Persian words and facts, with the absence of Greek words and facts, seems conclusive to the effect that the work was done before the conquests of Alexander rendered the Greek influence paramount. In some of the sections (e.g. ^{<1178>}Ezra 7:28 ff; Nehemiah passim) Ezra and Nehemiah speak in the first person. The whole work makes the impression of being written up to date. The latest situation in Chronicles is the same with that in Nehemiah (1 Chronicles 9; compare ^{<1118>}Nehemiah 11:3 through 12:26). The latest event mentioned is the differentiating of the Samaritan schism. A certain enrollment was made (^{<1622>}Nehemiah 12:22-26) in the reign of Darius, up to the high-priesthood of Johanan (elsewhere called Jonathan and John), but including Jaddua the son of Johanan in the high-priestly succession. Ezra and Nehemiah were still in office (^{<1625>}Nehemiah 12:26). This enrollment naturally connects itself with the expulsion of Jaddua's brother Manasseh for marrying into the family of Sanballat (^{<1638>}Nehemiah 13:28; Josephus, Ant, XI, 7-8). Jaddua belongs to the fifth generation from Jeshua, who was high priest 538 BC. Josephus says that Sanballat held a

commission from Darius. He mentions a certain Bagoas, “general of another Artaxerxes’ army,” as in relations with the high priest John.

Arguments for a Later Date.

Josephus, however, apparently regards the Darius who commissioned Sanballat as the last of the kings of that name, and says that Jaddua was contemporary with Alexander the Great, thus dating the Samaritan schism a little before 331 BC. All scholars reject these statements when they are used for dating the Samaritan schism, but some scholars eagerly accept them for the purpose of proving the late date of the last books of the Hebrew Bible. The argument never was valid, and it is completely exploded by the Aramaic papyri recently discovered in Egypt, which show that Bagoas and the high priest Johanan and the sons of Sanballat were contemporaries in 407 BC, the 17th year of Darius Nothus, and for some years earlier.

Dr. Driver (LOT, edition 1897, 518) expresses an opinion very commonly held concerning the Chronicles: “The only positive clue which the book contains as to the date at which it was composed is the genealogy in ^{<1387>}1 Chronicles 3:17-24, carried down to the sixth generation after Zerubbabel. This would imply a date not earlier than about 350 BC.” Turn to the passage and do your own arithmetic on it. Jeconiah was born 614 BC (^{<1248>}2 Kings 24:8). If as an average each of the sons in the succession was born when his father was about 25 years old, that would bring the first birth in the 6th generation from Zerubbabel to about 414 BC, and not 350 BC. This is not an improbable showing.

Dr. Driver suggests, however, that in ^{<1382>}1 Chronicles 3:21 we should follow the Greek reading instead of the Hebrew. This would give us: “And the sons of Hananiah: Pelatiah, and Jeshaiiah his son, Rephaiah his son, Arnan his son, Obadiah his son, Shecaniah his son.” The meaning here is ambiguous. It may be understood to be that each of the six men named after Hananiah was the son of the man named before him (compare ^{<1380>}1 Chronicles 3:10-14, or ^{<1361>}1 Chronicles 6:20-30,50-53); or as counting the six as the sons of Hananiah (compare ^{<1386>}1 Chronicles 3:16; 7:20,21, etc.). Understanding it in the first of these two ways the number of generations after Zerubbabel would be increased to eleven. So many generations before the early decades of the 4th century BC would be exceptional, though not impossible. But the statement that there were 11 generations is weak, being

based on a conjectural interpretation of an unproved text emendation, and standing unconfirmed in opposition to credible proof.

16. TRUTHFULNESS AND HISTORICITY:

“The Books of Chronicles are a tendency writing of little historical value”; “a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of postexilic Judaism”; “some ancient facts, having trickled down through oral or written tradition, are doubtless preserved. They are few indeed compared with the products of the imagination, and must be sifted like kernels of wheat from a mass of chaff.” These statements, taken at random from the book that happens to be handiest, fairly represent the opinion held by many. They regard the Chronicles as a fabrication made in the interest of a religious party, a fabrication in which the history has been intentionally falsified.

A principal motive for this opinion is to discredit the testimony of Chronicles against certain critical theories, the said testimony being more full and detailed than that in Samuel and Kings and the prophets. But on the whole question the testimony of Chronicles is to the same effect with that of the other books. The testimony of the other books supports that of the Chronicles. The discrediting of Chronicles is part of a theory which denies the historical trustworthiness of practically all parts of the Old Testament and New Testament.

(I) Alleged Proofs of Untruthfulness.

Against the Chronicles it is alleged that they sometimes contradict the older books; but nearly all the instances are capable of satisfactory solution. The large numerals in Chronicles, for example those concerning the armies of David, Abijah, Jeroboam, Asa, Zerah, Jehoshaphat, Amaziah, Uzziah, are adduced as extravagant and incredible. Most of the difficulty in connection with such numbers, whether in Chronicles or Exodus or Numbers or Judges or Samuel, disappears when we observe that they clearly belong to an artificial way of counting. These numbers are given in even thousands or even hundreds (even fifties or tens in a very few instances), which would not be the case if the hundreds and thousands were merely numerical. It is alleged that the Chronicler views the glories of the past as on a larger scale than that in which they are presented in the earlier books, but this is not uniformly the case. On the basis of these allegations the Chronicler is charged with an extravagance that is inconsistent with sober truthfulness,

but this charge follows the fate of the others. It is said that the Chronicler lacked trustworthy sources, but that is a thing to be proved, not taken for granted, and we have seen that it is improbable. It is alleged that the text is in such bad shape as to render the contents unreliable. This may be balanced against the counter conjecture that, since the Books of Chronicles have not been so often copied as the Books of Ki, their text is in the transcribed passages to be preferred to that of Ki. In fine, the reasons alleged against the historicity of Chronicles dwindle on examination, though there remain some problems that cannot be so easily disposed of.

(2) *Truthfulness in the Various Parts.*

Different parts of the Chronicles have their own separate problems of historicity. Take the genealogies, for example. If anyone had fabricated them, he would not have put them into their present fragmentary form, in which they have no story interest, and are of no direct use to anybody. On the other hand it is reasonable to account for their present form by the hypothesis that the writer used such materials as he had. This hypothesis is not derogatory to the inspiration of the writer. Deity saw fit to have these materials placed in the Scriptures, and to this end He influenced men of different generations through providential leadings and through impulses of the Spirit. No one thinks that the Spirit-guided man who put the genealogies in their final form received them as miraculous revelations. He received them as the product of effort in study — his own efforts and those of his predecessors. He is entitled to be counted as truthful if he used good judgment and fidelity in selecting and recording his materials.

Similar statements would be true in regard to the other statistical matter, and in regard to the many incidents that are mentioned in connection with the genealogies and other matters. To think of them as inventions by the Chronicler is not congruous with human experience. They are too brief and broken to have interest by themselves as stories. You can assign no possible reason that one could have for inventing them. They bear the marks of being genuine antiquarian discoveries. The final writer believed that he had come across facts which would be of interest if put into connection with the history as currently narrated. These matters are much more reasonably accounted for as facts than as inventions. And furthermore, a good many of them, first and last, have been corroborated by exploration. Take, for example, Manasseh's being carried to Babylon by the captains of the king of Assyria, or the account of Uzziah's military

greatness (~~<43B>~~ 2 Chronicles 33:11; 26:6 ff), or the references to industries in ~~<13B4>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:14-23 (compare PEFS, 1905, 243, 328; or Bible Sidelights from Gezer, 150 ff).

Possibly on a different footing is such a passage as the account of Abijah and Jeroboam (~~<44B>~~ 2 Chronicles 13:3-18). It says that Abijah had 400,000 men and Jeroboam 800,000, of whom 500,000 were slain in the battle. One might plausibly argue that these numbers were intended as a notice to the reader that he is to understand the story, not as fact, but as a work of the imagination, a religious parable, a midrashic narrative sermon, taken from the Midrash of Iddo (verse 22). Whether or no one finds this argument convincing, anyone can see that it does not accuse the Books of Chronicles of being untruthful. If the passage is a parable it is true in the sense in which it was intended to be understood. A similar case is the account of Jehoshaphat's peril from the invading nations and his wonderful rescue (2 Chronicles 20).

On still a different footing are such narratives as those concerning the bringing up of the ark, the first making of Solomon king, the reforms under Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah. These are sober narratives, with nothing in them to suggest flights of the imagination. Probably no one doubts that the Chronicler intended them to be understood as historical fact. If one is under bondage to the modern tradition which dates Deuteronomy from the time of Josiah and the priestly laws from after the exile, he must needs count these parts of Chronicles as falsified history; but if he is free from that bondage he will see no strong reason for counting them so.

17. THE VALUES OF THE CHRONICLES:

In fine men are correct when they say that the greatest values of the Books of Chronicles lie in their availability for vividly illustrating the great truths of religion. They are correct when they assign great value to these books as depicting the ideas of the time when they were written. But they are none the less of great value as repeating from the other Scriptures the outline of the history of the religion of Yahweh, and presenting additional material for the filling in of that outline.

LITERATURE.

Among the older commentaries on Chronicles see that of Keil in the Keil-Delitzsch series, published in English in 1872; that of Zockler in the Lange series, 1876; that of Barker in the Pulpit Commentary, after 1880. Among more recent works, from the point of view which denies the historicity of Chronicles, see R. Kittel in the Polychrome Bible, 1895, and Curtis and Masden in the International Critical Commentary, 1910. A brilliant characterization from that point of view is that by Torrey, "The Chronicler as Editor and as Independent Narrator" in AJSL, January, 1909, and subsequent numbers. On the other side see Beecher, Reasonable Biblical Criticism, 1911, chapters xviii and xxii; "Is the Chronicler a Veracious Historian?" in Bible Student (October, 1899 and subsequent numbers), is a defense of the historicity. All works on Old Testament Introduction discuss the questions concerning Chronicles. In view of the many proper names in Chronicles, such a book as Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, has its uses. For the chronological facts, especially in connection with the closing of the Old Testament history, see Beecher, Dated Events of the Old Testament, 1907. For the Egyptian papyri see Drei Aramaische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine, Sachau, Berlin, 1907, or the Appendix to Toffteen, Historic Exodus. Also Sprengling's article in AJSL, April, 1911. As to light on the Chronicles from explorations, see "The Excavations of Gezer, 1902-5, and 1907-9," PEF; or Bible Sidelights from the Mounds of Gezer, 1906. For other books see the lists in Encyclopedia Biblica and HDB.

Willis J. Beecher

CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

<kro-nol'-o-ji>:

I. INTRODUCTORY.

1. Difficulties of the Subject:

For evident reasons the student of Biblical chronology must meet many difficulties, and must always be severely handicapped. First of all, the Old Testament is not purely nor intentionally a book of history. Nor does it present a formulated system of chronology, its many numbers and dates being used principally with a view to the spiritual facts and truths with

which the authors were concerned. We are not, therefore, to expect to find a perfectly arranged order of periods and dates, though happily for us in our investigation we shall indeed find many accurately dated events, frequent consecutions of events, and orderly successions of officials; as, for example, the numerous genealogical tables, the succession of judges and the lists of kings.

Furthermore, there is not to be found in the Old Testament one particular and definitely fixed era, from which all of its events are dated, as is the case in Christian history. The points of departure, or reckoning, are found to vary in different periods of the advancing history; being at one stage the Creation, at another the migration of Abraham, or the Exodus, or again the disruption of the kingdom. Ordinarily dates and all time-allusions are comparative, i.e. they are related to the reign of some contemporary monarch, as the vision of Isaiah “in the year that king Uzziah died” (~~<2000>~~ Isaiah 6:1), or to some unusual occurrence, historical or natural, as the great earthquake (~~<3000>~~ Amos 1:1; ~~<3945>~~ Zechariah 14:5). Only occasional reference is found to some event, which marks an era-beginning; such as the Exodus (~~<07116>~~ Judges 11:16,26; ~~<1000>~~ 1 Kings 6:1).

The general lack of uniformity among writers on Biblical chronology contributes further toward increase of the already perplexing confusion. It is almost possible to say that no two writers agree; and proposed harmonies are with each other most inharmonious. The two articles on Old Testament chronology in a recent work (Murray, *Illus. Bible Dictionary*, 1908), for example, are several hundred years apart at certain points. Wide diversity of opinion exists about the most prominent events, such as the call of Abraham and the age of his famous contemporary Hammurabi, the year of the Exodus, and the beginning of Solomon’s temple. Naturally there is less variance of opinion about later dates, some of which, e.g. the fall of Samaria and the destruction of Jerusalem, may be considered as fixed. A like wide range of opinion prevails among archaeologists with regard to events in contemporaneous history, the difference between Goodspeed and Hommel in the dates of early Babylonian history being five hundred years, and the beginning and extent of the Hyksos period in Egypt varying in different “authorities” by hundreds of years. Nor should the difference in the various and total numbers of the Hebrew, Samaritan and Septuagint texts of the pre-Abrahamic ages be left out of sight in any statement of the difficulties attending the discussion of this subject.

2. Plan of Treatment:

These difficulties, and others as serious, have determined the plan of this article. The usual method of development has been to begin with the sources of Old Testament history, and to follow its course downward. While such a system may have its advantages, there is, however, this serious disadvantage connected with it: that the least certain dates are confessedly those at the beginning of the records, and the use of them at the foundation renders the whole structure of the discussion more or less uncertain. Archaeology and comparative history have done much to fix dates from the Exodus downward, bringing these later centuries by discovery and translation almost into the position of attested history. But the ages before the Exodus, and particularly before Abraham, still lie from the very nature of the case in great obscurity. And thus any system beginning with the indistinct early past, with its compacted numbers and their uncertain interpretation, is much like a chain hung on thin air. The writer purposes, therefore, beginning with certain familiar, important and pivotal dates, to gather around and relate to these the events and persons of the Old Testament. Such accepted dates are: the completion of the Second Temple in 516, the fall of Jerusalem in 586, the fall of Samaria in 721, tribute to Shalmaneser II from Jehu in 842, and from a member of Omri's dynasty in 854. Such Old Testament events as mark the beginning of eras are the Disruption, Solomon's temple, the Exodus and Abraham's Call. The material and the plan, then, almost necessarily require that we begin at the end of the history and work logically backward to the earlier stages, at which we may hope to arrive with firm ground under our feet for the disposition of the more uncertain problems. It is hoped that on this plan the system of chronology will not be mere speculation, nor a personal theory, but of some certainty and affording some assurance in days of wild assertion and free manipulation.

3. Bible to be Regarded as Highest Authority:

It should be remembered that this is a study of Bible chronology, and therefore full value will be given to the explicit and positive statements of the Bible. Surely the time has come, when all fair-minded men should recognize that a clear and straightforward declaration of the Sacred Scriptures is not to be summarily rejected because of its apparent contradiction by some unknown and irresponsible person, who could stamp clay or chisel stone. It has been all too common that archaeological and

critical adventurers have doubted and required accurate proof of every Bible statement, but have been ready enough to give credence to any statement from ancient pagan sources. We assume, as we have every reason to do, the trustworthiness of the Bible records, which have been corroborated in countless instances; and we shall follow their guidance in preference to any other. The help of contemporaneous history and the witness of archaeology can be used to advantage, but should not be substituted for the plain facts of the Scriptures, which are full worthy of our trust and regard. The province of a chronology of the Bible is properly to present in system the dates therein given, with an honest effort to harmonize the difficulties, using the external helps, but ever regardful of Scripture authority and rights.

II. THE AGES BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS.

Between the coming of Christ and the end of Old Testament history there lie in round numbers four hundred years. But while these were extra-Biblical ages, they were neither barren nor uneventful years; for in them will be found much of the highest value in the development of Jewish life, and in the preparation for the Messiah. And thus they have their proper place in Bible chronology (*see BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS*). The birth of Jesus could not have been later than 4 BC, since Herod the Great died in April of that year. Herod became king of Judea in 37 BC. Palestine had been conquered and Jerusalem entered by the Romans under Pompey in 56 BC, the Jews coming in this way under the power of Rome. The Roman age was preceded by the government of priest-kings, with which the Idumean Antipater became identified by marriage, so that Herod, whom Rome made king, was both Jew and alien.

The period of the Maccabees, which ended in 39 BC with the removal of Antigonus by the Romans in favor of Herod, began 168 BC with Judas. Antipater, who had been appointed procurator of Judea in 47, was assassinated in 43 BC. The period of the Seleucids stretches from its close with the regency of Antiochus VII in 128 back to its founder, Seleucus, 312 BC. The most notable of these monarchs from the Jewish point of view was Antiochus Epiphanes, who reigned from 175 to 164, and in 168 gave occasion to the rise of the Maccabees by his many acts of impiety and oppression, particularly the desecration of the Jerusalem temple. In 203 BC Antiochus the Great, who had become king of Syria in 223, took Jerusalem, and later, in 198, annexed Judea to Syria. Previous to this Judea

had been an Egyptian dependency, as after the death of Alexander the Great, 323 BC, and the division of his empire, it had been annexed by Ptolemy Soter to Egypt. Ptolemy Philadelphus, becoming king 280 BC, encouraged the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, the result being the Septuagint version, and all it meant by way of preparation for the spread of Christianity. Alexander's defeat of Darius III, or Codomannus, at Arbela in 331 brought the Persian empire to an end, fulfilling the long-cherished ambition of the Greeks for mastery of Asia. The long reign of the Biblical king of Persia, Artaxerxes Longimanus, extended from 465 to 424 BC, and in reaching his reign we find ourselves in the region of the Old Testament history. Reversing the order of this brief review and setting out from Old Testament point of view, we have the following table for the centuries between the Testaments:

III. PERSIAN PERIOD.

Entering now the last period of Old Testament history, which may be called the Persian period, we find that the activities of Ezra, Nehemiah and other Jewish leaders are dated by the regnal years of the kings of Persia (e.g. ~~<3000>~~ Haggai 1:1; ~~<3000>~~ Zechariah 1:1; ~~<3000>~~ Ezra 1:1; ~~<4000>~~ Nehemiah 2:1); and consequently the difficulties in the chronology of this period are not great. Recently a fanciful effort has been made to place the events narrated in Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah in the time of the Babylonian Captivity, claiming Scripture warrant from the occurrence of these names, with Mordecai, in ~~<4500>~~ Ezra 2:2 and ~~<4600>~~ Nehemiah 7:7; but altogether without success (see Prince of Judah, or Days of Nehemiah Redated). These names were doubtless of common occurrence, and their appearance among those returning with Zerubbabel is not sufficient to affect the historical evidence for the accepted dates of Ezra and Nehemiah. The attempt to move back these dates into the 6th century, to associate Nehemiah with Daniel and Mordecai and to place his work before Zerubbabel may be dismissed as pure fancy and impossible of reconciliation with the Old Testament narrative.

Artaxerxes I began his reign, which gives date to Ezra and Nehemiah, in 465 BC. In his 7th year, 458, Ezra went from Babylon to Jerusalem by the king's decree (~~<4500>~~ Ezra 7:7), taking back with him the vessels of the Temple and much besides for the worship at Jerusalem, accompanied also by a great company of returning Jews. Nehemiah followed from Shushan in the 20th year of the king (~~<4600>~~ Nehemiah 1:1), having heard of and being

distressed by the partial failure of Ezra's efforts. Under his wise and courageous leadership, the city walls were speedily restored, and many reforms accomplished. He returned after twelve years (433) to the service of the king in Shushan (~~<433>~~ Nehemiah 13:6), but in a short time, hearing evil tidings from Jerusalem, went back to complete his reforms, and apparently spent the rest of his life in that work. Although the Bible is silent, such is the testimony of Josephus. The Book of Mal, reflecting the difficulties and evils of this time, is evidently to be placed here, but not with exactness, as it might have been written as early as 460 or as late as 420.

The period from the return under Ezra (458) back to the completion of the Temple in the reign of Darius I (516) is, with the exception of incidental references and the assignment of undated books and incidents, practically a blank. Here belong, we believe, the Book of Esther, possibly Mal, some of the Psalms, and those social and religious tendencies among the returned exiles, which made the vigorous reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah so necessary. But the Old Testament does not draw the curtain from the mystery of that half-century, that we may know the happenings and watch the development. Beyond this blank we come again to explicit dates. The second temple, begun with the Return under Zerubbabel, was completed in the 6th year of Darius, i.e. 516. The building of it, which had been early abandoned for selfish reasons, was resumed in the 2nd year of Darius under the exhortation of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah (~~<500>~~ Haggai 1:1; ~~<500>~~ Zechariah 1:1). Darius the Great began his reign in 521. Cambyses succeeded Cyrus in 527. Babylon was taken by the Persians in 538, and shortly after the Jews, under the edict of Cyrus, began their return to Jerusalem, reaching their destination by 536 at the latest. Cyrus overthrew Lydia in 545, the Medes five years earlier, and must have come to the Persian throne not later than 555. His conquest of Asia Minor opened the contest between Persia and Greece for supremacy, to be continued by Darius and Xerxes, resulting finally at Arbela (331) in Greek triumph under Alexander, and the inauguration of a new age.

The table for the Persian period of Old Testament history, following the stream upward, is therefore as follows:

IV. BABYLONIAN PERIOD.

Just preceding the Persian is the Babylonian period of Old Testament chronology, overlapping, of course, the former, and finally superseded by it

in Cyrus' conquest of Babylonia. This period may properly be said to begin with the death in 626 BC of Ashurbanipal, the last great ruler of Assyria. At this time Nabopolassar had been made governor of Babylonia, subject to the supremacy of Assyria. With Ashurbanipal's death Nabopolassar became independent sovereign of Babylonia, and shortly entered into league with the Medes to overthrow the rule of Assyria, and then to divide its empire between them. This was accomplished in the fall of Nineveh (606) which brought the end of the mighty Assyrian empire, the last king being Sinsharishkun (the historic Saracus), a son of Ashurbanipal. Some years before his death in 604 Nabopolassar associated with him on the throne of Babylonia his son Nebuchadnezzar, most illustrious ruler of the new Babylonian empire, and intimately connected with the history of Judah in the last years of that kingdom. His long reign came to an end in 562.

While the conflict, which brought Assyria to its end, and the attendant confusion, were absorbing the attention of Mesopotamian countries, Egypt under a new and virile dynasty was reviving her ambitions and intrigues for dominion in Asia. Pharaoh-necho II taking advantage of the confusion and helplessness of Assyria invaded Palestine in 609, intending to march on through Palestine to attack Mesopotamia. King Josiah in loyalty to his Assyrian overlord opposed him, but was defeated and slain at the battle of Megiddo, after a reign of 31 years; apparently an unnecessary and foolish opposition on Josiah's part, as the plan of Necho's march shows that Judah was not directly affected. After the victory at Megiddo, Necho continued his march north-eastward, subduing Syria and hoping to have a hand in Mesopotamian affairs. But in 606 or 607 BC he was defeated at Carchemish and driven back to Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, fresh from victory over Nineveh. In the same year Nebuchadnezzar marched against Egypt, receiving the submission of Jerusalem as he passed through Palestine, and sending noble hostages back to Babylon, among whom were Daniel and his three friends. The death of his father and his endangered succession recalled Nebuchadnezzar suddenly to Babylon, where he became sole ruler in 604. It appears that Necho must have returned to Egypt after Megiddo and before the battle of Carchemish, as he made Jehoiakim, king in place of Jehoahaz, whom he carried captive to Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar's victory at Carchemish and his march southward brought Judah in close relations with Babylon, and opened up the dramatic chapter of Jerusalem's fall and exile. These historic events fix the dates of the last

kings and the closing incidents of the kingdom of Judah, as shown in the following table:

V. ASSYRIAN PERIOD AND JUDAH AFTER FALL OF SAMARIA.

This section, which may for convenience be treated as a division, is the chronology of Judah under Assyria after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 721. As the Scripture time-references are frequent and explicit, and the contemporaneous Assyrian records are full, and explicit also, the problems of this period are neither many nor insoluble. One difficulty is found in the fact that the aggregate years of the reigns of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon and Josiah fall one or two years short of the period between Hezekiah's accession in 726 and Josiah's death in 609. But there is evidence of anarchical conditions at the close of Amon's reign (^{<12123>}2 Kings 21:23,14), and it is probable that at least a year should be counted for the interregnum. The chief difficulty is with the invasions of Sennacherib in Hezekiah's reign. The confusion is caused by the apparent dating of Sennacherib's famous and disastrous invasion of 701 in the 14th year of Hezekiah's reign (^{<121813>}2 Kings 18:13). Various attempts reconciliation have been made; one attempt has been to place the beginning of Hezekiah's reign in 715, which is out of the question entirely, as it disregards the exact terms in which the beginning of his reign is placed before the fall of Samaria (^{<121810>}2 Kings 18:10). Another suggestion has been that "24th" be read instead of "14th"; but this is pure conjecture. There is a simple and satisfactory solution: in the chapters which contain the record (2 Kings 18 and Isaiah 36) it is evident that two invasions are described. Frequently in the Scriptures records are topical rather than chronological, and just so in this instance the topic is Sennacherib's menace of Judah, and the ultimate deliverance by Yahweh. The story includes two invasions: the first in the 14th year of Hezekiah (713) when Sennacherib led the armies of his father Sargon, the end of which, so far as Jerusalem was concerned, was the payment of tribute by Hezekiah, as is accurately stated in ^{<121816>}2 Kings 18:16. The second invasion, the description of which begins with the following verse (18:17), was the more serious, and is probably identified as that of 701, when Sennacherib had become king. The necessary insertion of a paragraph indicator between 18:16 and 17 satisfies every demand for harmony.

From 609 BC, the year of Josiah's death, we count back 31 years to the beginning of his reign in 639; he attained his majority in the 8th year (632; ~~<484B>~~ 2 Chronicles 34:3); the reformation in his 12th year, at the time of the Scythian irruption, would fall in 628 (~~<484B>~~ 2 Chronicles 34:3); in the following year Jeremiah began to prophecy; and in Josiah's 18th year (621) the temple was cleansed and the Book of the Law found (~~<484B>~~ 2 Chronicles 34:8). Allowing a year of confusion, Amon began his short reign in 642, and Manasseh his long reign of 55 years in 697, Hezekiah's reign of 29 years dating back to 726. Some fixed important dates of contemporaneous history are: death of Ashurbanipal, Assyria's last great king, in 626, with the consequent independence of Babylon and beginning of the 2nd Babylonian empire. Ashurbanipal's long reign began in 668 on the death of his father Esarhaddon; who succeeded his father Sennacherib in 681. Sargon usurped the Assyrian throne in 722, and died in 705. Shalmaneser IV, successor of Tiglath-pileser III, reigned for the brief space between 727 and 722. In Egypt the XXVth, or Ethiopian Dynasty, was in power from circa 720 to 667, two of its kings, So and Tirhakah, having mention in the Old Testament (~~<12704>~~ 2 Kings 17:4; 19:9; ~~<2357B>~~ Isaiah 37:9), and after this the XXVIth (a native) Dynasty appeared, Pharaoh-necho being one of its kings. The dates of this period we may summarize in the following table:

VI. PERIOD OF DIVIDED KINGDOM.

The most complex, but most interesting, problems of Old Testament chronology are found in the period of the Divided Kingdom. In the literature of this period are found larger number of dates and historical references than in that of any other. We have the assistance of several important sources and factors in arranging these dates:

- (1) The parallel records of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah serve as checks to each other, since the accession and death of the kings in each nation are fixed by reference to reigns of those of the other. Many other events are similarly related.
- (2) The history of the two kingdoms, or parts of it, at least, is given in three parallel authorities: the Books of Kings, of Chronicles, and of the Prophets.
- (3) The Assyrian records are fullest and are practically continuous in this period, the limu lists extending unbroken from 893 to 650 BC.

1. Causes of Variation in Systems:

But while this apparently should be the most satisfactory field for the chronologist, it has been found impossible to arrive at anything approaching certainty, and consequently there is considerable divergence among individuals and schools. One cause of variation is the difference between the Assyrian royal lists and the total of the Old Testament numbers for this period, the Old Testament aggregate being 51 years greater than the Assyrian lists. Two common methods of harmonizing this difference have been adopted:

(1) to accept the Old Testament aggregate as correct and to assume that the 51 years have been omitted from the Assyrian lists (see W. J. Beecher, *Dated Events of Old Testament*, 18, 19);

(2) to harmonize the Old Testament numbers with the Assyrian lists by taking into account the overlapping of reigns of kings who were, for brief periods, associated on the throne. Instances of such overlapping are the co-regency of Uzziah and Jotham in Judah (~~2~~¹ Kings 15:5), and possibly the reign of Pekah contemporaneously with Menahem and Pekahiah in Israel (2 Kings 23-28). The latter method yields the most satisfactory results, and will be adopted in this article. The chief point of difference will be the age of Solomon and the foundation-laying of the Temple. This may be found according to the former method by adding 51 years to the dates as given below. That the method of following the aggregate of the Old Testament numbers must assume arbitrarily that there have been omissions from the Assyrian lists, and that it also must resort to some overlapping and adjustment of the numbers as they are given in the text, are sufficient reasons against its adoption. And in meeting the difficulties of this period it should always be borne in mind that the Old Testament is not a book of annals merely, and that dates are given not for any special interest in them, but to correlate and emphasize events. Ordinarily dates are given with reference to local situations and contemporary persons, and not as fixed by some great epoch-marking event; e.g. Uzziah's reign is fixed not with reference to the Disruption nor the Temple building, but by relation to his Israelite contemporary, Jeroboam II.

2. Some Important and Pivotal Dates:

However, there are some fixed dates, which are so by reason of their international significance, and upon these we may rest with reasonable assurance. Such are the fall of Samaria (721 BC); the accession of Tiglath-pileser III (745); tribute paid to Shalmaneser II by Jehu in 842, and by Ahab, or one of his dynasty, in 854; and the invasion of Judah by Pharaoh-shishak in the fifth year of Rehoboam (~~<1145>~~ 1 Kings 14:25). There are also certain coincident dates, fixed with fair accuracy, in the parallel history of the two kingdoms, which serve both as starting-points and as checks upon each other. The most prominent of these are: the beginning of Hezekiah's reign, 5 years before the fall of Samaria (~~<1280>~~ 2 Kings 18:10); the synchronism of the reigns of Jeroboam II and Jotham (~~<1367>~~ 1 Chronicles 5:17), Jotham's accession being used as a basis of calculation for the reigns of Israelite kings (~~<1253>~~ 2 Kings 15:30); the coincidence of the end of the Omri Dynasty and the death of Ahaziah, king of Judah (2 Kings 9), Jehu and Athaliah therefore beginning their reigns at the same time; and, primarily, the division of the kingdom and the synchronous beginning of the reigns of Jeroboam I and Rehoboam. Using these fixed dates and coincidences, we must find the summaries of the reigns of Israelite and Jewish kings between 721, the 9th year of Hoshea and the 6th of Hezekiah, and 843, the beginning of the reigns of Jehu and Athaliah, to be 122 years each; and likewise the summaries from 843 back to the Disruption to be the same.

3. Difficulties to Be Removed:

The most serious difficulties are found near the end of the period, when conditions in the Northern Kingdom were becoming anarchical, and, also evident co-regencies, the extent of which is not evident, occurred in the Southern Kingdom. Pekah is said to have reigned 20 years (~~<1257>~~ 2 Kings 15:27); and yet Menahem paid tribute to Assyria in 738, and he was succeeded for two years by his son Pekahiah, from whom Pekah seized the kingdom. This would allow Pekah only 6 years of sovereignty. The explanation lies in the context: in the confusion which followed the death of Jeroboam, Pekah established his authority over the section East of the Jordan, and to that year the numbers in ~~<1257>~~ 2 Kings 15:27,32; ~~<1260>~~ 2 Kings 16:1 refer. Uzziah was leprous the last 16 years of his life, and Jotham his son was over the kingdom (~~<1255>~~ 2 Kings 15:5). The length of Jotham's reign was just 16 years, not additional to the 16 of the co-regency, as this

would result in the absurdity of making him co-regent at the age of 9 years (~~<1253>~~2 Kings 15:33). Therefore nearly his whole reign is included in the 52 years of his father. For some reason Ahaz was associated with his father Jotham before the death of the latter, since the 16 years of his reign plus the 5 of Hezekiah before the fall of Samaria bring his accession before the death of Uzziah and Jotham, i.e. in 741. So that for approximately 6 years the three reigns were contemporaneous. That these 6 years may not be accounted for by a co-regency with Hezekiah at the other end of Ahaz' reign is evident from the age of Hezekiah at his accession (~~<1281>~~2 Kings 18:2), and from the radical difference in the policy of the two kings. ~~<1210>~~2 Kings 7:1 may suggest that Uzziah and Jotham died about the same time, and that Ahaz was regarded as succeeding both directly.

Another difficulty is found at the beginning of Uzziah's reign, where he is said to have succeeded his father Amaziah at the age of 16, but is also said to have accomplished certain notable things after his father's death (~~<1241>~~2 Kings 14:21,22). Evidently, then, he became king before the death of Amaziah. When did this co-regency begin? No better time is suggested than Amaziah's ignominious defeat by Jehoash of Israel in the 15th year of his reign, after which the people arose and put Uzziah in his place, Amaziah living on for 15 years (~~<12417>~~2 Kings 14:17), so that 15 of Amaziah's 29 years were contemporaneous with Uzziah. Further, in the last years of Joash of Judah there may have been a co-regency, since he was "very sick" in those years (~~<1285>~~2 Chronicles 24:25). Thus the totals of 146 years for the reigns of the kings of Israel and of 165 for the reigns of the kings of Judah between 721 and 842 are reduced to the actual 121 by the overlappings, which are suggested in the narrative itself.

4. Overlappings:

For the first division of this period, from the rise of Jehu, circa 843, to the division of the kingdom, the totals of the reigns of the kings of Israel is 98 years, and of the kings of Judah is 95. But there must be some overlappings. The interval between Ahab and Jehu, as shown by mention of them in the Assyrian records, is 12 years; but the two sons of Ahab reigned 14 years, Ahaziah 2 and Jehoram 12. Evidently the last year of Ahab, in which came the defeat at Karkar, was the 1st of Ahaziah, and the 2nd of Ahaziah, who suffered in that year serious accident (~~<12100>~~2 Kings 1:2), was the first of Jehoram. It is probable that the long reign of Asa closed with Jehoshaphat as co-regent (~~<11153>~~1 Kings 15:23), so the above totals of both

kingdoms must be reduced to some extent, probably to 90 years, and the disruption of the kingdom placed about 933 BC. Shishak, founder of the XXII^d Dynasty, invaded Palestine in the 5th year of Rehoboam (^{<1142>}1 Kings 14:25), and in, or shortly before, the 21st year of his own reign, so that he must have become sovereign of Egypt about 950 BC. Jeroboam fled to Egypt after Solomon had reigned more than 20 years, as is shown by the connection of Jeroboam with the building of Millo; and so Jeroboam's flight must have been about the beginning of Shishak's reign. This is in accord with the Old Testament records, since the hostile Shishak Dynasty must have arisen in the reign of Solomon, the dynasty which was ruling at the beginning of his reign having been in alliance with him. So we place the accession of Shishak about 950, his invasion of Judah in 929, and the Disruption in 933 BC.

An interesting instance of co-regency in this period is that of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram, for while Ahaziah of Israel began to reign in the 17th year of Jehoshaphat (^{<122>}1 Kings 22:51) and died in the 2nd year of Jehoram (^{<1217>}2 Kings 1:17), the year of his death was also the 18th of Jehoshaphat, so that the father and son reigned together about 5 years. It is evident also that Jehoshaphat ruled before his father's death, as the total of his reign is counted from the co-regency's beginning (^{<1224>}1 Kings 22:41), but certain events are dated from his sole reign on the death of Asa (^{<1225>}1 Kings 22:51; ^{<1211>}2 Kings 3:1). It is probable that the 6 years of Athaliah were included in the 40 years of the reign of Joash, the legitimate king. The age of his son, Amaziah, at his accession (^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 25:1) does not operate against this probability, since the precocious Jewish sovereigns attained their majority at 15 years of age (compare ^{<1413>}2 Chronicles 34:3). The co-regency for 2 years of Joash and Amaziah (^{<1425>}2 Chronicles 24:25) brings the aggregate years of the reigns of the kings of both kingdoms down to the accession of Jeroboam II, three years before Uzziah's accession, into exact accord. Finally, the difference of three years in the totals of reigns in the two kingdoms from Jehu' to the Disruption is explained by the fact that in Israel the first year of a king was coincident with the last of his predecessor, whereas in Judah, certainly at the beginning of this period, the first year of a king followed the death of his predecessor; e.g. while Asa began to reign in the 20th year of Jeroboam (^{<1159>}1 Kings 15:9), Jeroboam, who reigned 22 years, died three years later in the second year of Asa (^{<1125>}1 Kings 15:25). Observation of this principle in the accessions of the first three kings after Jeroboam removes the difference, the long numbers

of the reign of Asa being found to corroborate. The preceding table will illustrate these facts of the records, as harmonizing the dates of the two contemporaneous kingdoms.

VII. FROM THE DISRUPTION TO THE EXODUS.

The period now to be considered extends from the disruption of the kingdom back to the Exodus. The reasons for combining the Biblical events within these widely separated dates into one period of such length are evident, namely,

(1) the regular sequence of the history;

(2) the occurrence of comprehensive numbers for the period as a whole, e.g. ^{<712>}Judges 11:26 and ^{<100>}1 Kings 6:1; the chronological data of the Book of Judges, which lead directly up to the developments in the time of the united kingdom, e.g. the narrative of Ruth preparing the way for the reign of David. Characteristic of this period is the frequent occurrence of the general numbers 80, 40 and 20, which are not necessarily to be taken always as exact, but possibly at times indicating a round, or generation, number. In order to get the time limits of this period, it is necessary to count back 37 years from the end of Solomon's reign in 933 BC, and this brings us to that epoch-marking event, the laying of the foundations of the Temple in 969 or 970, the 4th year of his reign (^{<100>}1 Kings 6:1); and from this event we are brought by the addition of the comprehensive number 479, given in the same verse, back to the year of the Exodus, approximately 1448 BC, making the total length of the period about 516 years.

Indications of Overlapping:

But the addition of the numbers given for the various reigns and administrations of the period yields a total which is much greater than 516, and therefore one must seek in the text indications of overlapping, which will bring the narrative into harmony with itself. The reigns of Solomon (^{<1112>}1 Kings 11:42), David (^{<1021>}1 Kings 2:11) and Saul (^{<412>}Acts 13:21), are given as 40 years each; and here there may be some overlapping, Solomon, e.g. becoming king before David's death (^{<1004>}1 Kings 1:43-48). We are rather surprised to find that there is no statement of the length of Samuel's ministry, such as its important place in the national life would lead us to expect. The probable reason for this is that his life was paralleled largely by

the reign of Saul and the administration of Eli. A period of 40 years is assigned to Eli (^{<0948>}1 Samuel 4:18); the aggregate of numbers given for the Judges is 410 years; Joshua ruled for 40 years (^{<0108>}Judges 2:8); and finally the wilderness wanderings covered another 40-year period. The sum total of all these numbers is 670 — far beyond the comprehensive reckonings of ^{<0712>}Judges 11:26; ^{<1001>}1 Kings 6:1, and ^{<4139>}Acts 13:19. It is evident from ^{<0707>}Judges 10:7,8; 13:1 that the periods of Ammonite and Philistine oppression were either contemporaneous or very near together, and therefore that the comprehensive number, 300 years, of ^{<0712>}Judges 11:26, reaches from the entrance into Canaan under Joshua down to the age of Samson, as well as of Jephthah. The administrations of Ibzan, Elon and Abdon (^{<0712>}Judges 12:8-13) should then be regarded as practically synchronous with Jephthah and Samson, and the number of their years should, in part at least, be left out of account. The numbers from Samson and Eli to Solomon are approximately fixed, 20 to Samson, 40 to Eli, 40 to Saul and 40 to David; and their total accords with the 300 before Jephthah, and the 40 of wilderness wanderings in making up the grand total (^{<1001>}1 Kings 6:1) from Solomon to the Exodus. This proportion before and after Jephthah, or Samson, and the Philistine oppression, approximately 330 and 150 years, is in agreement with the genealogies of ^{<0848>}Ruth 4:18-22; ^{<0948>}1 Samuel 14:3; 22:9; 1 Chronicles 2; 6; 24. The shortening therefore of the excessive aggregate of 670 years must be sought in the records from Samson back to Joshua. Assuming that the oppressions may be synchronous with the administrations of preceding or succeeding judges, that Abimelech's abortive attempt to become king (Judges 9) should be included in Gideon's 40 years, and that parallelings are possible in the three judges just after Jephthah (^{<0712>}Judges 12:8-13) and the two just before (^{<0707>}Judges 10:1-5), it is possible to bring the detailed time-references of the Books of Judges into satisfactory agreement with the comprehensive numbers. That the period of the Judges is shorter than the aggregate of the numbers assigned to each is further indicated by the manner in which the brief narratives at the end of the book — the migration of the Danites, the sin and punishment of Benjamin — and the Book of Ruth, bring the earlier generations into close touch with the later; compare the genealogy of David (^{<0848>}Ruth 4:18-22).

The preceding table (p. 641) shows the dates of events according to the longer reckoning, and also according to the suggested shortening by taking into account the possible synchronisms. It should be remembered that these figures are not indisputable, but merely tentative and suggestive.

VIII. FROM THE EXODUS TO BIRTH OF ABRAHAM.

The period of Old Testament chronology now to receive our attention is that which extends from the Exodus in circa 1448 BC back to the call and migration of Abraham. This may be called the period of the patriarchal wanderings, the formative or infancy period of the nation, and therefore of the highest interest historically and religiously. But it is not possible to fix its dates with indisputable accuracy, since, with rare exceptions, the events of the Old Testament record are not related in their narration to eras or definite persons of the contemporary nations; and since also the chronology of these nations is much in dispute among historians and archaeologists, with variations of hundreds of years.

Main Points at Issue:

The chief points at issue here for determination of the chronological problems are the time of the Exodus, the duration of Israel's sojourn in Egypt and the date of Hammurabi. Considering these in their order:

(1) As to the Exodus, opinions have been divided among the XVIIIth, XIXth and XXth dynasties as the time of the Oppression and Exodus of Israel, and there are plausible arguments for, and serious objections to, each of these periods. When all things have been considered it seems best to fix upon the XVIIIth Dynasty as the age of the Oppression and Exodus, Thothmes III as the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and the years immediately following his death as the time of the Exodus, for the following reasons:

(a) This is in harmony with the time-reckoning from the Temple of Solomon back to the Exodus (~~1000~~ 1 Kings 6:1), and fully satisfies the Biblical numbers for the intervening period, as shown above; while either later dynastic period would necessitate either unnatural cramping or ruthless rejection of the Biblical numbers. To place the Exodus so late as Ramses III, after 1200 BC, is in the light of the Biblical reckoning an evident absurdity.

(b) In the XVIIIth Dynasty we can look best for the Pharaoh "that knew not Joseph," as it was the leader of this dynasty, Ahmes I, who conquered and drove out the Hyksos, and left to his followers as a legacy cordial hatred of the Asiatics.

(c) Thothmes III was a great builder, and the heavy tasks of the Hebrews would fit well into his reign. He was also the champion of Amon, the god of Thebes, having been a priest of that god; therefore the religious significance of the Exodus and the struggle preceding it were most natural in his age.

(d) An inscription of Menephthah, son of Ramses II, indicates that Israel was in Palestine in his time, therefore he could not have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, nor his father the oppressor.

(e) The objection that Pharaohs of the XIXth and XXth dynasties invaded and claimed sovereignty over Palestine is of little consequence, since these invasions usually involved only the sea-plain, and any city or district might secure immunity and maintain its status quo by payment of tribute. In later centuries many foreign invasions swept through Israel without disturbing the national integrity. As for the objection that the cities Ramses and Pithom indicate the age of Ramses II, it is altogether probable that they were built long before his time, and only restored by him. For these reasons the earlier date is assigned to the Exodus.

(2) Whether the duration of the sojourn in Egypt was 430 or 215 years will depend upon the interpretation of the comprehensive 430, or roundly 400, which is of frequent occurrence in the Bible as indicating the extent of the period of the Hebrews' wanderings among, and oppression by, the nations (^{<0153>}Genesis 15:13; ^{<0224>}Exodus 12:40; ^{<4006>}Acts 7:6; ^{<8817>}Galatians 3:17). These passages have been, and may properly be, interpreted as indicating the time of the actual sojourn in Egypt, or the time from the entrance of Abraham into Canaan to the Exodus. Modern archaeological discoveries and the logical conclusions from them, our better knowledge of the history and conditions of contemporaneous Egypt, the shortening of the Hyksos period, as by Meyer, Mahler and Breasted, and the acceptance of a later date for Hammurabi, all seem to favor the shorter, or 215-year, view of the sojourn. The remaining 215 years cover the period from Jacob's descent into Egypt back to the migration of Abraham. The shorter period is adopted here for the reasons already given; but by the addition of 215 the dates from the death of Joseph backward may be conformed to theory of the longer period.

(3) Accepting the almost universal and well-grounded judgment that the Amraphel of Genesis 14 is the famous Hammurabi of the 1st

Babylonian Dynasty, we should have assistance in determining the date of his Biblical contemporary Abraham, if the opinions of scholars about the age of Hammurabi were not so divergent. Goodspeed (Hist Babylonian and Assyrian.) places his reign at 22:97-2254 BC; Hommel (art. on "Babylonia," HDB) fixes the probable date at 1772-1717, an astonishing divergence of 500 years, and suggestive of the spend-thrift manner in which chronologists are accustomed to dispose of the past ages of man. The difference in this instance is caused by the disposition of the IId Babylonian Dynasty, Goodspeed making its more than 360 years follow the Hammurabi Dynasty, and adding the years of the two; Hommel on the other hand regarding the IId, or Southern, Dynasty as contemporaneous with the Ist, or Northern. But it is more probable that the truth lies between these extremes, since the IId Dynasty must have had some independent standing, and must have ruled alone for a time, in order to secure consideration as a dynasty. This moderate reckoning is now commonly adopted, Breasted placing Hammurabi at 1900 BC, Davis (in DB) about 1975, and Pinches (in Murray's Illus. B. Dict.) later than 2000 BC. It is in accord with the Bible numbers, as the following table shows, and does not vary materially from the reckoning of Ussher, which was based upon those numbers. Therefore the age of Hammurabi and Abraham may be considered as about 1900 BC, or 2100, if one estimates the sojourn in Egypt at 430 years. The former is more reasonable. The Tell el-Amarna Letters, preserving correspondence of the 14th and 15th centuries between the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty and Palestine and Babylon, by showing the contemporary sovereigns of the empires of the Nile and the Euphrates, contribute confirmation to the Biblical reckoning. It is possible that increased knowledge of the Hittite empire and its dealings with Egypt, Palestine and Babylonian may in the near future contribute further confirmation. The foregoing conclusions may be summarized in the following table:

IX. FROM ABRAHAM TO THE CREATION.

One other general period of Old Testament chronology remains for consideration: from the age of Abraham back to the creation of the world, about which in the nature of the case there can be no absolute certainty, and in which there is neither reason nor need for inflexible accuracy. The system, or succession, of numbers in the early chapters of Genesis (5 and

11:10-26) has given rise, in the effort to explain these numbers, to several theories.

(1) The literal interpretation, the best known advocate of which was Archbishop Ussher (died 1656), whose literal arrangement was introduced into the margin of the King James Version after his death. This theory takes the birth- and death-numbers just as they are, and by addition of the time intervals between the birth of the various patriarchs, together with Adam's age at the birth of Seth, shows that 1,656 years elapsed from the Creation to the Flood, and 290 years from the Flood to Abraham's birth, according to the Massoretic Text. But it must be apparent at the very outset, that, on the most liberal arrangement of the numbers and the most conservative geological and anthropological estimate, this reckoning is not sufficiently long to satisfy the known facts of the age of the earth, of the life of man upon the earth, and of established historic dates. Even the conservative system of Professor Breasted (Ancient Egypt) places the first certain date of Egyptian history, namely, the introduction of the Sothic calendar, as early as 4241 BC, which is more than two centuries beyond Ussher's beginning of the world. Moreover, at that time an astronomical basis of reckoning time was in existence, implying an age of culture already gone before. This difficulty was appreciated by the earliest interpreters, as indicated by the variations of the Sam and Septuagint texts, the latter increasing the total of the age about 1,500 years and inserting a new name into the genealogical list of Genesis 11. An interesting commentary on the literal method is that it makes Noah live until Abraham was seventy years old, and prolongs the life of Shem to within the lifetime of Jacob.

(2) A second theory is the dynastic: that the long number of a patriarch's lifetime indicates the era during which his house or dynasty prevailed, to be followed by the long number of the next dynasty; e.g. the 930 years of Adam were followed by the 912 of Seth, and so on until the period is stretched to cover thousands of years. But there are evident objections to this view: it does not account for the invariable origin of each succeeding dynasty so near the beginning of its predecessor, and it disregards the manifest plan of the inspired author to narrate the descent of the human race through families and not by eras or empires.

(3) By others it has been conjectured that the units of time have been different in the ancient ages of man; that originally the time-unit was the lunar cycle, by which the 969 lunar cycles of Methuselah's life really should

be reduced to a little more than 80 years of more recent times; and that in the days of Abraham a year measured from equinox to equinox had superseded the lunar time-measurement. It is possible that the Septuagint variations were based upon this idea, since it increased the age at which every father begat a son to at least 162 in the generations before the Flood. But even this expedient would not remove all difficulties from the physical side; nor have we the slightest indication of the points at which these radical changes of the time-units were made. On the contrary the decrease of man's years seems to have come by somewhat gradual process, and not by sharp and tremendous breaks.

(4) Others have thought to meet the difficulties by suggesting the omission of links in the chain of descent, in accordance with Hebrew custom of omitting inconsequential names from a genealogical list. The omission by Matthew of certain names from his genealogy of Jesus Christ, in order to preserve his symmetrical scheme of fourteens (~~4008~~ Matthew 1:8), is an illustration in point. As corroborative of this it might be urged that the Septuagint does insert a name between Arpachshad and Shelah (~~40112~~ Genesis 11:12). It may be said confidently that whatever theory of the genealogies before Abraham one may adopt, it is altogether reasonable to suppose that one name, or many, may have been omitted from the line of descent.

The dates resulting from the literal and exact interpretation of the genealogical lists of Genesis 5 and 11 may be tabulated as follows:

If the 130 years of Kainan, whom the Septuagint inserts between Shelah and Arpachshad, be added, the date for Adam's creation is increased to 4031 BC. The exhibit of this table is most interesting and suggestive. Noah, Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg were contemporaries of Abraham. Shem, Shelah and Eber were living after Jacob's birth. Adam, Enoch, Methuselah and Lamech were contemporary; and Methuselah's long life came to an end in the year of the Flood.

A Suggested Interpretation:

These genealogical lists of the early chapters of Genesis appear therefore not to have been given as an exact and exclusive system of chronology; but it is more probable that they were written to present a general, compact, or mere outline statement of the origin, early experience and apostasy of the human race, given without the purpose of recording every possible link in

the chain of descent, or every incident in the early racial experience. There are many indications, or suggestions at least, that this is the sensible and Divinely intended interpretation, some of which have been stated: the variant items and summaries of the Massoretic Text, Septuagint and Sam; the frequent omission in Hebrew genealogies of one or more generations, the third, or later, descendant being truly regarded as a son; the age of the world; the comparative antiquity of man; and the more ancient dates disclosed by archaeology. It should be noticed further that the inspired writer gives ten generations from Adam to the Flood, and ten also from the Flood to Abraham, as if by the use of the decimal, or representatively human, number he would indicate to us that he is dealing with comprehensively complete numbers and not with those that are minutely complete, arranging in symbolic form the account of man's descent.

*See **ANTEDILUVIAN PATRIARCHS.***

But while the age of man may be greater than the mechanical and exact sum of the Genesis numbers, we should not be deluded into the belief that it is so great as some anthropologists and geologists, who are prodigal of their numbers, would have us think. The numbers of Genesis are much nearer the facts than these dreary stretches and wastes of time. The formation of the Nile and the Euphrates valleys, which furnished historic man's first home, is quite recent, possibly not antedating 7000 BC; the account of the Flood is the record of a great cataclysm which came upon historic man within these millenniums; we have the records of the presence of intelligent man in these fertile and recently formed centers without traces of his origin and development in, and movement from, other homes. Archaeology and ancient history bring civilized man upon us with somewhat of suddenness, well established in homelands of recent formation. Whence came these peoples whose great works and thoughts are found near the beginning of an era so clearly limited by history and geography? If they came from elsewhere and developed tediously, why have they left no trail of their movement and no trace of the evolution? So late as the 3rd millennium BC Mesopotamia was sparsely settled, and Palestine in the first half of the 2nd millennium was still thinly settled. It is a legitimate conclusion, then, that intelligent man's life on the earth does not extend far beyond the total of the Bible numbers (*see **ANTEDILUVIANS; DELUGE.***). At the same time it is far from necessary to force a literal and exact interpretation on these numbers, which were given rather to trace

lineage, keep relationships, show development under the Divine purpose, and fix responsibility, than to mark particular years.

LITERATURE.

Ussher, *Chronologia Sacra*; G. Smith, *Assyrian Eponym Canon*; Maspero, *The Dawn of Civilization*; *The Struggle of the Nations*; *The Passing of the Empires*; Goodspeed, *A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians*; Breasted, *Ancient Egypt*; *History of Egypt, Mesopotamia and Israel in History of World*; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*; L. W. King, *Chronology of the Babylonian Kings*; Beecher, *Dated Events of Old Testament*; Auchinloss, *Chronology of the Holy Bible*; various commentaries; Driver, *Book of Genesis*; Skinner, *Genesis*; Moore, *Commentary on Judges*; G. A. Smith, "Isaiah" in *Expositor's Bible*, etc. Magazines: James Orr, "Assyrian and Hebrew Chronology" in *Presbyterian Review*, 1889; "Israel and the Exodus" in *Expositor*, 1897; J. D. Davis. "Chronology of the Divided Kingdom" in *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 1891. Bible Dictionaries: J. D. Davis in *Dict. of the Bible*, Westminster Press; Hommel, articles on "Assyria" and "Babylonia" in *HDB*. Of interest also, Franke Parker, *Chronology*, 1858.

Edward Mack

CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The current Christian era is reckoned from the birth of Jesus and is based upon the calculations of Dionysius (6th century). Subsequent investigation has shown that the Dionysian date is at least four years too late. Several eras were in use in the time of Jesus; but of these only the Varronian will be used coordinately with the Dionysian in the discussion of the chronology of the life of Jesus, 753 A.U.C. being synchronous with 1 BC and 754 A.U.C. with 1 AD.

I. CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

1. Birth of Jesus:

Jesus was born before the death of Herod the Great (~~and~~ Matthew 2:1 ff) at the time of a census or enrollment made in the territory of Herod in accordance with a decree of Augustus when Quirinius (Revised Version; Cyrenius, the King James Version) was exercising authority in the Roman

province of Syria (~~Ant.~~ Luke 2:1 f). At the time of Jesus' birth a star led the Magi of the East to seek in Jerusalem the infant whom they subsequently found in Bethlehem (~~Ant.~~ Matthew 2:1 ff). John the Baptist was six months older than Jesus (~~Ant.~~ Luke 1:36) and he was born in the days of Herod (~~Ant.~~ Luke 1:5; compare 2:1) after his father, Zacharias, of the priestly course of Abijah, had been performing the functions of his office in the temple.

(1) Death of Herod.

The death of Herod the Great occurred in the spring of 750/4. (NOTE: The alternative numbers are BC or AD, i.e., 750 A.U.C. = 4 BC, etc.) He ruled from his appointment in Rome 714/40 (Ant., XIV, xiv, 4-5, in the consulship of Caius Domitius Calvinus and Caius Asinius Pollio) 37 years, and from his accession in Jerusalem after the capture of the city 717/37 (Ant., XIV, xvi, 1-3; BJ, I, xvii, 9; I, xviii, 1-3; Dio Cassius xlix.22; compare Schurer, GJV3, I, 358, note 11) 34 years (Ant., XVII, xviii, 1; BJ, I, xxxiii, 7-8; compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 415, note 167 where it is shown that Josephus reckons a year too much, probably counting from Nisan 1 and including partial years). Just before Herod's death there was an eclipse of the moon (Ant., XVII, vi, 4). According to astronomical calculations an eclipse was visible in Palestine on March 23 and September 15, 749/5, March 12, 750/4 and January 9, 753/1. Of these the most probable is that of March 12, 750/4. Soon after the eclipse Herod put to death his son Antipater and died five days later (Ant., XVII, vii; BJ, I, xxxiii, 7). Shortly after Herod's death the Passover was near at hand. (Ant., XVII, vi, 4 through ix, 3). In this year Passover (Nisan 15) fell on April 11; and as Archelaus had observed seven days of mourning for his father before this, Herod's death would fall between March 17 and April 4. But as the 37th (34th) year of his reign was probably reckoned from Nisan 1 or March 28, his death may be dated between March 28 and April 4, 750/4.

This date for Herod's death is confirmed by the evidence for the duration of the reigns of his three sons. Archelaus was deposed in 759/6 (Dio Cassius lv.27 in the consulship of Aemilius Lepidus and Lucius Arruntius) in the 10th year of his reign (Ant., XVII, xiii, 2; compare BJ, II, vii, 3 which gives the year as the 9th). Antipas was deposed most probably in the summer of 792/39 (Ant., XVIII, vii, 1-2; compare XVIII, vi, 11; XIX, viii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 6; Schurer, op. cit., I, 448, note 46 and 416, note 167). There are coins of Antipas from his 43rd year (Madden, Coins of the Jews, 121

ff). The genuineness of a coin from the 44th year is questioned by Schurer but accepted by Madden. The coin from the 45th year is most probably spurious (Schurer, *op. cit.*, I, 417, note 167). Philip died after reigning 37 years, in the 20th year of Tiberius — August 19, 786/33-787/34 (*Ant.*, XVIII, iv, 6). There is also a coin of Philip from his 37th year (Madden, *op. cit.*, 126). Thus Archelaus, Antipas and Philip began to reign in 750/4.

(2) Census of Quirinius.

The census or enrollment, which, according to ~~Ant.~~ Luke 2:1 f, was the occasion of the journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem where Jesus was born, is connected with a decree of Augustus embracing the Greek-Roman world. This decree must have been carried out in Palestine by Herod and probably in accordance with the Jewish method — each going to his own city — rather than the Roman (*Dig.* 15, 4, 2; Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, 195; Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, III, 124 f; Schurer, *Theol. Ztg.* 1907, 683 f; and on the other hand, Ramsay, *Expositor*, 1908, I, 19, note). Certainly there is no intimation of an insurrection such as characterized a later census (~~Ant.~~ Acts 5:37; *Ant.*, XVIII, i, 1; *BJ*, II, xvii, 7; compare *Tac. Ann.* vi.41; *Livy Epit.* cxxxvi, cxxxvii; Dessau, *Inscrip. lat. Sel.* number 212, col. ii, 36) and this may have been due in no small measure to a difference in method. Both Josephus and Luke mention the later census which was made by Quirinius on the deposition of Archelaus, together with the insurrection of Judas which accompanied it. But while Josephus does not mention the Herodian census — although there may be some intimation of it in *Ant.* XVI, ix, 3; XVII, ii, 4; compare Sanclemente, *Deuteronomy vulg. aerae emend.*, 438 f; Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Beth.* 1, 178 ff — Luke carefully distinguishes the two, characterizing the census at the time of Jesus' birth as "first," i.e. first in a series of enrollments connected either with Quirinius or with the imperial policy inaugurated by the decree of Augustus. The Greek-Roman writers of the time do not mention this decree and later writers (Cassiodor, Isidor and Suidas) cannot be relied upon with certainty as independent witnesses (Zumpt, *Geburtsjahr*, 148 ff). Yet the geographical work of Agrippa and the preparation of a *breviarium totius imperii* by Augustus (*Tac. Ann.* i.11; *Suet. Aug.* 28 and 101; *Dio Cassius* liii.30; lvi.33; compare Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II, 1025, note 3), together with the interest of the emperor in the organization and finances of the empire and the attention which he gave to the provinces (Marquardt, *Rom. Staatsverwaltung*, II, 211 f; compare 217), are indirectly corroborative of Luke's statement. Augustus himself

conducted a census in Italy in 726/28, 746/8, 767/14 (Mommsen, *Res Ges.*, 34 ff) and in Gaul in 727/27 (Dio Cassius liii.22, 5; Livy *Epit.* cxxxiv) and had a census taken in other provinces (Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyc.*, under the word "Census," 1918 f; Marquardt, *op. cit.*, II, 213). For Egypt there is evidence of a regular periodic census every 14 years extending back to 773/20 (Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 131 ff; Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxy. Papyri*, II, 207 ff; Wilcken, *Griech. Ostraka*, I, 444 ff) and it is not improbable that this procedure was introduced by Augustus (Schurer, *op. cit.*, I, 515). The inference from Egyptian to similar conditions in other provinces must indeed be made cautiously (Wilcken, *op. cit.*, 449; Marquardt, *op. cit.*, 441); yet in Syria the regular *tributum capitis* seems to imply some such preliminary work (Dig. 1. 15, 3; Appian, *Syriac.*, 50; Marquardt, *op. cit.*, II, 200, note 2; Pauly-Wissowa, *op. cit.*, 1921; Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 154). The time of the decree is stated only in general terms by Luke, and it may have been as early as 727/27 (Zumpt, *op. cit.*, 159; Marquardt, *op. cit.*, II, 212) or later in 746-8 (Huschke, *Census*, 34; Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 158 ff), its execution in different provinces and subject kingdoms being carried out at different times. Hence, Luke dates the census in the kingdom of Herod specifically by connecting it with the administrative functions of Quirinius in Syria. But as P. Quintilius Varus was the legate of Syria just before and after the death of Herod from 748/6-750/4 (Ant., XVII, v, 2; XVII, ix., 3; XVII, x, 1 and 9; XVII, xi, 1; Tac. *Hist.* v.9; and coins in Eckhel, *Doctr. num. vet.*, III, 275) and his predecessor was C. Sentius Saturninus from 745/9-748/6 (Ant; XVI, ix, 1; x, 8; xi, 3; XVII, i, 1; ii, 1; iii, 2), there seems to be no place for Quirinius during the closing years of Herod's reign. Tertullian indeed speaks of Saturninus as legate at the time of Jesus' birth (Adv. Marc., iv.9). The interpretation of Luke's statement as indicating a date for the census before Quirinius was legate (Wieseler, *Chron. Syn.*, 116; Lagrange, *Revue Biblique*, 1911, 80 ff) is inadmissible. It is possible that the connection of the census with Quirinius may be due to his having brought to completion what was begun by one of his predecessors; or Quirinius may have been commissioned especially by the emperor as *legatus ad census accipiendos* to conduct a census in Syria and this commission may have been connected temporally with his campaign against the Homonadenses in Cilicia (Tac. *Ann.* iii.48; compare Noris, *Cenotaph. Pis.*, 320 ff; Sanclemente, *op. cit.*, 426 *passim*; Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 238). It has also been suggested by Bour (L'Inscription de Quirinius, 48 ff) that Quirinius may have been an imperial procurator specially charged with authority in the matter of the Herodian census. The *titulus Tiburtinus* (CIL,

XIV, 3613; Dessau, *Inscr. Latin Sel.*, 918) — if rightly assigned to him — and there seems to be no sufficient reason for questioning the conclusiveness of Mommsen's defense of this attribution (compare Liebenam, *Verwaltungsgesch.*, 365) — proves that he was twice legate of Syria, and the *titulus Venetus* (CIL, III, 6687; Dessau, *op. cit.*, 2683) gives evidence of a census conducted by him in Syria. His administration is dated by Ramsay (*op. cit.*, 243) in 747/7; by Mommsen in the end of 750/4 or the beginning of 751/3 (*op. cit.*, 172 ff). Zahn (*Neue kirch. Zeitschr.*, 1893, IV, 633 ff), followed by Spitta (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1906, VII, 293 ff), rejects the historicity of the later census connected by Josephus with the deposition of Archelaus, basing his view on internal grounds, and assigns the Lucan census to a time shortly after the death of Herod. This view however is rendered improbable by the evidence upon which the birth of Jesus is assigned to a time before the death of Herod (~~400~~ Matthew 2:1 ff; ~~400~~ Luke 1:5; 2:1 f); by the differentiation of the census in ~~400~~ Luke 2:1 f and ~~415~~ Acts 5:37; by the definite connection of the census in Josephus with Syria and the territory of Archelaus (compare also the *tit. Venet.*); and by the general imperial policy in the formation of a new province (Marquardt, *op. cit.*, II, 213). Moreover there seems to be no adequate ground for identifying the Sabinus of Josephus with Quirinius as urged by Weber, who regards the two accounts (*Ant.*, XVII, viii, 1 ff and XVII, iv, 5; XVIII, i, 2; ii, 1 ff) as due to the separation by Josephus of parallel accounts of the same events in his sources (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1909, X, 307 ff) — the census of Sabinus-Quirinius being assigned to 4 BC, just after the death of Herod the Great. The synchronism of the second census of Quirinius with the periodic year of the Egyptian census is probably only a coincidence, for it was occasioned by the deposition of Archelaus; but its extension to Syria may be indicative of its connection with the imperial policy inaugurated by Augustus (*Tac. Ann.* vi.41; Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 161 f).

(3) Star of the Magi.

The identification of the star of the Magi (~~400~~ Matthew 2:2; compare 2:7,9,16; Macrobius, *Sat.*, II, 4; Sanclemente, *op. cit.*, 456; Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 215 ff) and the determination of the time of its appearance cannot be made with certainty, although it has been associated with a conjunction in 747/7 and 748/6 of Saturn and Jupiter in the sign of Pisces — a constellation which was thought to stand in close relation with the Jewish nation (Ideler, *Handbuch d. math. u. tech. Chron.*, II, 400 ff). When the Magi came to Jerusalem, however, Herod was present in the city; and this

must have been at least several months before his death, for during that time he was sick and absent from Jerusalem (Ant., XVII, vi, 1 ff; BJ, I, xxxiii, 1 ff).

(4) Course of Abijah.

The chronological calculations of the time of the service of the priestly course of Abijah in the temple, which are made by reckoning back from the time of the course of Jehoiarib which, according to Jewish tradition, was serving at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, are uncertain (Schurer, op. cit., II, 337, note 3; compare Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, 836).

(5) Day and month.

The day and month of Jesus' birth are also uncertain. December 25 was celebrated by the church in the West as early as the 2nd century — if the date in Hippolytus on Dan., IV, 23, be genuine (compare Ehrhardt, *Altchr. Lit.*, 1880-1900, 383); but January 6 was celebrated in the East as the anniversary both of the birth and of the baptism. The fact that shepherds were feeding their flocks at night when Jesus was born (~~☞~~ Luke 2:8) makes it improbable that the season of the year was winter.

(6) Summary.

The birth of Jesus may therefore be assigned to the period 747/7 to 751/5, before the death of Herod, at the time of a census made by Herod in accordance with a decree of Augustus and when Quirinius was exercising extraordinary authority in Syria — Varus being the regular legate of the province, i.e. probably in 748/6.

See JESUS CHRIST.

2. Baptism of Jesus:

The Synoptic Gospels begin their description of the public ministry of Jesus with an account of the ministry of John the Baptist (~~☞~~ Matthew 3:1 ff; ~~☞~~ Mark 1:1 ff; ~~☞~~ Luke 3:1 ff; compare ~~☞~~ John 1:19 ff; 4:24; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iii, 3) and Luke definitely dates the baptism of Jesus by John in the 15th year of Tiberius. Luke also designates this event as the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and by stating Jesus' age approximately brings it into connection with the date of His birth. If Luke reckoned the reign of Tiberius from the death of Augustus, August 19, 767/14, the 15th year would extend from August 19, 781/28 to August 18, 782/29; and if Jesus

was about thirty years old at this time, His birth would fall in 751/3 to 752/2 — or sometime after the death of Herod, which is inconsistent with Luke's own and Matthew's representation. This indeed was one of the common modes of reckoning the imperial reigns. The mode of reckoning from the assumption of the tribunician power or from the designation as emperor is altogether unlikely in Luke's case and intrinsically improbable, since for Tiberius the one began in 748/6 and the other in 743/11 (Dio Cassius Iv.9; liv.33; Vell. ii.99; Suet. Tib. ix.11). But if, as seems likely, the method of reckoning by imperial years rather than by the yearly consuls was not definitely fixed when Luke wrote, it is possible that he may have counted the years of Tiberius from his appointment in 764/11 or 765/12 to equal authority with Augustus in the provinces (Veil. ii 121; Suet. Tib. xx.21; Tac. Ann. i.3). This method seems not to have been employed elsewhere (Lewin, op. cit., 1143 f; compare Ramsay, op. cit., 202 f). The coins of Antioch in which it is found are regarded as spurious (Eckhel, op. cit., III, 276), the genuine coins reckoning the reign of Tiberius from the death of Augustus (ibid., III, 278). If Luke reckoned the reign of Tiberius from 764/11 or 765/12, the 15th year would fall in 778/25 or 779/26, probably the latter, and Jesus' birth about thirty years earlier, i.e. about 748/6 or 749/5.

3. First Passover:

At the time of the first Passover in Jesus' ministry the Herodian temple had been building 46 years (~~Q172~~ John 2:20). Herod began the temple in the 18th year of his reign (Ant., XV, xi, 1, which probably corrects the statement in BJ, I, xxi, I that it was the 15th year; compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 369 f, note 12). As Josephus reckons from the accession of Herod in 717/37, the 18th year would be 734/20 to 735/21 and 46 years later would be 780/27 to 781/28. The interval implied in John between this Passover and the beginning of Jesus' ministry agrees well with the Lucan dating of the baptism in 779/26.

4. Death of John the Baptist:

The imprisonment of John the Baptist, which preceded the beginning of Jesus' Galilean work, was continued for a time (~~Q112~~ Matthew 11:2-19; ~~Q178~~ Luke 7:18-35) but was finally terminated by beheading at the order of Herod Antipas. Announcement of the death was made to Jesus while in the midst of His Galilean ministry (~~Q143~~ Matthew 14:3-12; ~~Q164~~ Mark 6:14-29; ~~Q177~~ Luke 9:7-9). Josephus reports that the defeat of Antipas by Aretas, in the summer of 789/36, was popularly regarded as a Divine punishment for

the murder of John (Ant., XVIII, v, 2); But although Josephus mentions the divorce of Aretas daughter by Antipas as one of the causes of hostilities, no inference can be drawn from this or from the popular interpretation of Antipas' defeat, by which the interval between John's death and this defeat can be fixed (Schurer, op. cit., I, 443 f).

5. Length of Jesus' Ministry:

The Synoptic Gospels mention the Passion Passover at which Jesus' ministry was terminated, but they contain no data by which the interval between the imprisonment of John the Baptist and this Passover can be fixed with certainty. Yet indications are not wanting that the interval consisted of at least two years. The Sabbath controversy broke out in Galilee when the grain was still standing in the fields (~~4111~~ Matthew 12:1; ~~4023~~ Mark 2:23; ~~4001~~ Luke 6:1) and the condition of the grass when the Five Thousand were fed (~~4045~~ Matthew 14:15; ~~4069~~ Mark 6:39; ~~4092~~ Luke 9:12) points to the springtime, the Passion Passover marking the return of still another springtime (compare also ~~4037~~ Luke 13:7; ~~4039~~ Matthew 23:37). But the Gospel of John mentions explicitly three Passovers (2:23; 6:4; 11:55) and probably implies a fourth (5:1), thus necessitating a ministry of at least two years and making probable a ministry of three years after the first Passover. The Passover of 6:4 cannot be eliminated on textual grounds, for the documentary evidence is conclusive in its favor and the argument against it based on the statements of certain patristic writers is unconvincing (compare Turner, HDB, I, 407 f; Zahn, Kom., IV, 708 ff). The indications of time from 6:4 — the Passover when the Five Thousand were fed in Galilee — to 11:55 — the Passion Passover — are definite and clear (7:2; 10:22). But the interval between the first Passover (2:23) and the Galilean Passover (6:4) must have been one and may have been two years. The following considerations favor the latter view: Jesus was present in Jerusalem at a feast (5:1) which is not named but is called simply "a" or "the" feast of the Jews. The best authorities for the text are divided, some supporting the insertion, others the omission of the definite article before "feast." If the article formed part of the original text, the feast may have been either Tabernacles — from the Jewish point of view — or Passover — from the Christian point of view. If the article was wanting in the original text, the identification of the feast must be made on contextual and other grounds. But the note of time in 4:35 indicates the lapse of about nine months since the Passover of 2:23 and it is not likely that the Galilean ministry which preceded the feeding of the Five Thousand lasted only

about three months. In fact this is rendered impossible by the condition of the grain in the fields at the time of the Sabbath controversy. The identification of the feast of ^{<480>}John 5:1 with Purim, even if the article be not genuine, is extremely improbable; and if so, a Passover must have intervened between 2:23 and 6:4, making the ministry of Jesus extend over a period of three years and the months which preceded the Passover of 2:23. While the identification cannot be made with certainty, if the feast was Passover the subject of the controversy with the Jews in Jerusalem as well as the season of the year would harmonize with the Synoptic account of the Sabbath controversy in Galilee which probably followed this Passover (compare the variant reading in ^{<481>}Luke 6:1).

6. Death of Jesus:

Jesus was put to death in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover when Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea (^{<472>}Matthew 27:2 ff; ^{<4150>}Mark 15:1 ff; ^{<2701>}Luke 23:1 ff; ^{<382>}John 18:29 ff; 19:1 ff; ^{<4483>}Acts 3:13; 4:27; 13:28; ^{<483>}1 Timothy 6:13; Tac. Ann. xv.44), Caiaphas being the high priest (^{<4818>}Matthew 26:3,17; ^{<3149>}John 11:49; 18:13 ff) and Herod Antipas the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea (^{<2317>}Luke 23:7 ff). Pilate was procurator from 779/26 to 789/36 (Ant., XVIII, iv, 3; v, 3; compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 487, note 141); Caiaphas was high priest from 771/18 to 789/36 (Ant., XVIII, ii, 2; iv, 3; compare Schurer, op. cit., II, 271) and Antipas was tetrarch from 750/4 to 792/39. If the first Passover of Jesus' ministry was in 780/27, the fourth would fall in 783/30. The gospels name Friday as the day of the crucifixion (^{<472>}Matthew 27:62; ^{<4150>}Mark 15:42; ^{<2754>}Luke 23:54; ^{<3914>}John 19:14,31,42) and the Synoptic Gospels represent this Friday as Nisan 15 — the day following (or according to Jewish reckoning from sunset to sunset, the same day as) the day on which the paschal supper was eaten (^{<4817>}Matthew 26:17 ff; ^{<4142>}Mark 14:12 ff; ^{<2717>}Luke 22:7 ff). But the Fourth Gospel is thought by many to represent the paschal meal as still uneaten when Jesus suffered (18:28; compare 13:29); and it is held that the Synoptic Gospels also contain traces of this view (^{<4815>}Matthew 26:5; ^{<4142>}Mark 14:2; 15:21; ^{<2335>}Luke 23:26). Astronomical calculations show that Friday could have fallen on Nisan 14 or 15 in 783/30 according to different methods of reckoning (von Soden, EB, I, 806; compare Bacon, Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVIII, 2, 1910, 130 ff; Fotheringham, Jour. of Theol. Studies, October, 1910, 120 ff), but the empirical character of the Jewish calendar renders the result of such calculations uncertain (Schurer, op. cit., I, 749 f). In the year 783/30 Friday, Nisan 15, would fall

on April 7. There is an early patristic tradition which dates the death of Jesus in the year 782/29, in the consulship of the Gemini (Turner, HDB, I, 413 f), but its origin and trustworthy character are problematical.

7. Summary of Dates:

1. Birth of Jesus, 748/6.
2. Death of Herod the Great, 750/4.
3. Baptism of Jesus, 779/26.
4. First Passover of Jesus' ministry, 780/27.
5. Death of Jesus, 783/30.

LITERATURE.

Schurer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 3. und 4. Aufl., 1901-9, 3 volumes, English translation of the 2nd edition, in 5 volumes, 1885-94; Ideler, Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie, 1825-26, 2 volumes; Wieseler, Chronologische Synopse der Evangelien, 1843, English translation; Lewin, Fasti Sacri, 1865; Turner, article "Chronology of the NT" in HDB, 1900, I. 403-25; von Soden, article "Chronology" in Cheyne and Black, EB, 1899, I, 799-819; Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 1898; F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, article "Dates" in Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels; Mommsen, Res Gestae Divi Augusti².

II. CHRONOLOGY OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

The chronology of the apostolic age must be based on the data in Acts and the epistolary literature of the New Testament which afford contacts with persons or events of the Greek-Roman world. From the fixed points thus secured a general outline of the relative chronology may be established with reasonable probability.

1. Paul's Conversion:

Paul was converted near Damascus (^{<400>}Acts 9:3 ff; 22:5 ff; 26:12 ff; ^{<8017>}Galatians 1:17). After a brief stay in that city (^{<400>}Acts 9:19 ff) he went to Arabia and then came again to Damascus (^{<8017>}Galatians 1:17). When he left Damascus the second time, he returned to Jerusalem after an absence

of three years (~~<4018>~~ Galatians 1:18). The flight of Paul from Damascus (~~<4024>~~ Acts 9:24) probably terminated his second visit to the city. At that time the ethnarch of Aretas, the king of the Nabateans, acting with the resident Jews (~~<4023>~~ Acts 9:23 f), guarded the city to seize him (2 Cor 11:32). Aretas IV succeeded Obodas about 9 BC, and reigned until about 40 AD. Damascus was taken by the Romans in 62 BC and probably continued under their control until the death of Tiberius (March 37 AD). Roman coins of Damascus exist from the time of Augustus, Tiberius and Nero, but there are no such coins from the time of Caligula and Claudius (Schurer, op. cit., I, 737; II, 153). Moreover the relations of Aretas to Augustus and Tiberius make it extremely improbable that he held Damascus during their reign as part of his kingdom or acquired it by conquest. The statement of Paul however seems to imply Nabatean control of the city, and this is best explained on the supposition that Damascus was given to Aretas by Caligula, the change in the imperial attitude being due perhaps to the influence primarily of Agrippa and possibly also of Vitellius (Steinmann, Aretas IV, 1909, 34 ff). But if Paul's escape from Damascus was not earlier than 37 AD, his conversion cannot be placed earlier than 34 or 35 AD, and the journey to Jerusalem 14 years later (~~<4011>~~ Galatians 2:1) not earlier than 50 or 51 AD.

2. Death of Herod Agrippa I:

Herod Agrippa I died in Caesarea shortly after a Passover season (~~<4023>~~ Acts 12:23; compare 12:3,19). Caligula had given him the tetrarchy of Philip and of Lysanias in 37 AD — the latter either at this time or later — with the title of king (Ant., XVIII, vi, 10; BJ, II, ix, 6) and this was increased in 40 AD by the tetrarchy of Antipas (Ant., XVIII, vii, 1 f; BJ, II, ix, 6). Claudius gave him also Judea and Samaria (Ant., XIX, v, 1; BJ, II, xi, 5) thus making his territory even more extensive than that of his grandfather, Herod the Great. Agrippa reigned over “all Judea” for three years under Claudius (Ant., XIX, viii, 2; BJ, II, xi, 6), his death falling in the spring of 44 AD, in the 7th year of his reign. The games mentioned by Josephus in this connection are probably those that were celebrated in honor of the return of Claudius from Britain in 44 AD. There are coins of Agrippa from his 6th year, but the attribution to him of coins from other years is questioned (Schurer, op. cit., 560, note 40; Madden, op. cit., 132).

3. Famine under Claudius:

The prophecy of a famine and its fulfillment under Claudius (~~<4018>~~ Acts 11:28) are associated in Acts with the death of Herod Agrippa I (~~<4013>~~ Acts

11:30; 12:23). Famines in Rome during the reign of Claudius are mentioned by Suetonius (Claud. xviii), Dio Cassius (lx.11), Tacitus (Annals xii.43), and Orosius (vii.6). Josephus narrates in the time of Fadus the generosity of Helena during a famine in Palestine (Ant., XX, ii, 5), but subsequently dates the famine generally in the time of Fadus and Alexander. The famine in Palestine would fall therefore at some time between 44 and 48 (Schurer, op. cit., I, 567, note 8).

4. Sergius Paulus:

When Paul visited Cyprus with Barnabas the island was administered by Sergius Paulus (~~Acts~~ Acts 13:7 ff), a proprietor with the title proconsul (Marquardt, op. cit., I, 391). There is an inscription from Cyprus (Cagnat, Inscr. graec. ad res rom. pertin., III; 930) dating from the 1st century, and probably from the year 53 (Zahn, Neue kirch. Zeitschr., 1904, XV, 194) in which an incident in the career of a certain Apollonius is dated in the proconsulship of Paulus ([ἐπὶ αὐλοῦ ἀνθ υπάτου, epi Palilou (anth)upatou]). From another inscription (CIG, 2632), dated in the 12th year of Claudius, it appears that L. Annins Bassus was proconsul in 52. If the Julius Cordus mentioned by Bassus was his immediate predecessor, the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus may be dated at some time before 51.

5. Edict of Claudius:

When Paul came to Corinth for the first time he met Aquila and Priscilla, who had left Rome because of an edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from the city (~~Acts~~ Acts 18:2). Suetonius mentions an expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Claudius but gives no date (Claud. xxv; compare Dio Cassius lx.6). Orosius however dates the edict in the 9th year of Claudius or 49 AD (Hist. vii.6, 15); and though Josephus, from whom he quotes, does not mention this edict. but records the favor shown by Claudius to the Jews and to Herod Agrippa I (Ant., XIX, v, 1-3; compare Dio Cassius lx.6, 6, 9, 10; 8, 2), it is not improbable that the date is approximately accurate (Schurer, op. cit., III, 62, note 92).

6. Gallio:

During Paul's first sojourn in Corinth the apostle was brought before the proconsul Gallio (~~Acts~~ Acts 18:12). This could not have been earlier than the year 44 when Claudius gave Achaia back to the Senate and the province was administered by a proprietor with the title of proconsul (Dio Cassius lx.24; Marquardt, op. cit., I, 331 f; Ramsay, The Expositor., 1897, I, 207).

Moreover the career of Seneca makes it improbable that his brother would be advanced to this position before 49 or 50 (Harnack, *Chron.*, I, 237; Wieseler, *Chron. d. apos. Zeitalters*, 119). There is a fragmentary inscription from Delphi containing a letter from the emperor Claudius in which mention is made of Gallio. The inscription is dated by the title of the emperor which contains the number 26. This is referred naturally to the acclamatio as “imperator” and dated in the year 52 before August, after which time the number 27 occurs in the title of Claudian inscriptions. Gallio may therefore have been proconsul from the spring or summer of the year 51-52 or 52-53. The latter seems the more probable time (compare Aem. Bourguet, *Deuteronomy rebus Delphicis*, 1905, 63 f; Ramsay, *The Expositor.*, 1909, I, 467 f; *Princeton Theological Review*, 1911, 290 f; 1912, 139 f; Deissmann, *Paulus*, 1911, 159-177; Lietzmann, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1911, 345-54).

7. *Festus*:

When Paul had been for two years a prisoner in Caesarea Felix was succeeded by Festus as procurator of Judea (~~4207~~ Acts 24:27). The accession of Festus, which is placed by Eusebius in the Church History in the reign of Nero (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 22, 1), is dated in the Chronicle in the version of Jerome in the 2nd year of Nero, 56 AD, and in the Armenian version in the 14th year of Claudius, 54 AD. The excerpts from the Chronicle in Syncellus apparently follow the text underlying the version of Jerome, but state simply that Festus was sent as successor of Felix by Nero (ed. Schoene, II, 154). After his removal from office Felix was tried in Rome, but escaped punishment through the influence of his brother Pallas, who, according to Josephus, was in favor with Nero at that time (*Ant.*, XX, viii, 9). Pallas was removed from office before February 13, 55 AD (*Tac. Ann.* xiii.14, 1; compare 15, 1), but apparently continued to have influence with the emperor; for he fixed the terms of his removal and was permitted to enjoy his fortune for several years (*Tac. Ann.* xiii.14, 1 f; 23, 1-3). His death occurred in 62 AD (*Tac. Ann.* xiv.65, 1). The trial of Felix must therefore have occurred before 62; but it is impossible to place it before the removal of Pallas, for this would necessitate the removal of Felix in 54 AD, and this is excluded by the fact that the first summer of Nero's reign fell in 55 AD. But if Eusebius reckoned the imperial years from September 1st after the accession (*Turner, Jour. of Theol. Studies*, 1902, 120 f; *HDB*, I, 418 f), the summer of the second year of Nero would fall in 57. In any event the removal and trial of Felix must have fallen after

the removal of Pallas. The date of the Eusebian Chronicle is thus without support from Tacitus or Josephus, and its value depends on the character of the source from which it was obtained — if there was such a source, for it is at least possible that the definite date owes its origin solely to the necessities imposed on Eusebius by the form of the Chronicle. It is not unlikely that the error of 5 years made by Eusebius in the reign of Agrippa II may be the source of a similar error in regard to Festus in spite of the fact that the framework of the Chronicle is generally furnished not by the years of the Jewish kings but by the imperial years (Erbes in Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N.F., IV, 1, 1899; *Die Todestage d. Apos. Paulus u. Petrus*; Turner, *Jour. of Theol. Studies*, 1902, III, 120 f; Ramsay, *Pauline and Other Studies*, 1906, 350 ff). There is evidence however in ^{<4013>}Acts 21:38 that Paul's arrest could not have been earlier than the spring of 55 AD. For Paul was supposed by the chief captain to be the Egyptian who had led an insurrection that had been suppressed by Felix during the reign of Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 6; BJ, II, 13, 5). Thus the accession of Festus, two years later (^{<4007>}Acts 24:27), could not have been earlier than 57 AD.

But if the summer of 57 AD is the earliest date possible for the accession of Festus, the summer of 60 AD is the latest date that is possible. Albinus, the successor of Festus, was present in Jerusalem in October, 62 AD (Ant., XX, ix, 1 ff), and while the administration of Festus was probably shorter than that of Felix (compare Ant, XX, viii, 9-11; BJ, II, xiv, 1 with Ant, XX, vii, 1-8, 8; BJ, II, 12-13), it is not likely that it lasted less than two years. But as between 57 AD and 60 AD, probability favours the latter. For greater justice is thus done to the words of Paul to Felix: "Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation," etc. (^{<4010>}Acts 24:10). Felix was appointed by Claudius in 52 AD (Tac. Ann. xii. 54; Ant, XX, v, 2) and was continued in office by Nero. Most of the events of his administration are narrated by Josephus under Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 5 ff); and although Tacitus mentions an administration of Felix in Samaria when Cumanus was administering Galilee (Ann. xii.54), the omission of any direct reference to Judea, the unusual character of such a double administration and the explicit statement of Josephus that Claudius sent Felix as successor of Cumanus, make it unlikely that Paul's statement is to be understood of an administration beginning earlier than 52 AD. If Festus succeeded in the summer of 60 AD, Paul's arrest would fall in 58 and the "many years" of Felix' administration would cover a period of 6 years, from 52 AD to 58 AD (compare Schurer, *op. cit.*, I, 577 f, note 38).

Ramsay argues in favor of 57 AD as the year of Paul's arrest and 59 AD as the year of the accession of Festus (Pauline and Other Studies, 1906, 345 ff).

8. Relative Chronology of Acts:

If Festus succeeded Felix in the summer of 60 AD, Paul would reach Rome in the spring of 61 AD, and the narrative in Acts would terminate in 63 AD (28:30). Paul's arrest in Jerusalem 2 years before the accession of Festus (24:27) would fall in the spring of 58 AD. Previous to this Paul had spent 3 months in Corinth (20:3) and 3 years in Ephesus (20:31; compare 19:10), which would make the beginning of the third missionary journey fall about 54 AD. There was an interval between the second and the third journeys (18:23), and as Paul spent 18 months at Corinth (18:11) the beginning of the second journey would fall about 51 AD. The Apostolic Council preceded the second journey and may be dated about 50 AD — 14 years subsequent to Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (37 AD) in the third year after his conversion in 35 AD. The first missionary journey was made after the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem with the alms from the church at Antioch (11:30; 12:25), about the time of the death of Herod Agrippa I, and would fall between 44 AD and 50 AD. The growth of the early church in Jerusalem previous to Paul's conversion would thus extend over a period of about 5 years from 30 AD to 35 AD.

9. Pauline Epistles:

Ten of the thirteen Pauline epistles were written during a period of about ten years between Paul's arrival in Corinth and the close of his first Roman imprisonment. These epistles fall into three groups, each possessing certain distinctive characteristics; and although each reflects the difference in time and occasion of its production, they all reveal an essential continuity of thought and a similarity of style which evidences unity of authorship. The earliest group consists of the Thessalonian epistles, both of which were written from Corinth on the second missionary journey about 52 or 53 AD, while Silas (Silvanus) was still in Paul's company and shortly after Paul's visit to Athens (1 Thess 1:1; 3:1,2,6; ~~2~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:1). The major epistles belong to the third missionary journey. 1 Corinthians was written from Ephesus about 55 AD; Galatians probably from Ephesus, either before or after 1 Corinthians, for Paul had been twice in Galatia (~~2~~ Galatians 4:13); 2 Corinthians from Macedonia about 57 AD; and Romans from Corinth about 57 or 58 AD. The imprisonment epistles were

written from Rome: Colossians, Ephesians and Philemon about 62 AD, and Philippians about 63 AD.

10. Release and Death of Paul:

When Paul wrote to Philemon (Philem 1:22) and to the Philippians (~~<3712>~~Philippians 2:24; compare 1:25), he expected a favorable issue of his trial in Rome and was looking forward to another visit to the East. Before his arrest he had planned a journey to Spain by way of Rome (~~<6138>~~Romans 15:28), and when he bade farewell to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (~~<4015>~~Acts 20:25) he must have had in mind not only the dangers of his journey to Jerusalem, but also his determination to enter another field of labor. 1 Clement 5, the Muratori Canon and the Apocryphal Acts of Peter (Zahn, Einlgt.3, I, 444 f) witness to the Spanish journey, and the Pastoral Epistles to a journey to the East and to another imprisonment in Rome. The two lines of evidence for Paul's release are independent and neither can be explained as derived merely from the statement of Paul's intention in Romans and in Philemon and Philippians. The historical situation implied in the Pastoral Epistles can be charged with artificiality only on the hypothesis that Paul was not released from his first Roman imprisonment. The data of these epistles cannot be fitted into any period of Paul's life previous to his imprisonment. But these data are embodied in just those parts of the Pastoral Epistles which are admitted to be Pauline by those who regard the epistles as containing only genuine fragments from Paul but assign the epistles in their present form to a later writer. On any hypothesis of authorship, however, the tradition which these epistles contain cannot be much later than the first quarter of the 2nd century. It is highly probable therefore that Paul was released from his first Roman imprisonment; that he visited Spain and the East; and that he was imprisoned a second time in Rome where he met his death in the closing years of Nero's reign, i.e. in 67 or 68 AD. According to early tradition Paul suffered martyrdom by beheading with the sword (Tert., Deuteronomy praescr. haer., xxxvi), but there is nothing to connect his death with the persecution of the Christians in Rome by Nero in 64 AD.

Little is known of Peter beside what is recorded of him in the New Testament. The tradition of his bishopric of 20 or 25 years in Rome (compare Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Lit., II; Die Chronologie, I, 243 f) accords neither with the implications of Acts and Galatians nor with Paul's silence in Rom.

11. Death of Peter:

But 1 Peter was probably written from Rome (5:13; compare Euseb., HE, ii.15, 2) and the testimony to Peter's martyrdom (implied in ~~<4218>~~ John 21:18 f) under Nero in Rome by crucifixion (Tert., Deuteronomy praes. haer., xxxvi; compare 1 Clem 5:1 ff) is early and probably trustworthy. Tradition also associates Peter and Paul in their Roman labors and martyrdom (Dionysius in Euseb., HE, ii.25, 8; Iren., Adv. haer., iii.1, 2; iii.3, 1). The mention of the Vatican as the place of Peter's interment (Caius in Euseb., HE, ii.25, 6 f) may indicate a connection of his martyrdom with the Neronian persecution in 64 AD; but this is not certain. Peter's death may therefore be dated with some probability in Rome between 64 and 67 AD. His two epistles were written at some time before his death, probably the First about 64 and the Second at some time afterward and subsequent to the Epistle of Jude which it apparently uses. (The arguments against the Roman sojourn and martyrdom of Peter are stated fully by Schmiedel in the Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Simon Peter," especially col. 458 ff; on the other hand compare Zahn, Einleitung³, II, 17 ff, English translation, II, 158 ff.)

12. Death of James the Just:

James the Just, the brother of the Lord, was prominent in the church of Jerusalem at the time of the Apostolic Council (~~<4153>~~ Acts 15:13 ff; ~~<800>~~ Galatians 2:9; compare 1:19; 2:12) and later when Paul was arrested he seems still to have occupied this position (~~<4218>~~ Acts 21:18 ff), laboring with impressive devotion for the Jewish people until his martyrdom about the year 66 AD (Ant., XX, ix, 1; Euseb., HE, ii.23, 3 ff; HRE³, VIII, 581; Zahn, Einltg.³, I, 76). The Epistle of James contains numerous indications of its early origin and equally clear evidence that it was not written during the period when the questions which are discussed in the major epistles of Paul were agitating the church. It is probably the earliest book of the New Testament, written before the Apostolic Council.

13. The Synoptic Gospels, etc.:

In the decade just preceding the fall of Jerusalem, the tradition of the life and teaching of Jesus was committed to writing in the Synoptic Gospels. Early tradition dates the composition of Matthew's Gospel in the lifetime of Peter and Paul (Iren., Adv. haer., ill.1, 1; Eusebius, HE, v.8, 2 ff), and that of the Gospel of Mark either just before or after Peter's death (Clement in Euseb., HE, vi.14, 7; compare ii.15; and Irenaeus, Adv. haer.,

iii.11, 1; Presbyter of Papias in Euseb., HE, iii. 39, 15; compare also ~~6015~~2 Peter 1:15). The Lucan writings — both the Gospel and Acts — probably fall also in this period, for the Gospel contains no intimation that Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem had been fulfilled (compare ~~6271~~Luke 21:21; ~~44128~~Acts 11:28), and the silence of Acts about the issue of Paul's trial is best explained on the hypothesis of an early date (Jerome, Deuteronomy vir. illustr., vii; Harnack, Neue Untersuch. zur Apostelgesch., 1911; compare also ~~2107~~Luke 10:7; ~~5458~~1 Timothy 5:18). To this period belong also the Epistle of Jude and the Epistle to the He (if addressed to Jewish Christians of Palestine; but later, about 80 AD, if addressed to Jewish Christians of Rome (Zahn, Einltg.3, II, 152)), the former being used in 2 Peter and the latter in 1 Clement.

14. Death of John:

Early tradition connects John with Ephesus and mentions his continuing in life until the time of Trajan (Irenaeus, Adv. haer., ii.22, 5 (Eusebius, HE, v.24); iii.1, 1; v.30, 3; v.33, 4; Clement in Eusebius, HE, iii.23, 5-19; Polycrates in Eusebius, HE, iii.31, 3; v.24, 3; Justin, Dialogue, lxxxi; compare ~~6100~~Revelation 1:1,4,9; 22:8; ~~6272~~John 21:22,23,14; 19:35). He died probably about the end of the 1st century. There is another but less well-attested tradition of martyrdom based chiefly on the Deuteronomy Boor fragment of Papias (Texte u. Unters., 1888), a Syriac Martyrology of the 4th century (Wright, Jour. of Sacred Lit., 1865-66, VIII, 56 ff, 423 ff), the Codex Coislinianus 305 of Georgius Hamartolus. This tradition, it is thought, finds confirmation in ~~4105~~Mark 10:35-40; ~~4111~~Matthew 20:20-23 (compare Bousset, Theologische Rundschau., 1905, 225 ff, 277 ff). During the closing years of his life John wrote the Revelation, the Fourth Gospel and the three Epistles.

15. Summary of Dates:

LITERATURE.

In addition to the literature mentioned in section 8: Anger, Deuteronomy temporum in actis apostolorum ratione. 1833; Wieseler, Chronologie des apos. Zeitalters, 1848; Hoennicke, Die Chronologie des Lebens des Apostels Paulus, 1903; Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Lit. bis Euseb., II, 1, Die Chronologie bis Iren., 1897; Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 1893; Zahn, Einleitung, II, 1907 (Eng. translation, 1909).

W. P. Armstrong

CHRYSOLITE

<kris'o-lit>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CHRYSTOPRASE; CHRYSTOPRASUS

<kris'-o-praz>, <kri-sop'ra-sus>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CHUB

<chub> (bWk [kubh]).

See CUB.

CHUN

<chun> (^Wk [kun], “founding”).

See CUN.

CHURCH

<church>:

The word “church,” which is derived from [κυριακός, kuriakos], “of or belonging to the Lord,” represents in the English Versions of the Bible of the New Testament the Greek word [ἐκκλησία, ekklesia]; Latin, ecclesia. It is with the signification of this word [ekklesia] as it meets us in the New Testament, and with the nature of the society which the word is there used to describe, that the present article is concerned.

I. PRE-CHRISTIAN HISTORY OF THE TERM.

Although [ekklesia] soon became a distinctively Christian word, it has its own pre-Christian history; and to those, whether Jews or Greeks, who first heard it applied to the Christian society it would come with suggestions of familiar things. Throughout the Greek world and right down to New Testament times (compare ^{<4109>}Acts 19:39), [ekklesia] was the designation of the regular assembly of the whole body of citizens in a free city-state,

“called out” (Greek [ek], “out,” and [kalein], “to call”) by the herald for the discussion and decision of public business. The Septuagint translators, again, had used the word to render the Hebrew [qahal], which in the Old Testament denotes the “congregation” or community of Israel, especially in its religious aspect as the people of God. In this Old Testament sense we find [ekklesia] employed by Stephen in the Book of Acts, where he describes Moses as “he that was in the church (the Revised Version, margin “congregation”) in the wilderness” (~~4078~~ Acts 7:38). The word thus came into Christian history with associations alike for the Greek and the Jew. To the Greek it would suggest a self-governing democratic society; to the Jew a theocratic society whose members were the subjects of the Heavenly King. The pre-Christian history of the word had a direct bearing upon its Christian meaning, for the [ekklesia] of the New Testament is a “theocratic democracy” (Lindsay, *Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries*, 4), a society of those who are free, but are always conscious that their freedom springs from obedience to their King.

II. ITS ADOPTION BY JESUS.

According to ~~4068~~ Matthew 16:18 the name [ekklesia] was first applied to the Christian society by Jesus Himself, the occasion being that of His benediction of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. The authenticity of the utterance has been called in question by certain critics, but on grounds that have no textual support and are made up of quite arbitrary presuppositions as to the composition of the First Gospel. It is true that Jesus had hitherto described the society He came to found as the “kingdom of God” or the “kingdom of heaven,” a designation which had its roots in Old Testament teaching and which the Messianic expectations of Israel had already made familiar. But now when it was clear that He was to be rejected by the Jewish people (compare ~~4062~~ Matthew 16:21), and that His society must move on independent lines of its own, it was natural that He should employ a new name for this new body which He was about to create, and thus should say to Peter, on the ground of the apostle’s believing confession, “Upon this rock I will build my church.” The adoption of this name, however, did not imply any abandonment of the ideas suggested by the conception of the kingdom. In this very passage (~~4069~~ Matthew 16:19) “the kingdom of heaven” is employed in a manner which, if it does not make the two expressions church and kingdom perfectly synonymous, at least compels us to regard them as closely correlative and as capable of translation into each other’s terms. And the comparative disuse by the apostolic writers of the

name “kingdom,” together with their emphasis on the church, so far from showing that Christ’s disciples had failed to understand His doctrine of the kingdom, and had substituted for it the more formal notion of the church, only shows that they had followed their Master’s guidance in substituting for a name and a conception that were peculiarly Jewish, another name whose associations would enable them to commend their message more readily to the world at large.

III. ITS USE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. In the Gospels:

Apart from the passage just referred to, the word [ekklesia] occurs in the Gospels on one other occasion only (~~<0817>~~ Matthew 18:17). Here, moreover, it may be questioned whether Our Lord is referring to the Christian church, or to Jewish congregations commonly known as synagogues (see the Revised Version, margin) The latter view is more in keeping with the situation, but the promise immediately given to the disciples of a power to bind and loose (~~<0818>~~ Matthew 18:18) and the assurance “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (~~<0820>~~ Matthew 18:20) are evidently meant for the people of Christ. If, as is probable, the [ekklesia] of ~~<0817>~~ Matthew 18:17 is the Christian [ekklesia] of which Christ had already spoken to Peter, the words show that He conceived of the church as a society possessing powers of self-government, in which questions of discipline were to be decided by the collective judgment of the members.

2. In Acts:

In Acts the [ekklesia] has come to be the regular designation for the society of Christian believers, but is employed in two distinct senses. First in a local sense, to denote the body of Christians in a particular place or district, as in Jerusalem (5:11; 8:1), in Antioch (13:1; 15:22), in Caesarea (18:22) — a usage which reappears in the Apocalypse in the letters to the Seven Churches. Then in a wider and what may be called a universal sense, to denote the sum total of existing local churches (9:31 the Revised Version (British and American)), which are thus regarded as forming one body.

3. In the Pauline Epistles:

In the Pauline Epistles both of these usages are frequent. Thus the apostle

writes of “the church of the Thessalonians” (1 Thess 1:1), “the church of God which is at Corinth” (1 Cor 1:2; ~~<4010>~~2 Corinthians 1:1). Indeed he localizes and particularizes the word yet further by applying it to a single Christian household or to little groups of believers who were accustomed to assemble in private houses for worship and fellowship (~~<5165>~~Romans 16:5; ~~<6169>~~1 Corinthians 16:19; ~~<51045>~~Colossians 4:15; Philem 1:2) — an employment of the word which recalls the saying of Jesus in ~~<40830>~~Matthew 18:20. The universal use, again, may be illustrated by the contrast he draws between Jews and Greeks on the one hand and the church of God on the other (1 Cor 10:32), and by the declaration that God has set in the church apostles, prophets, and teachers (1 Cor 12:28).

But Paul in his later epistles has another use of [ekklesia] peculiar to himself, which may be described as the ideal use. The church, now, is the body of which Christ is the head (~~<40122>~~Ephesians 1:22 f; ~~<51018>~~Colossians 1:18,24). It is the medium through which God’s manifold wisdom and eternal purpose are to be made known not only to all men, but to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places (~~<40399>~~Ephesians 3:9-11). It is the bride of whom He is the heavenly Bridegroom, the bride for whom in His love He gave Himself up, that He might cleanse and sanctify her and might present her to Himself a glorious church, a church without blemish, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing (~~<40525>~~Ephesians 5:25 ff). This church clearly is not the actual church as we know it on earth, with its divisions, its blemishes, its shortcomings in faith and love and obedience. It is the holy and catholic church that is to be when the Bridegroom has completed the process of lustration, having fully “cleansed it by the washing of water with the word.” It is the ideal which the actual church must keep before it and strive after, the ideal up to which it shall finally be guided by that Divine in-working power which is able to conform the body to the head, to make the bride worthy of the Bridegroom, so that God may receive in the church the glory that is His (~~<40421>~~Ephesians 3:21).

IV. THE NOTES OF THE CHURCH.

1. Faith:

Although a systematic doctrine of the church is neither to be found nor to be looked for in the New Testament, certain characteristic notes or features of the Christian society are brought before us from which we can form some conception as to its nature. The fundamental note is faith. It was to Peter confessing his faith in Christ that the promise came, “Upon this rock I will build my church” (~~<40638>~~Matthew 16:18). Until Jesus found a man full

of faith He could not begin to build His church; and unless Peter had been the prototype of others whose faith was like his own, the walls of the church would never have risen into the air. Primarily the church is a society not of thinkers or workers or even of worshippers, but of believers. Hence, we find that “believers” or “they that believed” is constantly used as a synonym for the members of the Christian society (e.g. ^{<4024>}Acts 2:44; 4:32; 5:14; ^{<5042>}1 Timothy 4:12). Hence, too, the rite of baptism, which from the first was the condition of entrance into the apostolic church and the seal of membership in it, was recognized as preeminently the sacrament of faith and of confession (^{<4041>}Acts 2:41; 8:12,36; ^{<4040>}Romans 6:4; ^{<4023>}1 Corinthians 12:13). This church-founding and church-building faith, of which baptism was the seal, was much more than an act of intellectual assent. It was a personal laying hold of the personal Saviour, the bond of a vital union between Christ and the believer which resulted in nothing less than a new creation (^{<4040>}Romans 6:4; 8:1,2; ^{<4057>}2 Corinthians 5:17).

2. Fellowship:

If faith in Christ is the fundamental note of the Christian society, the next is fellowship among the members. This follows from the very nature of faith as just described; for if each believer is vitally joined to Christ, all believers must stand in a living relation to one another. In Paul’s favorite figure, Christians are members one of another because they are members in particular of the body of Christ (^{<4016>}Romans 12:5; ^{<4027>}1 Corinthians 12:27). That the Christian society was recognized from the first as a fellowship appears from the name “the brethren,” which is so commonly applied to those who belong to it. In Acts the name is of very frequent occurrence (9:30, etc.), and it is employed by Paul in the epistles of every period of his career (1 Thess 4:10, etc.). Similar testimony lies in the fact that “the koinonia” (English Versions “fellowship”) takes its place in the earliest meetings of the church side by side with the apostles’ teaching and the breaking of bread and prayers (^{<4020>}Acts 2:42). *See COMMUNION*. The koinonia at first carried with it a community of goods (^{<4024>}Acts 2:44; 4:32), but afterward found expression in the fellowship of ministration (2 Cor 8:4) and in such acts of Christian charity as are inspired by Christian faith (^{<4036>}Hebrews 13:16). In the Lord’s Supper, the other sacrament of the primitive church, the fellowship of Christians received its most striking and most sacred expression. For if baptism was especially the sacrament of faith, the Supper was distinctively the sacrament of love and fellowship — a communion or common participation in Christ’s death and its fruits

which carried with it a communion of hearts and spirits between the participants themselves.

3. Unity:

Although local congregations sprang up wherever the gospel was preached, and each of these enjoyed an independent life of its own, the unity of the church was clearly recognized from the first. The intercourse between Jerusalem and Antioch (~~<4112>~~Acts 11:22; 15:2), the conference held in the former city (~~<4156>~~Acts 15:6 ff), the right hand of fellowship given by the elder apostles to Paul and Barnabas (~~<809>~~Galatians 2:9), the untiring efforts made by Paul himself to forge strong links of love and mutual service between Gentile and Jewish Christians (2 Cor 8) — all these things serve to show how fully it was realized that though there were many churches, there was but one church. This truth comes to its complete expression in the epistles of Paul's imprisonment, with their vision of the church as a body of which Christ is the head, a body animated by one spirit, and having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all (~~<4906>~~Ephesians 4:4 ff; ~~<5008>~~Colossians 1:18; 3:11). And this unity, it is to be noticed, is conceived of as a visible unity. Jesus Himself evidently conceived it so when He prayed for His disciples that they all might be one, so that the world might believe (~~<872>~~John 17:21). And the unity of which Paul writes and for which he strove is a unity that finds visible expression. Not, it is true, in any uniformity of outward polity, but through the manifestation of a common faith in acts of mutual love (~~<4008>~~Ephesians 4:3,13; 2 Corinthians 9).

4. Consecration:

Another dominant note of the New Testament church lay in the consecration of its members. "Saints" is one of the most frequently recurring designations for them that we find. As thus employed, the word has in the first place an objective meaning; the sainthood of the Christian society consisted in its separation from the world by God's electing grace; in this respect it has succeeded to the prerogatives of Israel under the old covenant. The members of the church, as Peter said, are "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (1 Pet 2:9). But side by side with this sense of an outward and priestly consecration, the flame "saints" carried within it the thought of an ethical holiness — a holiness consisting, not merely in a status determined by relation to Christ, but in an actual and practical saintliness, a consecration to God that finds expression in character and conduct. No doubt the

members of the church are called saints even when the living evidences of sainthood are sadly lacking. Writing to the Corinthian church in which he found so much to blame, Paul addresses its members by this title (1 Cor 1:2; compare 6:11). But he does so for other than formal reasons — not only because consecration to God is their outward calling and status as believers; but also because he is assured that a work of real sanctification is going on, and must continue to go on, in their bodies and their spirits which are His. For those who are in Christ are a new creation (2 Cor 5:17), and those to whom has come the separating and consecrating call (2 Cor 6:17) must cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2 Cor 7:1). Paul looks upon the members of the church, just as he looks upon the church itself, with a prophetic eye; he sees them not as they are, but as they are to be. And in his view it is “by the washing of water with the word,” in other words by the progressive sanctification of its members, that the church itself is to be sanctified and cleansed, until Christ can present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing (~~413B~~ Ephesians 5:26,27).

5. Power:

Yet another note of the church was spiritual power. When the name [ekklesia] was given by Jesus to the society He came to found, His promise to Peter included the bestowal of the gift of power (~~413B~~ Matthew 16:18,19). The apostle was to receive the “power of the keys,” i.e. he was to exercise the privilege of opening the doors of the kingdom of heaven to the Jew (~~413B~~ Acts 2:41) and to the Gentile (~~413B~~ Acts 10:34-38; 15:7). He was further to have the power of binding and loosing, i.e. of forbidding and permitting; in other words he was to possess the functions of a legislator within the spiritual sphere of the church. The legislative powers then bestowed upon Peter personally as the reward of his believing confession were afterward conferred upon the disciples generally (~~413B~~ Matthew 18:18; compare 18:1 and also 18:19,20), and at the conference in Jerusalem were exercised by the church as a whole (~~413B~~ Acts 15:4,22). The power to open the gates of the kingdom of heaven was expanded into the great missionary commission, “Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations” (~~413B~~ Matthew 28:19) — a commission that was understood by the apostolic church to be addressed not to the eleven apostles only, but to all Christ’s followers without distinction (~~413B~~ Acts 8:4, etc.). To the Christian society there thus belonged the double power of legislating for its own members

and of opening the kingdom of heaven to all believers. But these double functions of teaching and government were clearly recognized as delegated gifts. The church taught the nations because Christ had bid her go and do it. She laid down laws for her own members because He had conferred upon her authority to bind and to loose. But in every exercise of her authority she relied upon Him from whom she derived it. She believed that Christ was with her alway, even unto the end of the world (^{<4181>}Matthew 28:20), and that the power with which she was endued was power from on high (^{<4249>}Luke 24:49).

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

It seems evident from the New Testament that Jesus gave His disciples no formal prescriptions for the organization of the church. In the first days after Pentecost they had no thought of separating themselves from the religious life of Israel, and would not realize the need of any distinct organization of their own. The temple-worship was still adhered to (^{<4126>}Acts 2:46; 3:1), though it was supplemented by apostolic teaching, by prayer and fellowship, and by the breaking of bread (^{<4126>}Acts 2:42,46). Organization was a thing of gradual growth suggested by emerging needs, and the differentiation of function among those who were drawn into the service of the church was due to the difference in the gifts bestowed by God upon the church members (1 Cor 12:28). At first the Twelve themselves, as the immediate companions of Jesus throughout His ministry and the prime witnesses of the Christian facts and especially of the resurrection (compare ^{<4121>}Acts 1:21,22), were the natural leaders and teachers of the community. Apart from this, the earliest evidence of anything like organization is found in the distinction drawn by the Twelve themselves between the ministry of the word and the ministry of tables (^{<4112>}Acts 6:2,4) — a distinction which was fully recognized by Paul (^{<5116>}Romans 12:6,8; ^{<4117>}1 Corinthians 1:17; 9:14; 12:28), though he enlarged the latter type of ministry so as to include much more than the care of the poor. The two kinds of ministry, as they meet us at the first, may broadly be distinguished as the general and prophetic on the one hand, the local and practical on the other.

1. The General and Prophetic Ministry:

From ^{<4111>}Acts 6:1 ff we see that the Twelve recognized that they were Divinely called as apostles to proclaim the gospel; and Paul repeatedly makes the same claim for himself (1 Cor 1:17; 9:16; ^{<4116>}2 Corinthians 3:6; 4:1; ^{<5112>}Colossians 1:23). But apostle ship was by no means confined to the

Twelve (^{<4144>}Acts 14:14; ^{<5617>}Romans 16:7; compare Didache 11 4 ff); and an itinerant ministry of the word was exercised in differing ways by prophets, evangelists, and teachers, as well as by apostles (1 Cor 12:28,29; ^{<4011>}Ephesians 4:11). The fact that Paul himself is variously described as an apostle, a prophet, a teacher (^{<4131>}Acts 13:1; 14:14; ^{<5417>}1 Timothy 2:7; ^{<5111>}2 Timothy 1:11) appears to show that the prophetic ministry was not a ministry of stated office, but one of special gifts and functions. The apostle carried the good tidings of salvation to the ignorant and unbelieving (^{<4117>}Galatians 2:7,8), the prophet (in the more specific sense of the word) was a messenger to the church (1 Cor 14:4,22); and while the teacher explained and applied truth that was already possessed (^{<5812>}Hebrews 5:12), the prophet was recognized by those who had spiritual discernment (1 Cor 2:15; 14:29; ^{<6101>}1 John 4:1) as the Divinely employed medium of fresh revelations (1 Cor 14:25,30,31; ^{<4015>}Ephesians 3:5; compare Didache 4 1).

2. The Local and Practical Ministry:

The earliest examples of this are the Seven of Jerusalem who were entrusted with the care of the “daily ministration” (^{<4117>}Acts 6:1 ff). With the growth of the church, however, other needs arose, and the local ministry is seen developing in two distinct directions. First there is the presbyter or elder, otherwise known as the bishop or overseer, whose duties, while still local, are chiefly of a spiritual kind (^{<4117>}Acts 20:17,28,35; ^{<5412>}1 Timothy 3:2,5; ^{<5154>}James 5:14; ^{<4012>}1 Peter 5:2). *See BISHOP*. Next there are the deacon and the deaconess (^{<5101>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<5418>}1 Timothy 3:8-13), whose work appears to have lain largely in house to house visitation and a practical ministry to the poor and needy (1 Tim 5:8-11). The necessities of government, of discipline, and of regular and stated instruction had thus brought it to pass that within New Testament times some of the functions of the general ministry of apostles and prophets were discharged by a local ministry. The general ministry, however, was still recognized to be the higher of the two. Paul addresses the presbyter-bishops of Ephesus in a tone of lofty spiritual authority (^{<4117>}Acts 20:17:ff). And according to the Didache, a true prophet when he visits a church is to take precedence over the resident bishops and deacons (Didache 10 7; 13 3).

See CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

LITERATURE.

Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*; Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Cents.*, lects I-V; Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*; Gwatkin, *Early Church History to AD 313*; Kostlin, article “Kirche” in *See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche*; Armitage Robinson, article “Church” in *Encyclopedia Biblica*; Fairbairn *Christ in Modern Theology*, 513-34; Dargan, *Ecclesiology*; Denney, *Studies in Theology*, Ch viii.

J. C. Lambert

CHURCH GOVERNMENT

<gʉv'-ern-ment>:

The object here sought is to discover what kind of church government is mirrored in the New Testament. To do this with perfect definiteness is, no doubt, quite impossible. Certain general features, however, may clearly be seen.

I. APPROACH TO THE SUBJECT.

The subject is best approached through the Greek word [ekklesia], translated “church.” Passing by the history of this word, and its connection with the Hebrew words [ʿedah] and [qahal] (which the Septuagint sometimes renders by [ἐκκλησία, ekklesia]), we come at once to the New Testament usage. Two perfectly distinct senses are found, namely, a general and a local.

1. The General Sense:

Christ is “head over all things to the church, which is his body” (⁴⁰¹²Ephesians 1:22); “the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven” (⁸¹²³Hebrews 12:23). Here we have “church” in the broadest sense, including all the redeemed in earth and heaven, and in all ages (see also ⁴⁰¹²Ephesians 1:22; 3:10; 5:22-27; ⁵¹⁰²⁴Colossians 1:24; ⁸¹²³Hebrews 12:23).

2. The Local Sense:

Here the Scripture passages are very numerous. In some cases, the word is used in the singular, and in others the plural; in some it is used with

reference to a specified church, and in others without such specification. In all cases the sense is local.

In ~~<4125>~~ Acts 11:26, it is said that Paul and Barnabas were “gathered together with the church,” where the church at Antioch is meant. In ~~<4423>~~ Acts 14:23, Paul and Barnabas are said to have “appointed elders in every church,” that is, churches which they had planted. In Revelation 2 and 3 the seven churches of Asia Minor are addressed. In ~~<4405>~~ Acts 16:5 we are told that the churches “were strengthened in the faith.” On the local sense see, further, ~~<4801>~~ Acts 8:1; 15:4; 16:5; 20:17; ~~<5104>~~ Romans 16:4; 1 Corinthians 12; 6:4; 11:16; ~~<8002>~~ Galatians 1:2,22, and many other places.

There are a few passages that do not seem exactly to fit into either of the above categories. Such, for example, are ~~<4187>~~ Matthew 18:17 and ~~<6128>~~ 1 Corinthians 12:28, where it seems best to understand a generic sense.

Such, also, are passages like ~~<4025>~~ Acts 9:31, and ~~<6102>~~ 1 Corinthians 10:32, where a collective sense best suits the cases.

Church government in the New Testament applies only to the local bodies.

II. INTERNAL ORDER.

With respect to the constitution and life of these New Testament churches, several points may be made out beyond reasonable doubt.

1. Subjects of Admission:

They were composed of persons who professed faith in Christ, and who were believed to have been regenerated, and who had been baptized. See ~~<4024>~~ Acts 2:41,44,47 (the Revised Version (British and American) “added to them”); 8:12; ~~<6008>~~ Romans 1:8; 6:4; 10:9,10; ~~<6002>~~ 1 Corinthians 1:2; ~~<5002>~~ Colossians 1:2,4; ~~<5062>~~ 1 Timothy 6:12, and others, where they are called “saints,” “sons of God,” “faithful brethren,” “sanctified in Christ Jesus.”

2. Definite Organizations:

They are definitely and permanently organized bodies, and not temporary and loose aggregations of individuals. It is quite impossible, for example, to regard the church at Antioch as a loose aggregation of people for a passing purpose. The letters of Paul to the churches at Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, cannot be regarded as addressed to other than permanent and definitely organized bodies.

3. *Ministers:*

They were served by two classes of ministers — one general, the other local.

(1) **General.**

At the head of these is the “apostle” (1 Cor 12:28; ~~4041~~ Ephesians 4:11). His official relation to the churches was general. He did not necessarily belong to the group of the original Eleven. Besides Matthias (~~4026~~ Acts 1:26), Paul and Barnabas (1 Cor 9:5,6), James, the Lord’s brother (~~4019~~ Galatians 1:19), Andronicus and Junias (~~5407~~ Romans 16:7) are reckoned as “apostles.” The one invariable and necessary qualification of an apostle was that he should have seen the Lord after the Resurrection (~~4022~~ Acts 1:22; ~~4001~~ 1 Corinthians 9:1). Another qualification was to have wrought “the signs of an apostle” (2 Cor 12:12; compare ~~4002~~ 1 Corinthians 9:2). He was to bear witness to what he had seen and heard, to preach the gospel of the kingdom (~~4008~~ Acts 1:8; ~~4017~~ 1 Corinthians 1:17), to found churches and have a general care of them (2 Cor 11:28). From the nature of his chief qualification, his office was temporary.

Next comes the “prophet.” His relation to the churches, also, was general. It was not necessary that he should have seen the Lord, but it appertained to his spiritual function that he should have revelations (~~4035~~ Ephesians 3:5). There is no indication that his office was in any sense administrative.

After the “prophet” come the “evangelist” and “teacher,” the first, a traveling preacher, the second, one who had special aptitude for giving instruction.

After the “teacher” and “evangelist” follow a group of special gifts of “healing,” “helps,” “governments,” “tongues.” It may be that “helps” and “governments” are to be identified with “deacons” and “bishops,” to be spoken of later. The other items in this part of Paul’s list seem to refer to special charismata.

(2) **Local.**

There were two clearly distinct offices of a local and permanent kind in the New Testament churches. Paul (~~5001~~ Philippians 1:1) addresses “all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.”

See BISHOP; DEACON.

The most common designation of the first of these officers is “elder” ([**πρεσβύτερος**, presbuteros]). In one passage (~~4041~~ Ephesians 4:11) he is called “pastor” ([**ποιμήν**, poimen]). In ~~4007~~ Acts 20:17-28, it becomes clear that the office of elder, bishop, and pastor was one; for there the apostle charges the elders of the church at Ephesus to feed (pastor) the church in which the Holy Spirit has made them bishops (compare ~~4005~~ Titus 1:5,7; ~~4001~~ 1 Peter 5:1,2).

The function of the elders was, in general, spiritual, but involved an oversight of all the affairs of the church (1 Tim 3:2; 5:17).

As to the second of the local church officers, it has to be said that little is given us in the New Testament. That the office of deacon originated with the appointment of the Seven in Acts 6 is not certain. If we compare the qualifications there given by the apostles with those given by Paul in ~~5438~~ 1 Timothy 3:8-13, it seems quite probable that the necessity which arose at Jerusalem, and which led to the appointment of the Seven was really the occasion for originating the office of deacon in the churches. The work assigned the Seven was secular, that is to say, the “service of tables.” They were to relieve the apostles of that part of the work. A similar relation to the work of the elders seems to have been borne by that of the deacons.

Again, they exercised the highest ecclesiastical functions.

4. Ecclesiastical Functions:

(1) Control of Membership.

In ~~4007~~ Matthew 18:17, our Lord, by anticipation, lodges final action, in the sphere of church discipline, with the church. When the church has taken action, the matter is ended. There is no direction to take it to a higher court. In the church at Corinth, there was a man who was guilty of an infamous offense against purity. With regard to the case, Paul urged the most summary discipline (1 Cor 5:5). If the church should act upon the judgment which he communicated to them, they would act when “gathered together”; that is to say, action would be taken in conference of the church. In 2 Corinthians 2, a reference to the case shows that they had acted upon his advice, and that the action was taken by the majority (“the many,” the more, ~~4005~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6). In 2 Corinthians 2 he counsels restoration of this excluded member now repentant. Exclusion and restoration of members were to be effected by a church. This, of course, carried with it the reception of members in the first instance.

(2) Selection of Officers, etc.

This was true in case of the Seven (^{<40B>}Acts 6:3-13; see other cases in ^{<4152>}Acts 15:22; ^{<416B>}1 Corinthians 16:3; ^{<4081>}2 Corinthians 8:1 ff; ^{<1745>}Philippians 2:25). ^{<4423>}Acts 14:23 and ^{<5005>}Titus 1:5 seem, at first, to offset the passages just given. In one of these, Paul and Barnabas are said to have “appointed” ([^{<416B>}χειροτονήσαντες, cheirotonesantes]) elders in the churches which they had planted. But scholars of first quality, though themselves adhering to Presbyterian or Episcopal forms of church government, maintain that Paul and Barnabas ordained the elders whom the churches selected — that they “appointed” them in the usual way, by the suffrages of the members of the churches concerned. The word rendered “appoint” in ^{<5005>}Titus 1:5 ([^{<416B>}καταστήσης, katasteses]) is more easily understood as referring to ordination instead of selection.

(3) Observation of Ordinances.

Paul gives direction (1 Cor 11:20-34) to the church at Corinth about the observance of the Lord’s Supper. These directions are given, not to any officer or set of officers, but to the church. Ecclesiastically, of course, the two ordinances are on the same level; and, if one of them had been committed to the custody, so to say, of the churches, so must the other.

5. Independent (Autonomous) Organizations:

The management of their business was in their own hands. Paul wrote the church at Corinth: “Let all things be done decently and in order” (1 Cor 14:40). In that comprehensive injunction, given to a church, is implied control of its affairs by the church.

III. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY.

The investigation up to this point places us in position to see that there is in the New Testament no warrant for ecclesiastical grades in the ministry of the churches, by which there may be created an ascending series of rulers who shall govern the churches merged into one vast ecclesiastical organization called “the church.” So, also, we are in position to see that there is no warrant for an ascending series of courts which may review any “case” that originates in a local church. We may see, on the contrary, that to each local church has been committed by Christ the management of its own affairs; and that He had endowed every such church with ecclesiastical

competency to perform every function that any ecclesiastical body has a right to perform.

As the churches are not to be dominated by any external ecclesiastical authority, so they are not to be interfered with, in their church life, by civil government. Jesus taught that Christians should be good citizens (^{<4125>}Matthew 22:15-22); so did the apostles (^{<531>}Romans 13:1-7; ^{<6123>}1 Peter 2:13-16). Jesus also taught the spirituality of His Kingdom: "My kingdom is not of this world" (^{<583>}John 18:36). It follows that only where the life of a church touched the civic life of the community has the civil authority any right to interfere.

IV. COOPERATIVE RELATIONS.

While each local church, according to the New Testament, is independent of every other in the sense that no other has jurisdiction over it, yet cooperative relations were entered into by New Testament churches. Examples and indications of that may be found in ^{<553>}Romans 15:26,27; 2 Corinthians 8; 9; ^{<820>}Galatians 2:10; ^{<551>}Romans 15:1; ^{<6008>}3 John 1:8. The principle of cooperation effective in those cases is susceptible of indefinite expansion. Churches may properly cooperate in matters of discipline, by seeking and giving counsel, and by respecting each other's disciplinary measures. In the great, paramount business of evangelizing and teaching the nations, they may cooperate in a multitude of ways. There is no sphere of general Christian activity in which the churches may not voluntarily and freely cooperate for the betterment of the world, the salvation of humanity. For other standpoints *see* BISHOP; GOVERNMENT; MINISTRY, etc.

LITERATURE.

Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*; Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*; Whitley, *Church, Ministry and Sacraments in the New Testament*; Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Cents.*; French, *Synonyms of New Testament*; Vitringa, *Deuteronomy Synagoga Vetere*; Holzinger, *ZAW*; Schurer, *Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II*; Driver, *Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*; Thayer, *New Testament Lexicon*, and Cremer, *Biblical Theol. Lexicon*, under the word, "ekklesia" and "sunagoge"; Neumann, *Rom. Staat und die all-gemeine Kirche*; Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire.*; Lightfoot, "The Christian Ministry," in *Commentary on Philippians*; Harvey, *The Church*; Dagg, *Church Order*;

Hovey, Religion and the State; Owen, Church Government; Ladd, Principles of Church Polity; Dexter, Congregationalism; Hodge, Discussions in Church Polity; Abbey, Ecclesiastical Constitutions; Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity; Jacob, Ecclesiastical Polity; Bore, The Church and Its Ministry; Dollinger, The Church and The Churches; Stanley, Lectures on the Eastern Church; Dargan, Ecclesiology.

E. J. Forrester

CHURCHES, ROBBERS OF

<church'-iz>.

See ROBBERIES OF TEMPLES.

CHURCHES, SEVEN

See ANGELS OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

CHURL

<churl> (yl " yKi[kilay] or yl " Kē[kelay]): The Hebrew word occurs only in ^{<3315>}Isaiah 32:5,7, in the latter verse in a form slightly modified so as to produce a pleasing assonance with the word immediately following. The word probably means “crafty” or “miserly,” both ideas being suitable to the context, though “miserly” accords with the setting in Isaiah somewhat better.

In ^{<0271>}1 Samuel 25:3 the Hebrew [qasheh] which means “hard,” “severe,” “rough,” is rendered “churlish.” In Saxon, churl, as the name for the lowest order of freemen, came to be used of persons boorish in manner. The rough and ill-mannered Nabal is aptly described as churlish.

John Richard Sampey

CHUSHAN-RISHATHAIM

<ku-shan-rish-a-tha'-im>.

See CUSHAN-RISHATHAIM.

CHUSI

<ku'-si>, ([ούς, Chous]): A place only named in Judith 7:18, as near Ekrebel on the brook Mochmur. It was in central Palestine, and has with some probability been identified with Quzah, a village 5 1/2 miles South of Nablus and 5 miles West of Agrabeh (Ekrebel).

CHUZAS

<ku'-zas>, <chu'-zas> ([ουζᾱς, Chouzas]; the King James Version Chuza): The steward of Herod Antipas. In ^{<0808>}Luke 8:3 we read that his wife Joanna, "and Susanna, and many others," ministered to Christ and His disciples.

See JOANNA (^{<0240>}Luke 24:10).

CICCAR

<sik'-ar> (rKKi[kikkar], "circle"): Used of the circle of the Jordan (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10, Hebrew).

See PLAIN; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

CIELED; CIELING

<seld>, <sel'-ing>.

See CEILED; CEILING.

CILICIA

<si-lish'-i-a> ([ή ιλικάια, he Kilikia]): An important province at the Southeast angle of Asia Minor, corresponding nearly with the modern Turkish vilayet of Adana; enfolded between the Taurus mountains and the Mediterranean Sea, with the Amanus range on the East and Pamphylia on the West; chief rivers, the Pyramus, Sarus, Cydnus and Calycadnus. The character of Cilician history has been largely determined by the physical features of the province. It is divided by nature into a mountainous part to the West, called Tracheia, and a broad, alluvial plain, hot and fertile, toward the East, termed Campestris or Pedias. Cilicia has always been isolated from its neighbors by land by its encircling mountains, save for its two famous mountain passes, the "Syrian Gates," which offer an easy road

to Antioch and the South, and the wonderful “Cilician Gates,” which open a road to central and western Asia Minor. Through these passes the armies and the pilgrims, the trade and the travel of the centuries have made their way. Alexander was one of the most renowned leaders of such expeditions, and at Issus he met and shattered the power of the Persian empire.

The early settlers of Cilicia are held to have been Semitic Syrians and Phoenicians, but in the still earlier days the inhabitants must have been Hittites. While few Hittite remains have been brought to light in Cilicia proper, the province was so surrounded by Hittites, and such important works of Hittite art and industry remain on the outskirts of the province, as at Ivriz, Marash, Sinjirli and Sakche Geuzi, that the intervening territory could hardly fail to be overspread with the same civilization and imperial power. See Professor John Garstang’s *The Land of the Hittites*.

Cilicia appears as independent under Syennesis, a contemporary of Alyattes of Lydia, 610 BC. Later it passed under the Persian sway, but retained its separate line of kings. After Alexander the Seleucid rulers governed Cilicia from Antioch. The disturbances of the times enabled the pirates so to multiply and establish themselves in their home base, in Cilicia, Tracheia, that they became the scourge of the Mediterranean until their power was broken by Pompey (67-66 BC). Cilicia was by degrees incorporated in the Roman administration, and Cicero, the orator, was governor (51-50 BC).

The foremost citizen of the province was Saul of Tarsus (^{<423>}Acts 21:39; 22:3; 23:34). Students or pilgrims from Cilicia like himself disputed with Stephen (^{<419>}Acts 6:9). Some of the earliest labors of the great apostle were near his home, in Syria and Cilicia (^{<812>}Galatians 1:21; ^{<4152>}Acts 15:23,11). On his voyage to Rome he sailed across the sea which is off Cilicia (^{<4715>}Acts 27:5). Constantinople and Antioch may be regarded as the front and back door of Asia Minor, and as the former was not founded till the 4th century, Asia Minor may be regarded as fronting during apostolic days on Antioch. Cilicia was intimately connected with its neighbor province on the South. The first Christian apostles and evangelists followed the great highways, through the famous mountain passes, and carried the religion of Jesus to Asia Minor from Antioch as a base. Armenians migrating from the North founded kingdom in Cilicia under Roupen which was terminated by the overthrow of King Levon, or Leo, by the conquering Turks in 1393. A remnant of this kingdom survives in the separate Armenian catholicate of Sis, which has jurisdiction over few

bishoprics, and Armenians are among the most virile of the present inhabitants of the province.

G. E. White

CINNAMON

<sin'-a-mun> ([^]whNqi[qinnamon]; [κιννάμωμον, kinnamomon]):

Mentioned, like cassia, as a perfume. In ^{<237>}Exodus 30:23 it is one of the ingredients of the "holy anointing oil"; in ^{<3077>}Proverbs 7:17 it is, along with myrrh and aloes, a perfume for a bed; in Song 4:14 it is a very precious spice. Cinnamon is (^{<6883>}Revelation 18:13) part of the merchandise of "Babylon the great."

Cinnamon is the product of *Cinnamomum zeylanicum*, a laurel-like plant widely cultivated in Ceylon and Java. It has a profuse white blossom, succeeded by a nut from which the fragrant oil is obtained. The wood is the inner bark from branches which have reached a diameter of from 2 to 3 inches; the epidermis and pulpy matter are carefully scraped off before drying. In commerce the cheaper Cassia ligna of China is sometimes substituted for true cinnamon, and it is thought by some authorities that this was the true cinnamon of the ancients.

See, however, CASSIA.

E. W. G. Masterman

CINNEROTH

<sin'-e-roth> (twON" Ki[kinneroth]).

See CHINNERETH.

CIRAMA

<si-ra'-ma>, <sir'-a-ma>.

See KIRAMA.

CIRCLE

<sur'-k'-l>: Is used with reference to the vault of the heavens (**gwj** [hugh]) in ^{<2312>}Isaiah 40:22, and in a similar sense in The Wisdom of Solomon 13:2 (Revised Version margin), “circle of stars” (**κύκλος ἄστρον**, kuklos astron). It is also used in the sense of surrounding territory, as in the expression “circle of Jordan” (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10 the Revised Version, margin).

See also **CICCAR**; **ASTRONOMY, III, 1**.

CIRCUIT

<sur'-kit>, “a going around”: Used to represent several Hebrew words in several senses, e.g. the sun’s orbit (**hpwqt**) [tequphah], ^{<0916>}Psalms 19:6; the vault of the heavens (**gwj** [chugh]), ^{<1824>}Job 22:14 the King James Version; the circuit of the winds (**byb**) [cabhibh], ^{<2005>}Ecclesiastes 1:6 (see **ASTRONOMY**); Samuel’s visiting of communities (**bb** **s**; [cabhabh]), ^{<0076>}1 Samuel 7:16. In the Revised Version (British and American) the idea of encircling or “fetching a compass” (the King James Version) is expressed by the phrase “to make a circuit” (**bsa**) [hacebh], ^{<1023>}2 Samuel 5:23; ^{<1201>}2 Kings 3:9; and in the Revised Version, margin it indicates a plain (**rKKh**) [ha-kikkar], ^{<1622>}Nehemiah 3:22. The Greek [perielthontes] is translated in the same way (^{<4813>}Acts 28:13), but the Revised Version, margin reads “cast loose,” following the Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek reading [perielontes].

Nathan Isaacs

CIRCUMCISION

<sur-kum-sizh'-un> (**l Wm** [mul], **t l Wm** [muloth]; [**περιτομή**, peritome]): The removal of the foreskin is a custom that has prevailed, and prevails, among many races in different parts of the world — in America, Africa and Australia. It was in vogue among the western Semites — Hebrews, Arabians, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Egyptians, but was unknown among the Semites of the Euphrates. In Canaan the Philistines were an exception, for the term “uncircumcised” is constantly used in

connection with them. Generally speaking, the rite of circumcision was a precondition of the enjoyment of certain political and religious privileges (^{<0128>}Exodus 12:48; ^{<349>}Ezekiel 44:9); and in view of the fact that in the ancient world religion played such an important role in life, it may be assumed that circumcision, like many other strange customs whose original significance is no longer known, originated in connection with religion. Before enumerating the different theories which have been advanced with regard to the origin and original significance of circumcision, it may be of advantage to consider some of the principal references to the rite in the Old Testament.

1. CIRCUMCISION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the account of the institution of the covenant between Yahweh and Abraham which Priestly Code (P) gives (Genesis 17), circumcision is looked upon as the ratification of the agreement. Yahweh undertook to be the God of Abraham and of his descendants. Abraham was to be the father of a multitude of nations and the founder of a line of kings. He and his descendants were to inherit Canaan. The agreement thus formed was permanent; Abraham's posterity should come within the scope of it. But it was necessary to inclusion in the covenant that every male child should be circumcised on the 8th day. A foreigner who had attached himself as a slave to a Hebrew household had to undergo the rite — the punishment for its non-fulfilment being death or perhaps excommunication. According to ^{<0128>}Exodus 12:48 (also P) no stranger could take part in the celebration of the Passover unless he had been circumcised. In the Book of Joshua (5:2-9) we read that the Israelites were circumcised at Gilgal ("Rolling"), and thus the "reproach of Egypt" was "rolled away." Apparently circumcision in the case of the Hebrews was prohibited during the Egyptian period — circumcision being a distinctive mark of the ruling race. It is noticeable that flint knives were used for the purpose. This use of an obsolete instrument is one of many proofs of conservatism in religion. According to the strange and obscure account of the circumcision by Zipporah of her eldest son (^{<0025>}Exodus 4:25) the performance of the rite in the case of the son apparently possesses a vicarious value, for thereby Moses becomes a "bridegroom of blood." The marriage bond is ratified by the rite of blood (see 4 below). But it is possible that the author's meaning is that owing to the fact that Moses had not been circumcised (the "reproach of Egypt") he was not fit to enter the matrimonial estate (see 3 below).

2. THEORIES OF ORIGIN:

The different theories with regard to the origin of circumcision may be arranged under four heads:

- (1) Herodotus (ii.37), in dealing with circumcision among the Egyptians, suggests that it was a sanitary operation. But all suggestions of a secular, i.e. non-religious, origin to the rite, fail to do justice to the place and importance of religion in the life of primitive man.
- (2) It was a tribal mark. Tattooed marks frequently answered the purpose, although they may have been originally charms. The tribal mark enabled one member of the tribe to recognize another and thus avoid injuring or slaying a fellow-tribesman. It also enabled the tribal deity to recognize a member of the tribe which was under his special protection. A mark was placed on Cain to indicate that he was under the special protection of Yahweh (^{<00415>}Genesis 4:15). It has been suggested, in the light of ^{<2416>}Isaiah 44:5 the Revised Version, margin, that the employer's mark was engraved (tattooed) on the slave's hand. The prophet represents Jews as inscribing on their hands that they belong to Yahweh. The walls of Jerusalem are engraved on Yahweh's palms (^{<2316>}Isaiah 49:16). On the other hand "cuttings in the flesh" are prohibited in ^{<0128>}Leviticus 19:28 because they were common in the case of the non-Jewish religions. Such tattooed marks might be made in conspicuous places when it was necessary that they should be easily seen, but there might be reason for secrecy so that the marks might be known only to the members of the tribe in question.
- (3) It was a rite which celebrated the coming of age of the person. It signified the attainment of puberty and of the right to marry and to enjoy full civic privileges.
- (4) As human sacrifices began to be done away with, the sacrifice of the most easily removed portion of the anatomy provided a vicarious offering.
- (5) It was a sacramental operation. "The shedding of blood" was necessary to the validity of any covenant between tribes or individuals. The rite of blood signifies the exchange of blood on the part of the contracting parties, and therefore the establishment of physical affinity between them. An alliance based on blood-relationship was inviolable. In the same way the tribal god was supposed to share in the blood of the sacrificed animal, and a sacred bond was established between him and the tribe. It is not quite

obvious why circumcision should be necessary in connection with such a ceremony. But it may be pointed out that the process of generation excited the wonder and awe of primitive man. The prosperity of the tribe depended on the successful issue of the marriage bond, and a part of the body which had so much to do with the continuation and numerical strength of the tribe would naturally be fixed upon in connection with the covenant of blood. In confirmation of the last explanation it is urged that in the case of the covenant between Yahweh and Abraham circumcision was the rite that ratified the agreement. In opposition to (3) it has been urged that among the Hebrews circumcision was performed in infancy — when the child was 8 days old. But this might have been an innovation among the Hebrews, due to ignorance of the original significance of the rite. If circumcision conferred upon the person circumcised the right to the enjoyment of the blessings connected with membership in the tribe it was natural that parents should be anxious that such an initiatory act should be performed early in life. The question of adult and infant baptism is capable of similar explanation. When we examine explanations (2), (3), (4), (5), we find that they are really different forms of the same theory. There can be no doubt that circumcision was originally a religious act. Membership in the tribe, entrance upon the rights of citizenship, participation in the religious practices of the tribe — these privileges are interdependent. Anyone who had experienced the rite of blood stood within the scope of the covenant which existed between the tribe and the tribal god, and enjoyed all the privileges of tribal society. It is easily understood why the historian carefully relates the circumcision of the Israelites by Joshua on their arrival in Canaan. It was necessary, in view of the possible intermingling of the conquerors and the conquered, that the distinctive marks of the Abrahamic covenant should be preserved (~~4005~~Joshua 5:3).

3. SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE:

In ~~4005~~Jeremiah 9:25 and ~~4006~~Deuteronomy 30:6 we find the spiritual significance of circumcision. A prophet like Jeremiah was not likely to attach much importance to an external act like circumcision. He bluntly tells his countrymen that they are no better than Egyptians, Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites. They are uncircumcised in heart. Paul uses the term concision for this outward circumcision unaccompanied by any spiritual change (~~4007~~Philippians 3:2). The question of circumcision occasioned a protracted strife among the early Christians. Judaizing Christians argued for the necessity of circumcision. It was a reminiscence

of the unrelenting particularism which had sprung up during the prolonged oppression of the Greek and Roman period. According to their view salvation was of the Jews and for the Jews. It was necessary to become a Jew in order to become a Christian. Paul consented to circumcision in the case of Timothy “because of the Jews” (^{<4118>}Acts 16:3). But he saw that a principle was at stake and in most of his epistles he points out the sheer futility of the contention of the Judaizers. (See commentaries on Romans and Galatians.)

4. FIGURATIVE USES:

In a few suggestive passages we find a figurative application of the term. For three years after the settlement in Canaan the “fruit of the land” was to be considered as “uncircumcised” (^{<1893>}Leviticus 19:23), i.e. it was the property of the Baalim, the gods of Palestine. The fruit of the fourth year belonged to Yahweh. Moses with characteristic humility describes himself as a man of “uncircumcised lips” (^{<1870>}Exodus 6:30). Jeremiah charges his contemporaries with having their ear uncircumcised (^{<2180>}Jeremiah 6:10) and their heart (9:26). “An uncircumcised heart is one which is, as it were, closed in, and so impervious to good influences and good impressions, just as an uncircumcised ear (^{<2180>}Jeremiah 6:10) is an ear which, from the same cause, hears imperfectly; and uncircumcised lips (compare ^{<1862>}Exodus 6:12,30) are lips which open and speak with difficulty (Driver on ^{<5006>}Deuteronomy 10:16).

T. Lewis

CIS

^{<sis>} ([^{<εῖς>}, Keis]): The form given in ^{<4132>}Acts 13:21 the King James Version for Kish, the father of Saul the first king of Israel (^{<1001>}1 Samuel 9:1 f).

CISAI

^{<si'-sa-i>}.

See *KISEUS*.

CISTERN; WELL; POOL; AQUEDUCT

^{<sis'-tern>}:

Several words are rendered by “cistern,” “well,” “pool,” the relations of which in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) are as follows:

USE OF TERMS:

“Cistern,” **raḇō** [bo’r] (^{<2413>}Jeremiah 2:13, etc.), or **rwḇ** [bor] (^{<1283>}2 Kings 18:31). The latter word is frequently in the King James Version translated “well.” the Revised Version (British and American) in these cases changes to “cistern” in text (^{<1861>}Deuteronomy 6:11; ^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 26:10; ^{<1625>}Nehemiah 9:25) or margin (1 S 19:22, etc). The words **abḡ** [gebhe’] (^{<2304>}Isaiah 30:14), **bḡsis** [gebh] (^{<2443>}Jeremiah 14:3), rendered “pit” in the King James Version are changed to “cistern” the Revised Version (British and American) (the latter in the American Standard Revised Version only).

The proper Hebrew word for “well” is **raḇī** [be’er] (seen in Beer-sheba, “well of the oath,” ^{<1213>}Genesis 21:31), but other terms are thus rendered in the King James Version, as **ʾayī** [ʾayin] (^{<1243>}Genesis 24:13,16, etc., and frequently), **rwqī** [ma’yan] (^{<1685>}Joshua 18:15), **rwqī** [maqor] (^{<1001>}Proverbs 10:11). ally changes to “fountain”; in ^{<1257>}Exodus 15:27, however, it renders [ʾayin] by “springs,” and in ^{<1846>}Psalms 84:6, [ma’yan] by, “place of springs.”

“Pool,” **ḡā** [ʾagham] (^{<2343>}Isaiah 14:23, etc.; in the King James Version, ^{<1719>}Exodus 7:19; 8:5, rendered “ponds”); more frequently **hkrḇ** [berekhah] (^{<1013>}2 Samuel 2:13; 4:12, etc.). In ^{<1846>}Psalms 84:6 the cognate **hkrḇ** [berakhah], is changed to “blessing.”

In the New Testament “well” represents the two words: [πηγή, pege] (^{<1016>}John 4:6,14; in the Revised Version, margin “spring”; ^{<1017>}2 Peter 2:17; the Revised Version (British and American) renders “springs”), and [φρέαρ, phrear] (^{<1041>}John 4:11,12). “Pool” is [κολυμβήθρα, kolumbethra], in ^{<1846>}John 5:2,4,7; 9:7,11.

1. GENERAL:

The efforts made to supplement the natural water supply, both in agricultural and in populated areas, before as well as after the Conquest,

are clearly seen in the innumerable cisterns, wells and pools which abound throughout Palestine. The rainy season, upon which the various storage systems depend, commences at the end of October and ends in the beginning of May. In Jerusalem, the mean rainfall in 41 years up to 1901 was 25.81 inches, falling in a mean number of 56 days (see Glaisher, *Meteorological Observations*, 24). Toward the end of summer, springs and wells, where they have not actually dried up, diminish very considerably, and cisterns and open reservoirs become at times the only sources of supply. Cisterns are fed from surface and roof drainage. Except in the rare instances where springs occur, wells depend upon percolation. The great open reservoirs or pools are fed from surface drainage and, in some cases, by aqueducts from springs or from more distant collecting pools. In the case of private cisterns, it is the custom of the country today to close up the inlets during the early days of the rain, so as to permit of a general wash down of gathering surfaces, before admitting the water. Cisterns, belonging to the common natives, are rarely cleansed, and the inevitable scum which collects is dispersed by plunging the pitcher several times before drawing water. When the water is considered to be bad, a somewhat primitive cure is applied by dropping earth into the cistern, so as to sink all impurities with it, to the bottom. The accumulation often found in ancient cisterns probably owes some of its presence to this same habit.

2. WELLS OR CYLINDRICAL CISTERNS:

It is necessary to include wells under the head of cisterns, as there appears to be some confusion in the use of the two terms. Wells, so called, were more often deep cylindrical reservoirs, the lower part of which was sunk in the rock and cemented, the upper part being built with open joints, to receive the surface percolation. They were often of great depth. Job's well at Jerusalem, which is certainly of great antiquity, is 125 ft. deep (see *Palestine Exploration Fund*, "Jerus," 371).

The discovery of "living water" when digging a well, recorded in ⁽¹²³⁹⁾Genesis 26:19 margin, appears to have been an unusual incident. Uzziah hewed out many cisterns in the valley for his cattle (⁽¹⁴⁰⁹⁾2 Chronicles 26:9,10 the Revised Version (British and American)), and he built towers, presumably to keep watch over both cattle and cisterns. Isaac "dugged again the wells" which had been filled in by the Philistines (⁽¹²³⁸⁾Genesis 26:18). Wells were frequently dug in the plain, far from villages, for flocks and herds, and rude stone troughs were provided nearby. The well was

usually covered with a stone, through which a hole was pierced sufficiently large to allow of free access for the pitchers. A stone was placed over this hole (^{<0290>}Genesis 29:10) when the well was not in use. The great amount of pottery found in ancient cisterns suggests that clay pots were used for drawing water (see Bible Sidelights, 88). Josephus (Ant., IV, viii, 37) elucidates the passage in ^{<0213>}Exodus 21:33 requiring the mouth of a “pit” or “well” to be covered with planks against accidents. This would seem to apply to wide-mouthed wells which had not been narrowed over to receive a stone cover. It may have been a well or cistern similar to these into which Joseph was cast (^{<03724>}Genesis 37:24). In fact, dry-wells and cisterns formed such effective dungeons, that it is very probable they were often used for purposes of detention. From earliest times, wells have been the cause of much strife. The covenant between Abimelech and Abraham at Beersheba (Genesis 32) was a necessity, no less pressing then than it is now. The well, today, is a center of life in the East. Women gather around it in pursuit of their daily duties, and travelers, man and beast, divert their course thereto, if needs be, for refreshment; and news of the outer world is carried to and from the well. It is, in fact, an all-important center, and daily presents a series of characteristic Bible scenes. The scene between Rebekah and the servant of Abraham (^{<0241>}Genesis 24:11 ff) is one with frequent parallels. The well lies usually at some little distance from the village or city. Abraham’s servant made his “camels to kneel down without the city by the well of water at the time of the evening, the time that women go out to draw water.” Saul and his servant found young maidens going out of the city to draw water (^{<0091>}1 Samuel 9:11). Moses helped the daughters of the priest of Midian at the well, which was evidently at some distance from habitation (^{<0016>}Exodus 2:16 ff).

3. PRIVATE CISTERNS:

Private cisterns must be distinguished from public cisterns or wells. They were smaller and were sunk in the rocks within private boundaries, each owner having his own cistern (^{<02831>}2 Kings 18:31; ^{<005>}Proverbs 5:15). Ancient sites are honeycombed with these cisterns. A common type in Jerusalem seems to have been bottle-shaped in section, the extended bottom part being in the softer rock, and the narrow neck in the hard upper stratum. Many irregularly shaped cisterns occur with rock vaults supported by rock or masonry piers. Macalister tells of the discovery at Gezer of a small silt catchpit attached to a private cistern, and provided with an overflow channel leading to the cistern. It is an early instance of a now

well-known method of purification. The universal use of cement rendering to the walls of the cisterns was most necessary to seal up the fissures of the rock. The “broken cisterns” (~~24213~~ Jeremiah 2:13) probably refer to insufficiently sealed cisterns.

4. PUBLIC CISTERNS:

Besides private cisterns there were huge public rock-cut cisterns within the city walls. The great water caverns under the Temple area at Jerusalem show a most extensive system of water storage (see Recovery of Jerusalem, chapter vii). There are 37 of these described in Palestine Exploration Fund, “Jerus,” 217 ff, and the greatest is an immense rock-cut cavern the roof of which is partly rock and partly stone, supported by rock piers (see Fig. 1, Palestine Exploration Fund). It is 43 ft. deep with a storage capacity of over two million gallons and there are numerous access manholes. This cistern is fed by an aqueduct from Solomon’s Pools about 10 miles distant by road, and is locally known as Bahar el Kebir, the “Great Sea.” One of the most recent and one of the most interesting rock-cut reservoirs yet discovered is that at Gezer. (See Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1908, 96 ff.) In this example, the pool of spring water is reached by a great rock-tunnel staircase which descends 94 ft. 6 inches from the surface. The staircase diminishes in size as it descends, and at its greatest, it is 23 ft. high and 12 ft. 10 inches wide. These proportions may seem unnecessarily large, but may be accounted for by the necessity for providing light at the water level. As a matter of fact, the brink of the pool receives the light from above. The work dates back to pre-Israelite times.

5. POOLS AND AQUEDUCTS:

Open pools were common in every city. They were cut out of the rock and were built and cemented at points where occasion demanded. They were often of great size. The pool outside Jerusalem known as Birket es Sultan measures 555 ft. x 220 ft. x 36 ft. deep, and the so-called Hezekiah’s Pool within the walls, is 240 ft. x 144 ft. x about 20 ft. deep. The latter probably owes its origin to the rock-cut fosse of early Jewish date. The Birket es Sultan, on the other hand, probably dates from the time of the Turkish occupation. They may, however, be taken as examples, which, if somewhat larger, are still in accord with the pool system of earlier history. Pools were usually fed by surface drainage, and in some cases by aqueducts from springs at some distance away. They seem to have been at the public

service, freely accessible to both man and beast. Pools situated outside the city walls were sometimes connected by aqueducts with pools within the city, so that the water could be drawn within the walls in time of siege. The so-called Pools of Solomon, three in number (see Fig. 3), situated about 10 miles by road from Jerusalem, are of large proportions and are fed by surface water and by aqueducts from springs. The water from these pools is conveyed in a wonderfully engineered course, known as the lower-level aqueduct, which searches the winding contours of the Judean hills for a distance of about 15 miles, before reaching its destination in “the great sea” under the Temple area. This aqueduct is still in use, but its date is uncertain (see G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 131, where the author finds reason for ascribing it to the period of Herod). The course and destination of another aqueduct known as the high-level aqueduct is less definite. These aqueducts are of varying dimensions. The low-level aqueduct at a point just before it enters the Temple area was found to measure 3 ft. high x 2 ft. 3 inches wide, partly rock-cut and partly built, and rendered in smooth-troweled cement, with well-squared stone covers (see *Palestine Exploration Fund, Excavations at Jerusalem*, 53 ff). There are many remains of rock-cut aqueducts throughout Palestine (see Fig. 4) which seem to indicate their use in early Hebrew times, but the lack of Old Testament references to these works is difficult to account for, unless it is argued that in some cases they date back to pre-Israelite times. The great tunnel and pool at Gezer lends a measure of support to this hypothesis. On the other hand, a plea for a Hebrew origin is also in a measure strengthened by the very slight reference in the Old Testament to such a great engineering feat as the cutting of the Siloam tunnel, which is doubtless the work of Hezekiah. The pool of Siloam was originally a simple rock-cut reservoir within the walls, and was constructed by Hezekiah (¹⁴²⁰2 Chronicles 32:30). It measures 75 ft. x 71 ft. It is the upper pool of ^{237B}Isaiah 7:3. A lower overflow pool existed immediately beyond, contained by the city wall across the Tyropoeon valley. The aqueduct which supplies the upper pool takes a tortuous course of about 1,700 ft. through the solid rock from the Virgin’s fountain, an intermittent spring on the East slope of the hill. The water reaches the pool on the Southwest of the spur of Ophel, and it was in the rock walls of this aqueduct that the famous Siloam inscription recording the completion of the work was discovered.

Herod embellished the upper pool, lining it with stone and building arches around its four sides (see Palestine Exploration Fund, Excavations at Jerusalem, 154 ff), and the pool was most likely in this condition in the time of Christ (<306>John 9:6,7). There are numerous other pools, cisterns and aqueducts in and around Jerusalem, which provide abundant evidence of the continual struggle after water, made by its occupants of all times (see G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, chapter v, volume I).

See also PIT; WELL, etc.

6. FIGURATIVE USES:

Good wives are described as cisterns (<205>Proverbs 5:15 ff). “The left ventricle of the heart, which retains the blood till it be redispersed through the body, is called a cistern” (<206>Ecclesiastes 12:6). Idols, armies and material objects in which Israel trusted were “broken cisterns” (<203>Jeremiah 2:13, see above) “soon emptied of all the aid and comfort which they possess, and cannot fill themselves again.”

LITERATURE.

G. A. Smith, Jerusalem; Palestine Exploration Fund Memoirs, Jerusalem vol; Wilson, The Recovery of Jerusalem; Macalister, Bible Sidelights; Palestine Exploration Fund Statement; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations at Jerusalem; Josephus.

Arch. C. Dickie

CITADEL

<sith'-a-del> (1 Macc 1:33; 3:45).

See FORTIFICATION.

CITHERN

<sith'-ern> ([λιθάρα, kithara]; 1 Macc 4:54 the King James Version, [kitharais kai kinurais] is translated “citherns and harps”; the Revised Version (British and American) “harps and lutes”; compare guitar, zither): As 1 Macc was originally written in Hebrew, it is natural to suppose that these two Greek words stand for Hebrew [nebhalm] and [kinnoroth]; but to this it may be objected that [kithara] and [kinura] are not used elsewhere

together to represent two different instruments. On the contrary we have either [kinura kai nabla] or [kithara kai psalterion]. The most probable explanation of the unusual collocation of these two words in 1 Maccabees is that [kithara] was a gloss meant to explain the obsolescent [kinura].

See Music.

James Millar

CITIES, LEVITICAL

See LEVITICAL CITY; CITY.

CITIES OF REFUGE

See REFUGE, CITIES OF.

CITIES, OF THE PLAIN; CICCAR

<sit'-iz>, <plan>, (ʔDē" Yh" rK" Ki[kikkar ha-yarden]): Included Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim and Zoar. The locality is first referred to in ^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10, where it is said that Lot "lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the Plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before Yahweh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of Yahweh, like the land of Egypt, as thou goest unto Zoar." The word translated plain is [kikkar], "circle." In this ver, and in the 11th, as well as in ^{<0076>}1 Kings 7:46 and ^{<0085>}Matthew 3:5, we have the full phrase "circle of the Jordan." Elsewhere (^{<0132>}Genesis 13:12; 19:17,29; ^{<0348>}Deuteronomy 34:3; ^{<0082>}2 Samuel 18:23) the word for "circle" is used alone with the article. Until recently the traditional view that this circle of the Jordan was at the south end of the Dead Sea was universally maintained. The arguments in favor of this view are:

- (1) The name of Sodom is preserved in Jebel Usdum — Usdum having the same consonants with Sodom; moreover, the name is known to have referred to a place in that region as early as the days of Galen (Deuteronomy Simpl. medic. Facult., 4,19) who describes certain "salts of Sodom" from the mountains surrounding the lake which are called Sodom.
- (2) Zoar seems to have been represented in the Middle Ages by a place which the Crusaders called Segore, and Arabic writers Zoghar. Under

the name Zughar or Sughar the place is often referred to by medieval Arabian geographers as situated 1ø South of Jericho “at the end of the Dead Sea” and as a station on the route between the Gulf of Akabah and Jericho, two days’ journey from Jericho. Ptolemy (v.17,5) reckons Zoar as belonging to Arabia Petrea. Eusebius (Onom., 261) describes the Dead Sea as lying between Jericho and Zoar. Josephus (Ant., I, xi, 4) makes the Dead Sea extend 580 stadia “as far as Zoar of Arabia” (Wars, IV, viii, 4). These references would locate Zoar at the base of the mountains just Southeast of the Dead Sea, and, as it was within easy reach of Sodom, from which Lot fled, would fix the Cities of the Plain in that locality. Jerome (Comm. on ^{<0130>}Isaiah 15:5) says that Zoar was in the borders of Moab.

On the other hand, it is maintained that the “kikkar of the Jordan” lay North of the Dead Sea for the following reasons:

- (1) That is the region which is visible from the heights of Bethel whence Abraham and Lot looked down upon it (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10), while the south end of the lake is not visible. But it may be answered that the phrase need not be limited to the actual region in sight, but may have included the whole known extension of the valley.
- (2) Zoar was said to be in range of Moses’ vision from the top of Pisgah (^{<0130>}Deuteronomy 34:1-3) whereas the south end of the Dead Sea is invisible from that point, on account of intervening mountains. But this description in Deuteronomy evidently is not intended to be limited to the points which are actually visible, but should be understood as describing the extreme limits of the land some points of which are visible in their near vicinity. Certainly the vision did not comprehend all portions of Daniel or Judah “unto the hinder sea.” The phrase from Jericho to Zoar is like “from Daniel to Beersheba.” The mountain heights overlooking Zoar were certainly visible.
- (3) In Genesis 14 the four kings coming up from Kadesh attacked the Amorites “that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar” before reaching Sodom, and Hazezon-tamar is to be identified with Engedi. On the other hand, it is possible that it is to be identified with the Tamar of ^{<0130>}Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28, and that this place lay Southwest of the Dead Sea. Or, if that explanation is not accepted, it is proper to note that the course of this expedition led at first a considerable distance South of the Dead Sea through Mt. Seir to El-paran, when “they smote all the country of the

Amalekites, and also the Amorites.” In accomplishing this they would naturally be led along the highland to Hebron from which they could easily descend to Engedi, whence they could proceed without difficulty to the south end of the end Sea. Besides, it is by no means certain that there was not an easy passage along the whole western shore of the Dead Sea at that time. *See DEAD SEA.*

(4) It is argued that the region at the south end of the Dead Sea could not be described “as the garden of the Lord,” etc. Neither, for that matter, could the region around the north end be so described in its present condition. But, on the other hand, the region South of the sea is by no means as devoid of vegetation as is sometimes represented, while there are convincing arguments to prove that formerly it was much more extensive and fertile than now. To the fertility of this area there is no more capable witness than Professor Hull, though he is an ardent advocate of the location of these cities at the north end of the lake. This appears both in his original diary, and in his more mature and condensed account contained in his article on the Dead Sea in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), where he writes, “When, in December, 1883. the writer found himself standing on the edge of the terrace overlooking the Ghor, he beheld at his feet a wide plain stretching away northward toward the margin of the Dead Sea, and to a large extent green with vegetation and thickets of small trees. To the right in an open space were seen several large Bedouin camps, from which the shouts of wild men, the barking of dogs, and the bellowing of camels ascended. Numerous flocks of black goats and white sheep were being tended by women in long blue cloaks; and on the party of travelers being observed, groups of merry children came tripping up toward the path accompanied by a few of the elders, and, ranging themselves in a line, courteously returned salutations. Here the Arabs remain enjoying the warmth, of the plain till the increasing heat of the summer’s sun calls them away to their high pasture grounds on the table-land of Edom and Moab. At a short distance farther toward the shore of the lake is the village of Es-Safieh, inhabited by a tribe of fellahin called the Ghawarneh, who by means of irrigation from the Wady el-Hessi cultivate with success fields of wheat, maize, dhurah, indigo and cotton, while they rear herds of camels and flocks of sheep and goats. On the produce of these fields the Arabs largely depend for

their supplies of food and raiment, which they obtain by a kind of rude, often compulsory, barter.”

LITERATURE.

Authorities favoring the south end of the Dead Sea: Dillmann, Genesis, 111 f; Robinson, BRP2, II, 187:ff; G. A. Smith, Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 505 ff; Baedeker-Socin, Palestine, III, 146; Buhl, Buhl, Geographic des alten Palastina, 117, 271, 274; see also especially Samuel Wolcott, “Site of Sodom,” Bibliotheca Sacra, XXV, 112-51. Favoring the north end: Sir George Grove in various articles in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible; Canon Tristram, Land of Moab, 330 ff; Selah Merrill, East of the Jordan, 232-39; W. M. Thomson, The Land and the Book.

George Frederick Wright

CITIES, STORE

<stor>.

See *CITY*.

CITIMS

<sit'-imz>.

See *CHITTIM* (1 Macc 8:5 the King James Version).

CITIZENSHIP

<sit'-i-zen-ship>: All the words in use connected with this subject are derived from [πόλις, polis], “city.”

1. PHILOLOGICAL:

These words, with the meanings which they have in the Bible, are the nouns, [πολίτης, polites], “citizen”; [πολιτεία, politeia], “citizenship”; [πολίτευμα, politeuma], “commonwealth”; [συμπολίτης, sumpolites], “fellow-citizen”; and the verb, [πολιτεύω, politeuo], “to behave as a citizen.” Each will be considered more fully in its proper place.

2. CIVIL:

(1) The word for citizen is sometimes used to indicate little if anything more than the inhabitant of a city or country. “The citizens of that country” (~~2151~~ Luke 15:15); “His citizens hated him” (~~2941~~ Luke 19:14). Also the quotation from the Septuagint, “They shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen” (~~881~~ Hebrews 8:11; compare ~~2613~~ Jeremiah 31:34). So also in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 4:50; 5:6; 9:19).

(2) Roman citizenship. — This is of especial interest to the Bible student because of the apostle Paul’s relation to it. It was one of his qualifications as the apostle to the Gentiles. Luke shows him in Acts as a Roman citizen, who, though a Jew and Christian receives, for the most part, justice and courtesy from the Roman officials, and more than once successfully claims its privileges. He himself declares that he was a citizen of Tarsus (~~4213~~ Acts 21:39). He was not only born in that city but had a citizen’s rights in it.

See PAUL; TARSUS.

But this citizenship in Tarsus did not of itself confer upon Paul the higher dignity of Roman citizenship. Had it done so, Claudius Lysias would not have ordered him to be scourged, as he did, after having learned that he was a citizen of Tarsus (~~4213~~ Acts 21:39; compare 22:25). So, over and above this Tarsian citizenship, was the Roman one, which availed for him not in one city only, but throughout the Roman world and secured for him everywhere certain great immunities and rights. Precisely what all of these were we are not certain, but we know that, by the Valerian and Porcian laws, exemption from shameful punishments, such as scourging with rods or whips, and especially crucifixion, was secured to every Roman citizen; also the right of appeal to the emperor with certain limitations. This sanctity of person had become almost a part of their religion, so that any violation was esteemed a sacrilege. Cicero’s oration against Verres indicates the almost fanatical extreme to which this feeling had been carried. Yet Paul had been thrice beaten with rods, and five times received from the Jews forty stripes save one (2 Cor 11:24,25). Perhaps it was as at Philippi before he made known his citizenship (~~4462~~ Acts 16:22,23), or the Jews had the right to whip those who came before their own tribunals. Roman citizenship included also the right of appeal to the emperor in all cases, after sentence had been passed, and no needless impediment must be interposed against a trial. Furthermore, the citizen had the right to be sent to Rome for trial before the emperor himself, when charged with capital

offenses (~~4165~~ Acts 16:37; 22:25-29; 25:11).

How then had Paul, a Jew, acquired this valued dignity? He himself tells us. In contrast to the parvenu citizenship of the chief captain, who seems to have thought that Paul also must have purchased it, though apparently too poor, Paul quietly, says, "But I was free born" (King James Versions; "a Roman born" the Revised Version (British and American), ~~4228~~ Acts 22:28). Thus either Paul's father or some other ancestor had acquired the right and had transmitted it to the son.

3. METAPHORICAL AND SPIRITUAL:

What more natural than that Paul should sometimes use this civic privilege to illustrate spiritual truths? He does so a number of times. Before the Sanhedrin he says, in the words of our English Versions, "I have lived before God in all good conscience" (~~4231~~ Acts 23:1). But this translation does not bring out the sense. Paul uses a noticeable word, politeuo, "to live as a citizen." He adds, "to God" ([$\tau\theta$ θεῷ, to Theo]). That is to say, he had lived conscientiously as God's citizen, as a member of God's commonwealth. The day before, by appealing to his Roman citizenship, he had saved himself from ignominious whipping, and now what more natural than that he should declare that he had been true to his citizenship in a higher state? What was this higher commonwealth in which he has enjoyed the rights and performed the duties of a citizen? What but theocracy of his fathers, the ancient church, of which the Sanhedrin was still the ostensible representative, but which was really continued in the kingdom of Christ without the national restrictions of the older one? Thus Paul does not mean to say simply, "I have lived conscientiously before God," but "I have lived as a citizen to God, of the body of which He is the immediate Sovereign." He had lived theocratically as a faithful member of the Jewish church, from which his enemies claimed he was an apostate. Thus Paul's conception was a kind of blending of two ideas or feelings, one of which came from the old theocracy, and the other from his Roman citizenship.

Later, writing from Rome itself to the Philippians, who were proud of their own citizenship as members of a colonia, a reproduction on a small scale of the parent commonwealth, where he had once successfully maintained his own Roman rights, Paul forcibly brings out the idea that Christians are citizens of a heavenly commonwealth, urging them to live worthy of such honor (~~5027~~ Philippians 1:27 margin).

A similar thought is brought out when he says, "For our commonwealth

([politeuma]) is in heaven” (~~503~~Philippians 3:20 margin). The state to which we belong is heaven. Though absent in body from the heavenly commonwealth, as was Paul from Rome when he asserted his rights, believers still enjoy its civic privileges and protections; sojourners upon earth, citizens of heaven. The Old Testament conception, as in Isaiah 60 through 62, would easily lend itself to this idea, which appears in ~~810~~Hebrews 11:10,16; 12:22-24; 13:14; ~~805~~Galatians 4:26, and possibly in Revelation 21.

See also ROME.

G. H. Trever

CITRON

<sit'-run>.

See APPLE.

CITY

<sit'-i> (ry[i'ir], hyr" qi[qiryah]; [πόλις, polis]):

I. THE CANAANITE CITY.

1. Origin:

The development of the Canaanite city has been traced by Macalister in his report on the excavation at Gezer (Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1904, 108 ff). It originated on the slopes of a bare rocky spur, in which the Neolithic Troglodytes quarried their habitations out of the solid rock, the stones therefrom being used to form a casing to the earthen ramparts, with which the site was afterwards surrounded and which served as a protection against the intrusion of enemies. Later Semitic intruders occupied the site, stone houses were built, and high stone defense walls were substituted for the earthen stone-cased ramparts. These later walls were much higher and stronger than those of the Neolithic occupation and were the walls seen by the Israelites when they viewed the country of their promise.

2. Extent:

“The people that dwell in the land are strong, and the cities are fortified, and very great” (~~0438~~Numbers 13:28) was the report of the spies sent by

Moses to spy out the land of Canaan, to see “what cities they are that they dwell in, whether in camps, or in strongholds” (~~Q139~~ Numbers 13:19,20). The difficulties of the task set before the advancing Israelites and their appreciation of the strength of the cities, is here recorded, and also in ~~Q138~~ Deuteronomy 1:28: “The people are greater and taller than we; the cities are great and fortified up to heaven; and moreover we have seen the sons of the Anakim there.” This assessment of greatness was based upon comparative ignorance of such fortifications and the want of war experience and the necessary implements of assault. It need not, therefore, be supposed that the cities were “great” except by comparison in the eyes of a tent-dwelling and pastoral people. On the contrary, most recent exploration has proved that they were small (see Pere Vincent, Canaan, 27, note 3, and Pl. I, where comparative measurements of the areas of ancient cities show that, in nine cities compared, Tell Sandahannah (barely 6 acres) is the smallest). Gezer measures approximately 22 1/4 acres and Tell el-Hesi somewhat greater. By way of illustration, it is interesting to note that the Acropolis at Athens, roughly computed, measures 7:1/4 acres, while the Castle Rock at Edinburgh is about 6 acres, or the same as the whole Seleucid city of Tell Sandahannah. The Acropolis at Tell Zakariya measures about 2 acres or nearly one-fourth of the area of the whole city (about 8 1/2 acres). It is unlikely that Jebus (Jerusalem) itself was an exception, although in Solomonian and later times it extended to a far greater area.

3. Villages:

Besides the walled cities there were “unwalled (country) towns a great many” (~~Q138~~ Deuteronomy 3:5), “villages,” unfortified suburbs, lying near to and under the protection of the walled cities and occupied by the surplus population. The almost incredible number of cities and their villages mentioned in the Old Testament, while proving the clannishness of their occupants, proves, at the same time, their comparatively small scale.

4. Sites:

Traces of similar populations that rise and fall are seen in China and Japan today. As a little poem says of Karakura:

*“Where were palaces and merchants and the blades of warriors,
Now are only the cicadas and waving blades of grass.”*

“Cities that stood on their mounds” (~~6113~~Joshua 11:13; ~~2808~~Jeremiah 30:18) as at Lachish and Taanach are distinguished from those built on natural hills or spurs of hills, such as Jebus, Gezer, Tell es Sail (Gath?), Bethshemesh (see Vincent, Canaan, 26 ff). The Arabic name “Tell” is applied to all mounds of ancient cities, whether situated on a natural eminence or on a plain, and the word is common in the geographical nomenclature of Palestine Sites were chosen near a water supply, which was ever the most essential qualification. For purposes of defense, the nearest knoll or spur was selected. Sometimes these knolls were of no great height and their subsequent elevation is accounted for by the gradual accumulation of debris from town refuse and from frequent demolitions; restoration being effected after a leveling up of the ruins of the razed city (see Fig. 2: Tell el-Hesi, Palestine Exploration Fund, which shows a section of the Tell from which the levels of the successive cities in distinct stratification were recovered). Closely packed houses, in narrow alleys, with low, rude mud, brick, or stone and mud walls, with timber and mud roofs, burned readily and were easily razed to the ground (~~4881~~Joshua 8:1 ff; 11:11).

It would seem that, viewed from the outside, these cities had the appearance of isolated forts, the surrounding walls being strengthened at frequent intervals, with towers. The gates were approached by narrow roads, which mounted the slopes of the mound at the meeting-point of the meandering paths on the plain below.

5. External Appearance:

The walls of Tell ej-Judeideh were strengthened by towers in the inside, and presented an unbroken circuit of wall to the outside view (see Fig. 4, PEF). Houses on the wall (~~4825~~Joshua 2:15; ~~4713~~2 Corinthians 11:33) may have been seen from the outside; but it is unlikely that any building within the walls was visible, except possibly the inner tower or stronghold. The whole of the interior of the early Jerusalem (Jebus) was visible from the hills to the East, but this peculiarity of position is uncommon. Strong and high walls, garrisoned by men-at-arms seen only through the battlements, showed no weakness, and the gates, with their narrow and steep approaches and projecting defense towers, looked uninviting traps. The mystery of these unseen interiors could therefore be easily conjured into an exaggeration of strength.

6. General:

The inhabitants of the villages (**twb**[banoth], “daughters,” **Numbers** 32:42 margin) held feudal occupation and gave service to their lord of the city (**mae**’em], “mother,” **2 Samuel** 20:19), in defense of their own or in attacks on their neighbor’s property. Such were the cities of the truculent, marauding kings of Canaan, whose broken territories lent themselves to the upkeep of a condition, of the weakness of which, the Israelites, in their solid advance, took ready advantage.

II. THE CITY OF THE JEWISH OCCUPATION.

After the conquest, and the abandonment of the pastoral life for that of agriculture and general trade, the condition of the cities varied but little, except that they were, from time to time, enlarged and strengthened. Solomon’s work at Jerusalem was a step forward, but there is little evidence that, in the other cities which he is credited with having put his hands to, there was any embellishment. Megiddo and Gezer at least show nothing worthy of the name. Greek influence brought with it the first real improvements in city building; and the later work of Herod raised cities to a grandeur which was previously undreamed of among the Jews. Within the walls, the main points considered in the “layout” were, the Tower or Stronghold, the High Place, the Broad Place by the Gate, and the Market-Place.

1. Tower or Stronghold:

The Tower or Stronghold was an inner fort which held a garrison and commander, and was provisioned with “victuals, and oil and wine” (**2 Chronicles** 11:11), to which the defenders of the city when hard pressed betook themselves, as a last resource. The men of the tower of Shechem held out against Abimelech (**Judges** 9:49) who was afterward killed by a stone thrown by a woman from the Tower of Thebez “within the city” (**Judges** 9:51,53). David took the stronghold of Zion, “the same is the city of David” (**2 Samuel** 5:7), which name (Zion) was afterward applied to the whole city. It is not unlikely that the king’s house was included in the stronghold. Macalister (Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1907, 192 ff) reports the discovery of a Canaanite castle with enormously thick walls abutting against the inside of the city wall. The

strongholds at Taanach and Tell el-Hesi are similarly placed; and the Acropolis at Tell Zakariya lies close to, but independent of, the city wall.

2. High Place:

The High Place was an important feature in all Canaanite cities and retained its importance long after the conquest (^{<10912>}1 Samuel 9:12 ff; ^{<10812>}1 Kings 3:2; ^{<10709>}Amos 7:9). It was a sanctuary, where sacrifices were offered and feasts were held, and men did “eat before Yahweh” (^{<64435>}Deuteronomy 14:26). The priests, as was their custom, received their portion of the flesh (^{<10912>}1 Samuel 2:12 ff). The High Place discovered at Gezer (Bible Sidelights, chapter iii) is at a lower level than the city surrounding it, and lies North and South. It is about 100 ft. in length, and when complete consisted of a row of ten rude undressed standing stones, of which eight are still remaining, the largest being 10 ft. 6 inches high, and the others varying to much smaller sizes.

See HIGH PLACE.

3. Broad Place:

The Broad Place (^{<3681>}Nehemiah 8:1,3,16; ^{<3481>}Jeremiah 5:1) seems to have been, usually, immediately inside the city gate. It was not, in early Jewish cities, an extensive open area, but simply a widening of the street, and was designated “broad” by comparison with the neighboring alleys, dignified by the name of street. It took the place of a general exchange. Justice was dispensed (^{<8042>}Ruth 4:2) and punishment was administered. Jeremiah was put in “the stocks that were in the upper gate of Benjamin” (^{<2412>}Jeremiah 20:2), proclamations were read, business was transacted, and the news and gossip of the day were exchanged. It was a place for all classes to congregate (^{<8807>}Job 29:7 m; ^{<3823>}Proverbs 31:23), and was also a market-place (^{<1010>}2 Kings 7:1). In later times, the market-place became more typically a market square of the Greek agora plan, with an open area surrounded by covered shelters. The present market-place at Haifa resembles this. Probably it was this type of market-place referred to in ^{<1116>}Matthew 11:16; 20:3 and ^{<1073>}Luke 7:32; 11:43. The street inside the Damascus gate of Jerusalem today is, in many ways, similar to the Broad Place, and retains many of its ancient uses. Here, Bedouin and Fellahin meet from the outlying districts to barter, to arbitrate, to find debtors and to learn the news of the day. Lying as it did immediately inside the gate, the Broad Place had a defensive value, in that it admitted of concentration

against the forcing of the gate. There does not seem to have been any plan of either a Canaanite or early Jewish city, in which this question of defense did not predominate. Open areas within the city were “waste places” (^{<288D>}Isaiah 58:12) and were not an integral part of the plan.

4. Streets:

The streets serving these quarters were not laid out on any fixed plan. They were, in fact, narrow, unpaved alleys, all seeming of equal importance, gathering themselves crookedly to the various centers. Having fixed the positions of the City Gates, the Stronghold and the High Place, the inhabitants appear to have been allowed to situate themselves the best way they could, without restriction of line or frontage. Houses were of modest proportions and were poorly built; planned, most often, in utter disregard of the square, and presenting to the street more or less dead walls, which were either topped by parapets or covered with projecting wood and mud roofs (*see* **ARCHITECTURE** Fig. 1; HOUSE).

The streets, as in the present day in Palestine, were allocated to separate trades: “bakers’ street” (^{<267D>}Jeremiah 37:21), place “of the merchants” (^{<403D>}Nehemiah 3:31,32 the King James Version), “goldsmiths,” etc. The Valley of the Cheesemakers was a street in the Tyropoeon Valley at Jerusalem.

For a discussion of the subject of “cisterns” , see the separate article under the word

5. General Characteristics:

The people pursued the industries consequent upon their own self-establishment. Agriculture claimed first place, and was their most highly esteemed occupation. The king’s lands were farmed by his subjects for his own benefit, and considerable tracts of lands belonged to the aristocracy. The most of the lands, however, belonged to the cities and villages, and were allotted among the free husbandmen. Various cereals were raised, wheat and barley being most commonly cultivated. The soil was tilled and the crops reaped and threshed in much the same manner and with much the same implements as are now used in Syria. Cities lying in main trade routes developed various industries more quickly than those whose positions were out of touch with foreign traffic. Crafts and trades, unknown to the early Jews, were at first monopolized by foreigners who, as a matter of course, were elbowed out as time progressed. Cities on the seaboard of Phoenicia

depended chiefly on maritime trade. Money, in the form of ingots and bars of precious metals, “weighed out” (^{<1211>}2 Kings 12:11), was current in preexilic times, and continued in use after foreign coinage had been introduced. The first native coinage dates from the Maccabean period (see Madden, *Jewish Coinage*, chapter iv). Slavery was freely trafficked in, and a certain number of slaves were attached to the households of the more wealthy. Although they were the absolute property of their masters, they enjoyed certain religious privileges not extended to the “sojourners” or “strangers” who sought the protection of the cities, often in considerable numbers.

The king’s private property, from which he drew full revenue, lay partly within the city, but to a greater extent beyond it (^{<1085>}1 Samuel 8:15,16). In addition to his private property, he received tithes of fields and flocks, “the tenth part of your seed.” He also drew a tax in the shape of certain “king’s mowings” (^{<3001>}Amos 7:1). Vassal kings, paid tribute; Mesha, king of Moab, rendered wool unto the king of Israel” (^{<1301>}2 Kings 3:4).

See G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, I, chapters v-x, for detailed account of the conditions of Jewish city life. For details of government, see ELDER; JUDGES; SANHEDRIN.

III. STORE CITIES.

These were selected by Solomon and set aside for stores of victuals, chariots, horsemen, etc. (^{<1099>}1 Kings 9:19). Jehoshaphat “built in Judah castles and cities of store” (^{<14712>}2 Chronicles 17:12). Twelve officers were appointed by Solomon to provision his household, each officer being responsible for the supply in one month in the year (^{<1047>}1 Kings 4:7). There were also “storehouses in the fields, in the cities, and in the villages” (^{<13725>}1 Chronicles 27:25 the King James Version).

IV. LEVITICAL CITIES.

These were apportioned 13 to the children of Aaron, 10 to Kohath, 13 to Gershon, 12 to Merari, 48 cities in all (^{<6213>}Joshua 21:13 ff), 6 of which were cities of Refuge (^{<4816>}Numbers 35:6); *see REFUGE, CITIES OF*. For further details *see ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE*.

Arch. C. Dickie

CITY OF CONFUSION

CITY OF DAVID

See **ZION**.

CITY OF DESTRUCTION

James Orr

CITY, GOLDEN

See GOLDEN CITY.

CITY OF PALM TREES

<paṁ'-trez> (μῦρῃῑῑ" ry[iḥir ha-temarim]).

See JERICO (^{<ḡ34ḡ>}Deuteronomy 34:3; ^{<ḡ016>}Judges 1:16; 3:13; ^{<ḡ35>}2 Chronicles 28:15).

CITY OF SALT

See SALT, CITY OF.

CITY OF WATERS

See RABBAH.

CITY, ROYAL

See RABBAH.

CITY, RULERS OF

<rool'-erz>: The English Versions of the Bible rendering of the [πολιτάρχαι, politarchai], of Thessalonica, before whom Jason and the other Christians were dragged by the mob (^{<ḡ17ḡ>}Acts 17:6,8). The term distinguishes the magistrates of a free Greek city from the ordinary Roman officials. It primarily denotes “rulers of the citizens,” and hence, was used only of magistrates of free cities. The term seems to have been confined largely to Macedonia, although there have been found a few inscriptions elsewhere in which it is used. The use of this term well illustrates the accuracy of the author of the Book of Acts, for while politarchai is not used by classical authors, this form is attested by a number of Macedonian inscriptions. Much work has been done in this field in recent years and the results throw light on the reference in Acts. Of the inscriptions that have been found at least five belong to Thessalonica (see article by Professor Burton, in the American Journal of Theology of 1898, “The Politarchs”).

“The rulers” of Philippi, before whom Paul and Silas were brought is the English Versions of the Bible rendering of [ἄρχοντες, archonies], which is commonly used in the New Testament (^{<ḡ16ḡ>}Acts 16:19). This is the ordinary term for “rulers” and is not the same as “rulers of the city.”

A. W. Fortune

CLAP

An emphatic expression of joy, “They clapped their hands ([nakhah]), and said, Long live (the King James Version “God save”) the king” (^{<12112>}2 Kings 11:12); “Oh clap your hands ([taqa`]), all ye peoples” (^{<19501>}Psalm 47:1); or exultation ([caphaq], ^{<25025>}Lamentations 2:15; [macha’], ^{<25516>}Ezekiel 25:6; [taqa`], Nah 3:19); or repudiation ([caphaq], ^{<18273>}Job 27:23; 34:37).

Figurative: To denote Nature’s “sympathy” with God’s people. “Let the floods clap ([macha’]) their hands” (^{<19808>}Psalm 98:8); “All the trees of the field shall clap their hands” (^{<25512>}Isaiah 55:12; compare ^{<10131>}Judges 5:20).

CLASPS

^{<klasps>} (^{Sr}q,[qerec]): The word occurs nine times in Exodus 26; 36; and 39, which record the specifications for the erection of the tabernacle and their subsequent carrying out. In each of these passages the King James Version renders “taches” — an early English word of French origin now embodied in our “attachment.” 50 clasps or taches of gold were ordered to be used in connecting together the two sets of inner tapestry curtains (10 in number) of the tabernacle (^{<12316>}Exodus 26:6), and 50 clasps of brass (bronze) were similarly to be used in joining the two sets of goats’ hair curtains (11 in number) which formed the outer covering (^{<12311>}Exodus 26:11). *See* **TABERNACLE**. As to the nature of the clasp itself, it seems to have belonged to a double set of loops, opposite to each other, to one of which in each set, required to be of blue cord, a gold or brass button or pin was attached, which, being inserted into the loop opposite, kept the curtain in position (^{<12314>}Exodus 26:4-6).

A difficulty arises from the direction in ^{<12333>}Exodus 26:33 that the veil which divided the “dwelling” into two parts — the holy place and the most holy — was to be suspended “under the clasps.” If the clasps are supposed to be midway in the total length of the tabernacle, this would make the two holy places to be of equal size, contrary to the usual assumption that the outer was twice the length of the inner. The term “under” must therefore be used with some latitude, or the ordinary conception of the arrangement of the curtains, or of the size of the holy places will have to be revised (the dimensions are not actually given in the description).

CLAUDA

<klo'-da>.

See CAUDA.

CLAUDIA

<klo'-di-a> ([λαυδία, Klaudia]): A member of the Christian congregation at Rome, who, with other members of that church, sends her greetings, through Paul, to Timothy (2 Tim 4:21). More than this concerning her cannot be said with certainty. The Apostolical Constitutions (VII, 21) name her as the mother of Linus, mentioned subsequently by Irenaeus and Eusebius as bishop of Rome. An ingenious theory has been proposed, upon the basis of the mention of Claudia and Pudens as husband and wife in an epigram of Martial, that they are identical with the persons of the same name here mentioned. A passage in the Agricola of Tacitus and an inscription found in Chichester, England, have been used in favor of the further statement that this Claudia was a daughter of a British king, Cogidubnus. See argument by Alford in the Prolegomena to 2 Timothy in his Greek Testament. It is an example of how a very few data may be used to construct a plausible theory. If it be true, the contrast between their two friends, the apostle Paul, on the one hand, and the licentious poet, Martial, on the other, is certainly unusual. If in ²⁰²2 Timothy 4:21, Pudens and Claudia be husband and wife, it is difficult to explain how Linus occurs between them. See argument against this in Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers.

H. E. Jacobs

CLAUDIUS

<klo'-di-us> ([λαύδιος, Klaudios]): Fourth Roman emperor. He reigned for over 13 years (41-54 AD), having succeeded Caius (Caligula) who had seriously altered the conciliatory policy of his predecessors regarding the Jews and, considering himself a real and corporeal god, had deeply offended the Jews by ordering a statue of himself to be placed in the temple of Jerusalem, as Antiochus Epiphanes had done with the statue of Zeus in the days of the Maccabees (2 Macc 6:2). Claudius reverted to the policy of Augustus and Tiberius and marked the opening year of his reign by issuing edicts in favor of the Jews (Ant., XIX, 5), who were permitted

in all parts of the empire to observe their laws and customs in a free and peaceable manner, special consideration being given to the Jews of Alexandria who were to enjoy without molestation all their ancient rights and privileges. The Jews of Rome, however, who had become very numerous, were not allowed to hold assemblages there (Dio LX, vi, 6), an enactment in full correspondence with the general policy of Augustus regarding Judaism in the West. The edicts mentioned were largely due to the intimacy of Claudius with Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, who had been living in Rome and had been in some measure instrumental in securing the succession for Claudius. As a reward for this service, the Holy Land had a king once more. Judea was added to the tetrarchies of Philip and Antipas; and Herod Agrippa I was made ruler over the wide territory which had been governed by his grandfather. The Jews' own troubles during the reign of Caligula had given "rest" (the American Standard Revised Version "peace") to the churches "throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria" (~~418B~~ Acts 9:31). But after the settlement of these troubles, "Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the church" (~~412C~~ Acts 12:1). He slew one apostle and "when he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to seize" another (~~412B~~ Acts 12:3). His miserable death is recorded in ~~412D~~ Acts 12:20-23, and in Ant, XIX, 8. This event which took place in the year 44 AD is held to have been coincident with one of the visits of Paul to Jerusalem. It has proved one of the chronological pivots of the apostolic history.

Whatever concessions to the Jews Claudius may have been induced out of friendship for Herod Agrippa to make at the beginning of his reign, Suetonius records (Claud. chapter 25) "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit," an event assigned by some to the year 50 AD, though others suppose it to have taken place somewhat later. Among the Jews thus banished from Rome were Aquila and Priscilla with whom Paul became associated at Corinth (~~418D~~ Acts 18:2). With the reign of Claudius is also associated the famine which was foretold by Agabus (~~411D~~ Acts 11:28). Classical writers also report that the reign of Claudius was, from bad harvest or other causes, a period of general distress and scarcity over the whole world (Dio LX, 11; Suet. Claud. xviii; Tac. Ann. xi. 4; xiii.43; see Mommsen, Provinces of the Roman Empire, chapter ix; and Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul, I).

J. Hutchison

CLAUDIUS LYSIAS

<klo'-di-us lis'-i-as> [λαύδιος υσίας, Klaudios Lysias]): A chief captain who intervened when the Jews sought to do violence to Paul at Jerusalem (^{<421>}Acts 21:31; 24:22). Lysias, who was probably a Greek by birth (compare ^{<421>}Acts 21:37), and who had probably assumed the Roman forename Claudius (^{<423>}Acts 23:26) when he purchased the citizenship (^{<423>}Acts 22:28), was a military tribune or chiliarch (i.e. leader of 1,000 men) in command of the garrison stationed in the castle overlooking the temple at Jerusalem. Upon learning of the riot instigated by the Asiatic Jews, he hastened down with his soldiers, and succeeded in rescuing Paul from the hands of the mob. As Paul was the apparent malefactor, Lysias bound him with two chains, and demanded to know who he was, and what was the cause of the disturbance. Failing amid the general tumult to get any satisfactory reply, he conducted Paul to the castle, and there questioned him as to whether he was the "Egyptian," an postor that had lately been defeated by Felix (Josephus, BJ, II, xiii, 5; Ant, XX, viii, 6). Upon receiving the answer of Paul that he was a "Jew of Tarsus," he gave him permission to address the people from the stairs which connected the castle and the temple. As the speech of Paul had no pacifying effect, Lysias purposed examining him by scourging; but on learning that his prisoner was a Roman citizen, he desisted from the attempt and released him from his bonds. The meeting of the Sanhedrin which Lysias then summoned also ended in an uproar, and having rescued Paul with difficulty he conducted him back to the castle. The news of the plot against the life of one whom he now knew to be a Roman citizen decided for Lysias that he could not hope to cope alone with so grave a situation. He therefore dispatched Paul under the protection of a bodyguard to Felix at Caesarea, along with a letter explaining the circumstances (^{<423>}Acts 23:26-30. The genuineness of this letter has been questioned by some, but without sufficient reason.) In this letter he took care to safeguard his own conduct, and to shield his hastiness in binding Paul. There is evidence (compare ^{<422>}Acts 24:22) that Lysias was also summoned to Caesarea at a later date to give his testimony, but no mention is made of his arrival there. It is probable, however, that he was among the chief captains who attended the trial of Paul before King Agrippa and Festus (compare ^{<422>}Acts 25:22). For the reference to him in the speech of Tertullus (see ^{<421>}Acts 24:7 the Revised Version, margin), *see TERTULLUS*.

C. M. Kerr

CLAW

<klo> (hṣr" P" [parcah], literally, "hoof"): One of the marks of a "clean" animal is stated thus: "Every beast that parteth the hoof, and cleaveth the cleft into two claws, ye shall eat" (⁴⁵⁴⁶Deuteronomy 14:6 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "hath the hoof cloven in two"). See CHEW; CUD. the King James Version uses the word "claws" where the Revised Version (British and American) supplies "hoofs" in ³⁸¹¹⁶Zechariah 11:16, "and will tear their hoofs in pieces," as the sheep are being overdriven. In the only other passage containing the word (²⁷⁰⁸³Daniel 4:33) there is no Hebrew equivalent in the original — "his nails like birds' (claws)."

CLAY

<kla> (rmj [chomer], 's" j] [chacaph], fyfi[TiT], fl m,[meleT], yb[] [abhi], hb[ḥ] [ma'abbeh], fyfb[] [abhTiT]; [πηλός, pelos], "wet clay," "mud"): True clay, which is a highly aluminous soil, is found in certain localities in Palestine, and is used in making pottery. The Hebrew and Greek words, as well as the English "clay," are, however, used loosely for any sticky mud. In making mud bricks, true clay is not always used, but ordinary soil is worked up with water and mixed with straw, molded and left to dry in the sun. [Chomer] (compare [chmar], "slime" or "bitumen") is rendered both "clay" and "mortar." [TiT] is rendered "clay" or "mire." In ²³⁴²⁵Isaiah 41:25 we have: "He shall come upon rulers as upon mortar ([chomer]), and as the potter treadeth clay" ([TiT]). In Nah 3:14, "Go into the clay ([TiT]), and tread the mortar ([chomer]); make strong the brickkiln" (i.e. make the walls ready to withstand a siege). [Chacaph] is the clay of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (²⁷⁰⁸³Daniel 2:33 ff). [MeleT] occurs only in ²⁴⁴⁹Jeremiah 43:9, where we find: the King James Version, "Take great stones and hide them in the clay in the brickkiln"; the Revised Version (British and American), "hide them in mortar in the brickwork"; the Revised Version, margin, "lay them with mortar in the pavement." In ³⁸¹¹⁶Habakkuk 2:6, [abhTiT] (found only here) is rendered in the King James Version "thick clay," as if from [abhi] and [TiT], but the Revised Version (British and American) has "pledges," referring the word to the root [abhaT], "to give a pledge." In ⁴¹⁰⁷⁴1 Kings 7:46, [ma'abbeh ha-'adhamah] (compare ⁴⁰⁴¹⁷2 Chronicles 4:17, [abhi ha-'adhamah]) is the

compact or clayey soil in the plain of Jordan between Succoth and Zarethan, in which Hiram cast the vessels of brass for Solomon's temple. In ^{<806>}John 9:6,11,14, Thayer gives "made mud of the spittle"; in ^{<802>}Romans 9:21, "wet clay."

Alfred Ely Day

CLEAN

^{<klen>} (Anglo-Saxon, cloene, "clear," "pure"): Rendering four Hebrew roots: **rBi**[bar], etc., "purify," "select," "make shining"; **ṣ**[zakh], etc., "bright," "clean" "pure"; **yqñ**[naqi], "free from," "exempt"; **rhē**[Taher], "clean," "pure," "empty," "bright" (?) the principal root, rendered "clean" 80 times (the King James Version); occurring in all its forms in various renderings about 200 times; also one Greek root, [**καθαρός**, **katharos**], etc., akin to [castus], "chaste," "free from admixture or adhesion of anything that soils, adulterates, corrupts" (Thayer's Lexicon). The physical, ritual, ethical, spiritual, figurative uses continually overlap, especially the last four.

1. PHYSICAL:

The physical use is infrequent: "Wash with snow water, and make my hands never so clean" ([zakhakh], ^{<808>}Job 9:30; figurative also); "clean provender" ([hamits], the Revised Version (British and American) "savory"; the Revised Version, margin "salted"); "Cleanse inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also" ([katharos], ^{<836>}Matthew 23:26); "arrayed in fine linen, clean ([katharon]) and white" (^{<698>}Revelation 19:8; the American Standard Revised Version "bright and pure").

2. CEREMONIAL:

The principal use was the ceremonial; applied to persons, places or things, "undefiled," "not causing defilement," or "from which defilement has just been removed"; [Taher], almost exclusively ceremonial, being the chief Hebrew root. [Katharos] (New Testament), or derivatives, has this use clearly in ^{<4044>}Mark 1:44; ^{<454>}Luke 5:14: "Offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses," etc.; ^{<803>}Hebrews 9:13,12,23: "the cleanness of the flesh," etc. "Clean" is applied to animals and birds: "of every clean beast" (^{<0002>}Genesis 7:2); "of all clean birds" (^{<6411>}Deuteronomy 14:11); (for list of

unclean creatures see Leviticus 14-20); to places: “Carry forth unto a clean place” (^{<10412>}Leviticus 4:12); to buildings: “Make atonement for the house; and it shall be clean” (^{<10443>}Leviticus 14:53); to persons: “A clean person shall take hyssop” (^{<10498>}Numbers 19:18); to clothing: “garment washed the second time, and shall be clean” (^{<10538>}Leviticus 13:58); and to objects of all sorts, free or freed from defilement.

3. ETHICAL OR SPIRITUAL:

The ethical or spiritual meaning, either directly or figuratively, is found in the Old Testament chiefly in Job, Psalms, the Prophets, whose interest is ethico-religious, rather than ritual, but the predominant uses are found in the New Testament: “Cleanse yourselves ([barar]) ye that bear the vessels of Yahweh” (^{<2521>}Isaiah 52:11); “How can he be clean ([zakhah]) that is born of a woman?” (^{<3254>}Job 25:4) (principally moral, perhaps with allusion to the ceremonial defilement of childbirth); “The fear of Yahweh is clean” (^{<1919>}Psalms 19:9), that is, the religion of Yahweh is morally undefiled, in contrast to heathen religions; “He that hath clean ([naqi]) hands, and a pure heart” (^{<1244>}Psalms 24:4); “Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean” ([Taher], ^{<1517>}Psalms 51:7); “Therefore said he, Ye are not all clean” ([katharos], ^{<1311>}John 13:11). Here, as in ^{<1517>}Psalms 51:7 and many others, the ritual furnishes a figure for the spiritual, illustrating the Divine purpose in the ritual, to impress, prefigure and prepare for the spiritual. A somewhat similar figurative moral use is found in ^{<4186>}Acts 18:6: “Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean” ([katharos], “guiltless,” “unstained”).

See also UNCLEAN; PURIFICATION; DEFILEMENT/ILEMENT.

Clean. — Adverb (in one case adjective): “utterly,” “wholly”; usually rendering an intensive use of the Hebrew verb as ^{<2007>}Joel 1:7: “He hath made it clean bare” (lit. “stripping he will strip”); ^{<3117>}Zechariah 11:17: “Arm clean dried up”; ^{<2419>}Isaiah 24:19 the King James Version: “Earth is clean dissolved.” Twice it renders a principal verb: ^{<1617>}Joshua 3:17: “Passed clean over the Jordan” (literally, “finished with regard to J.”); ^{<1322>}Leviticus 23:22 King James Version: “Shall not make a clean riddance” (literally, “shall not finish the corners”; the American Standard Revised Version “shalt not wholly reap”). Once it renders a noun: ^{<1718>}Psalms 77:8: “Is his lovingkindness clean gone for ever?” (“end,” [he-’aphec], “has his lovingkindness come to an end?”); and once an adverb “clean ([ὅντως, ontos], “actually,” “really”) escaped” (2 Pet 2:18); but the American

Standard Revised Version, following the reading “[oligos],” “a little,” “scarcely,” renders “just escaping.”

Philip Wendell Crannell

CLEANSE

<klenz>: “Make clean,” “purify” being a frequent rendering of the original. It is found often (American Revised Version) instead of “purge,” “purify” (the King James Version), renders nearly the same roots, and has the same overlapping phases, as “clean.”

1. PHYSICAL:

Physical cleansing, often figuratively used: “Stripes that wound cleanse away ([tamriq]) evil” (^{<1218>}Proverbs 20:30); “A hot wind not to winnow, nor to cleanse” ([barar], ^{<2441>}Jeremiah 4:11); “Straightway his leprosy was cleansed” ([katharizo], ^{<4088>}Matthew 8:3).

2. CEREMONIAL:

In the ceremonial sense:

(1) With a very strong religious aspect: to purify from sin by making atonement ([chaTe]); e.g. the altar, by the sin offering (^{<0286>}Exodus 29:36); the leprous house (^{<0848>}Leviticus 14:48-53); the people, by the offering of the Day of Atonement (^{<0860>}Leviticus 16:30); the sanctuary, by the blood of the sin offering (^{<2658>}Ezekiel 45:18 ff).

(2) To expiate ([kaphar], “cover,” “hide”); sin (in this case blood-guiltiness): “The land cannot be cleansed of the blood” (the King James Version ^{<0853>}Numbers 35:33; the American Standard Revised Version “no expiation can be made for the land”).

(3) To remove ceremonial defilement, the principal use, for which the chief root is [Taher]: “Take the Levites and cleanse them” (^{<0086>}Numbers 8:6); “and she shall be cleansed (after childbirth) from the fountain of her blood” (^{<0827>}Leviticus 12:7); “Cleanse it, and hallow it (the altar) from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel” (^{<0869>}Leviticus 16:19), etc. This use is infrequent in the New Testament, except figuratively. Clear instances are ^{<4044>}Mark 1:44: “Offer for thy cleansing ([katharismos]) for a testimony unto them” (also ^{<0514>}Luke 5:14); ^{<3022>}Hebrews 9:22,23: “necessary therefore

that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these.” Physical, ritual, and figurative uses are combined in ^{<1225>}Matthew 23:25: “Ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter.” ^{<4015>}Acts 10:15: “What God hath cleansed, make not thou common” uses the figure of the ritual to declare the complete abolition of ceremonial defilement and hence, of ceremonial cleansing. For the elaborate system of ceremonial cleansing see especially Leviticus 12 through 17, also articles *UNCLEAN; PURIFICATION*. Its principal agencies were water, alone, as in minor or indirect defilements, like those produced by contact with the unclean (^{<0155>}Leviticus 15:5-18, etc.); or combined with a sin offering and burnt offering, as with a woman after childbirth (12:6-8); fire, as with Gentile booty (^{<0123>}Numbers 31:23; by water, when it would not endure the fire); the ashes of a red heifer without spot, mingled with running water, for those defiled by contact with the dead (^{<0492>}Numbers 19:2 ff). For the complex ceremonial in cases of leprosy, combining water, cedar, hyssop, crimson thread, the blood and flight of birds, the trespass offering, sin offering, burnt offering, see Leviticus 14. Blood, the vehicle and emblem of life, plays a large part in the major cleansings, in which propitiation for sin, as well as the removal of ceremonial defilement, is prominent, as of the temple, altar, etc.: “According to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood” (^{<3002>}Hebrews 9:22).

3. ETHICAL AND SPIRITUAL:

In the ethical and spiritual sense, using the symbolism chiefly of 2. This embodies two phases:

- (1) the actual removal of sin by the person's own activity, “Wherewith shall a young man cleanse ([zakhah]) his way?” (^{<4900>}Psalms 119:9); “Cleanse your hands, ye sinners” (^{<3048>}James 4:8); “Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement” (2 Cor 7:1);
- (2) God's removal of the guilt and power of sin, as, by discipline or punishment: “He cleanseth it” (^{<0152>}John 15:2, the King James Version “purgeth”); “I have cleansed thee” (^{<0243>}Ezekiel 24:13); or in forgiveness, justification, sanctification. In these latter cases the exculpatory idea is sometimes the prominent, although the other is not absent: “I will cleanse ([Taher]) them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities” (^{<0438>}Jeremiah 33:8); “Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse ([Taher], “declare me clean”) me from my sin” (^{<0502>}Psalms 51:2). “Cleanse ([naqqeh]; the American

Standard Revised Version “clear”) thou me from hidden faults” (^{<1912>}Psalm 19:12), while formally to be understood “hold innocent,” really connotes forgiveness. In ^{<1913>}Ephesians 5:26, it is hard to determine whether pardon or God-given holiness is predominant: “That he might sanctify it (the church), having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word.” In ^{<1917>}1 John 1:7, the sanctificatory meaning seems almost wholly to absorb the other: “The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us (“is purifying, sanctifying”) from all sin”; but in 1:9 it is again hard to determine the predominance: “He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sin, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” The uncertainty lies in that the second clause may not, as in our speech, add a distinct idea, but may be Hebrew synonymous parallelism. Perhaps it is not wise to seek too curiously to disentangle the two ideas, since they cannot be separated. God never “clears” where he has not begun to “cleanse,” and never “cleanses” by the Spirit without “clearing” through the blood.

Philip Wendell Crannell

CLEAR; CLEARNESS

^{<kler>}, ^{<kler'-nes>} (^{rB} [bar]; [^{<1917>}διαβλέπω, diablepo]): Equivalent of several Hebrew and Greek words for bright, unclouded, shining without obstruction, distinct, brilliant; “clearer than the noon-day” (^{<1917>}Job 11:17); “clear as the sun” (Song 6:10); “clear shining after rain” (^{<1913>}2 Samuel 23:4); “clear heat in sunshine” (^{<1913>}Isaiah 18:4); “clear as crystal” (^{<1917>}Revelation 21:11). Adverb, “clearly,” for distinctly (^{<1913>}Matthew 7:5; ^{<1913>}Mark 8:25; ^{<1913>}Romans 1:20). Noun, “clearness,” for brilliancy, in ^{<1913>}Exodus 24:10, “as the very heaven for clearness.”

From this physical, it is applied, in a moral sense, to character, as spotless and free from guilt, or charge, or obligation “from oath” (^{<1913>}Genesis 24:8); “from transgression” (^{<1913>}Psalm 19:13). Hence, the verb “to clear” means juridically to declare or prove innocent, to vindicate (^{<1913>}Genesis 44:16; ^{<1913>}Exodus 34:7; ^{<1913>}Numbers 14:18; compare [hagnos], ^{<1913>}2 Corinthians 7:11, the Revised Version (British and American) “pure”) “Be clear when thou judgest” (^{<1913>}Psalm 51:4) refers to the proof and vindication of the righteousness of God.

H. E. Jacobs

CLEAVE

<klev>: Is used in the Bible in two different senses:

(1) [q" B:[baqa`] “to split,” or “to rend.” We are told that Abraham “clave the wood for the burnt-offering” (<0228>Genesis 22:3), and that “they clave the wood of the cart” (<0064>1 Samuel 6:14). The Psalmist speaks of Yahweh cleaving fountain and flood (<1974>Psalm 74:15), and the plowman cleaving the earth (<1930>Psalm 141:7). For other examples see <0759>Judges 15:19; <2109>Ecclesiastes 10:9; <1985>Psalm 78:15; <3189>Habakkuk 3:9.

(2) qb" D:[dabhaq]; [κολλάω, kollao], “to adhere to,” or “to join one’s self to.” This meaning is the reverse of the preceding. The Psalmist speaks of his tongue cleaving to the roof of his mouth (<1906>Psalm 137:6). We are told that a man should cleave unto his wife (<0024>Genesis 2:24; <0095>Matthew 19:5). It is said that Ruth clave unto her mother-in-law (<0014>Ruth 1:14), and that certain men clave unto Paul (<4174>Acts 17:34; compare 4:23; 11:23 margin).

“Cleave” is also used in this sense to describe one’s adherence to principles. Paul admonished the Romans to cleave to that which is good (<5129>Romans 12:9).

A. W. Fortune

CLEFT; CLIFF; CLIFT

<kleft>, <klif>, <klift>: The first of these words, from cleave, “to split,” is a crevice or narrow opening, as “of the ragged rocks” (<2121>Isaiah 2:21); “under the clefts of the rocks” (<2505>Isaiah 57:5). “Clift” is an obsolete form of cleft, found in the King James Version <1232>Exodus 33:22; <2505>Isaiah 57:5, but not in the Revised Version (British and American). “Cliff,” an abrupt, precipitous, towering rock, is not in the Revised Version (British and American), but is found in the King James Version <4106>2 Chronicles 20:16, the Revised Version (British and American) “ascent,” <3305>Job 30:6.

CLEMENCY

<klem'-en-si> ([ἐπιείκεια, epietkeia], “fairness,” “sweet reasonableness,” <4204>Acts 24:4): The Greek word is rendered elsewhere “gentleness,” <4001>2 Corinthians 10:1; <3182>Titus 3:2, “meekness”; <3187>James 3:17; <1128>1 Peter 2:18.

CLEMENT

<klem'-ent> ([λήμης, *Klemes*], “mild”): A fellow-worker with Paul at Philippi, mentioned with especial commendation in ~~<104B>~~Philippians 4:3. The name being common, no inference can be drawn from this statement as to any identity with the author of the Epistle to the Corinthians published under this name, who was also the third bishop of Rome. The truth of this supposition (“it cannot be called a tradition,” Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers*, 120), although found in Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and Jerome, can neither be proved nor disproved. Even Roman Catholic authorities dispute it (article “Clement,” *Catholic Cyclopaedia*, IV, 13). The remoteness between the two in time and place is against it; “a wholly uncritical view” (Cruttwell, *Literary History of Early Christianity*, 31).

H. E. Jacobs

CLEMENT

<klem'-ent> ([λήμης, *Klemes*], “mild”): A fellow-worker with Paul at Philippi, mentioned with especial commendation in ~~<104B>~~Philippians 4:3. The name being common, no inference can be drawn from this statement as to any identity with the author of the Epistle to the Corinthians published under this name, who was also the third bishop of Rome. The truth of this supposition (“it cannot be called a tradition,” Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers*, 120), although found in Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and Jerome, can neither be proved nor disproved. Even Roman Catholic authorities dispute it (article “Clement,” *Catholic Cyclopaedia*, IV, 13). The remoteness between the two in time and place is against it; “a wholly uncritical view” (Cruttwell, *Literary History of Early Christianity*, 31).

H. E. Jacobs

CLEOPAS

<kle'-o-pas> ([λεόπας, *Kleopas*], “renowned father”): One of the two disciples whom Jesus met on the way to Emmaus (~~<24B>~~Luke 24:18). The name is a contraction of Cleopatros, not identical with Clopas of ~~<19B>~~John 19:25.

See also ALPHAEUS; CLOPAS.

CLEOPATRA

<kle-o-pa'-tra> ([λεοπάτρα, *Kleopatra*], “from a famous father”): A daughter of Ptolemy VI (Philometor) and of Queen Cleopatra, who was married first to Alexander Balas 150 BC (1 Macc 10:58; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iv, 1) and was afterward taken from him by her father and given to Demetrius Nicator on the invasion of Syria by the latter (1 Macc 11:12; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iv, 7). Alexander was killed in battle against the joint forces of Ptolemy and Demetrius while Demetrius was in captivity in Parthia. Cleopatra married his brother Antiochus VII (Sidetes), who in the absence of Demetrius had gained possession of the Syrian throne (137 BC). She was probably privy (Appian, Syriac., 68) to the murder of Demetrius on his return to Syria 125 BC, but Josephus (Ant., XIII, ix, 3) gives a different account of his death. She afterward murdered Seleucus, her eldest son by Nicator, who on his father's death had taken possession of the government without her consent. She attempted unsuccessfully to poison her second son by Nicator, Antiochus VIII (Grypus), for whom she had secured the succession, because he was unwilling to concede to her what she considered her due Share of power. She was herself poisoned (120 BC) by the draught which she had prepared for their son (Justin 39). She had also a son by Antiochus VII (Sidetes Antiochus Cyzicenus), who took his name from the place in which he was educated. He was killed in battle 95 BC. The name Cleopatra was borne by many Egyptian princesses, the first of whom was daughter of Antiochus III and was married to Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) 193 BC.

J. Hutchison

CLEOPHAS

<kle'-o-fas>.

See CLOPAS.

CLERK

See TOWN CLERK.

CLIFF; CLIFT

See CLEFT.

CLOAK; CLOKE

<klok>, ([l y[m] me'il], [hl mɛi simlah], etc.; [ἱμάτιον, himation], [στολή, stole], etc.): “Clope” is retained in the English Revised Version, as in the King James Version, instead of modern “cloak” (American Revised Version). In the Old Testament, *me'il* (compare New Testament himation) uniformly stands for the ordinary upper garment worn over the coat (*kethoneth*). In ^{<0150>}Matthew 5:40 both “cloak” and “coat” are mentioned together; compare ^{<0159>}Luke 6:29. In size and material the “cloak” differed according to age and sex, class and occupation, but in shape it was like our mantle or shawl. It might be sewed up to have the surplice form of the robe of the Ephod (^{<0243>}Exodus 39:23), or be worn loose and open like a Roman toga, the Arabic Abaa, or the Geneva gown. This is the “garment” referred to in ^{<0392>}Genesis 39:12; ^{<0226>}Exodus 22:26; ^{<0243>}Deuteronomy 24:13; “the robe” that Jonathan “stripped himself of” and gave to David (^{<0804>}1 Samuel 18:4); “the robe” of Saul, “the robe” in which it is said the “old man” (Samuel) was “covered” (^{<0844>}1 Samuel 28:14); and in the New Testament “the best robe” put on the returning prodigal (^{<0152>}Luke 15:22). Paul’s “cloak” that he left at Troas (^{<0413>}2 Timothy 4:13; [phailones], Latin, paenula, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek phelones), it has been suggested, “may have been a light mantle like a cashmere dust-cloak, in which the books and parchment were wrapped” (HDB, under the word).

Figuratively: The word lent itself easily and naturally to figurative uses. We find Paul (^{<0176>}1 Thessalonians 2:5) disclaiming using “a cloak of covetousness” (compare ^{<0126>}1 Peter 2:16) and Jesus (^{<0152>}John 15:22) saying, “Now they have no excuse (“cloak”) for their sin.” Some such usage seems common to all languages; compare English “palliate.”

See *DRESS*.

George B. Eager

CLOD

In ^{<0876>}Job 7:5 ([vygi gish], [vYg, gush], “a mass of earth”), “clods of dust,” the crust of his sores, formed by the dry, swollen skin — a symptom of leprosy, though not peculiar to it. In ^{<0213>}Job 21:33; 38:38 ([bgr, reghebh], “a soft clod,” “lump of clay”), “The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him,” “The clods cleave fast together.” In ^{<0417>}Joel 1:17 ([hprgn,]

meghraphah], “a furrow,” “something thrown off” (by the spade)), “The seeds rot (m “shrivel”) under their clods.”

Figurative: “Jacob shall break his clods” (^{<2801>}Hosea 10:11), i.e. “must harrow for himself,” used figuratively of spiritual discipline (compare ^{<2334>}Isaiah 28:24 the King James Version).

M. O. Evans

CLOPAS; CLEOPHAS

<klo'-pas> ([*λωπάς*, *Klopas*): The former in the Revised Version (British and American), the latter in the King James Version, of ^{<4925>}John 19:25, for the name of the husband of one of the women who stood by the cross of Christ. Upon the philological ground of a variety in pronunciation of the Hebrew root, sometimes identified with Alpheus, the father of James the Less. Said by tradition to have been the brother of Joseph, the husband of Mary; see *BRETHREN OF THE LORD*. Distinguished from Cleopas, a Greek word, while Clopas is Aramaic

CLOSE

<kloz>, *<klos>* verb, adjective and adverb, ([*hsk*; *kasah*], [*rgæ*, *saghar*]; [*καμύω*, *kammuo*): Other words are *harah*, “to burn”; “Shalt thou reign, because thou closest thyself in cedar?” (^{<4215>}Jeremiah 22:15 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) “strivest to excel in cedar,” margin “viest with the cedar”; *atsam*, “to harden”; “Yahweh has closed your eyes” (^{<2390>}Isaiah 29:10); *gadhar*, “to hedge” or “wall up” (^{<3091>}Amos 9:11); *atsar*, “to restrain” (^{<01208>}Genesis 20:18). In ^{<0101>}Luke 4:20, *ptusso*, “to fold up.” the Revised Version (British and American) has “was closed,” margin “is opened,” for “are open” (^{<00413>}Numbers 24:3,15), “closed” for “narrow” or “covered” (^{<2416>}Ezekiel 40:16; 41:16,26). To “keep close,” *sigao* (^{<4026>}Luke 9:36), the Revised Version (British and American) “held their peace.” We have also “kept close” (the Revised Version (British and American) ^{<04513>}Numbers 5:13; Hebrew *sathar*, “to hide”); also ^{<18321>}Job 28:21; “kept himself close,” the Revised Version, margin “shut up” (^{<13201>}1 Chronicles 12:1); “close places,” *micgereth* (^{<01246>}2 Samuel 22:46; ^{<0185>}Psalms 18:45 = “castles or holds shut in with high walls”).

W. L. Walker

CLOSET

<kloz'-et>: Is the rendering in the King James Version of

(1) [hPj ʰhuppah], and

(2) [ταμείον, *tameion*], also *tamieion*. *Huppah*, derived from *haphah*, “to cover,” was probably originally the name of the tent specially set apart for the bride, and later (<2016> Joel 2:16) used for the bride’s chamber. The word *tameion*, originally storeroom (compare <2124> Luke 12:24, the King James Version “storehouse”; the Revised Version (British and American) “storechamber”), but since for safety it was the inner rooms of the Hebrew house which were used for storage purposes, the word came to mean inner room, as in <4186> Matthew 6:6; <2178> Luke 12:3, in both the King James Version “closet” (compare <4186> Matthew 24:26, the King James Version “secret chamber”). In all cases the Revised Version (British and American) uses “inner chamber.”

See also *HOUSE*.

David Foster Estes

CLOTH; CLOTHING

<kloth>, <kloth'-ing>.

See *DRESS*.

CLOTHED, UPON

<klothd>, ([ἐπενδύω, *ependuo*], “to put on over” another garment): Used only in <4182> 2 Corinthians 5:2,4. In 5:4 in contrast with unclothed, compare <4153> 1 Corinthians 15:53 f, in which the idea of putting on, as a garment, is expressed of incorruption and immortality. The meaning here is very subtle and difficult of interpretation. In all probability Paul thinks of a certain envelopment of his physical mortal body even in this life (“in this we groan,” i.e. in this present body), hence, the force of the prefixed preposition. The body itself was regarded by the philosophers of his day as a covering of the soul, and hence, it was to be clothed upon and at the same time transformed by the superimposed heavenly body. *Ependutes*, an outer garment, is used several times in Septuagint for *me'il*, an upper garment or robe (compare <4207> John 21:7).

Walter G. Clippinger

CLOTHES, RENDING OF

<klothz>, ([t [ʔeʔ]µydjB] kerī`ath beghadhim]): This term is used to describe an ordinary tear made in a garment. Samuel's skirt was rent when Saul laid hold upon it (<0157> 1 Samuel 15:27). Jesus spoke about a rent being made in a garment (<0196> Matthew 9:16). The term is also used to describe a Hebrew custom which indicated deep sorrow. Upon the death of a relative or important personage, or when there was a great calamity, it was customary for the Hebrews to tear their garments. Reuben rent his clothes when he found that Joseph had been taken from the pit (<0379> Genesis 37:29). The sons of Jacob rent their clothes when the cup was found in Benjamin's sack (<0443> Genesis 44:13). A messenger came to Eli with his clothes rent to tell of the taking of the ark of God and of the death of his two sons (<0602> 1 Samuel 4:12). David rent his garments when he heard that Absalom had slain his brothers (<0631> 2 Samuel 13:31). See also <0652> 2 Samuel 15:32; <0837> 2 Kings 18:37; <0852> Isaiah 36:22; <0405> Jeremiah 41:5. Rending of clothes was also an expression of indignation. The high priest rent his garment when Jesus spoke what he thought was blasphemy (<0166> Matthew 26:65).

See also MOURNING.

A. W. Fortune

CLOUD

<kloud> ([^n[; `anan], [b[; `abh]; [νεφέλη, nephele], [νέφος, nephos]):

I. CLOUDS IN PALESTINE.

In the Bible few references are found of particular clouds or of clouds in connection with the phenomena of the weather conditions. The weather in Palestine is more even and has less variety than that in other lands. It is a long, narrow country with sea on the West and desert on the East. The wind coming from the West is always moist and brings clouds with it. If the temperature over the land is low enough the clouds will be condensed and rain will fall, but if the temperature is high, as in the five months of summer, there can be no rain even though clouds are seen. As a whole the winter is cloudy and the summer clear.

1. Rain Clouds:

In the autumn rain storms often arise suddenly from the sea, and what

seems to be a mere haze, “as small as a man’s hand,” such as Gehazi saw (^{<1184>}1 Kings 18:44) over the sea, within a few hours becomes the black storm cloud pouring down torrents of rain (^{<1185>}1 Kings 18:45). Fog is almost unknown and there is very seldom an overcast, gloomy day. The west and southwest winds bring rain (^{<1254>}Luke 12:54).

2. Disagreeable Clouds:

In the months of April, May and September a hot east wind sometimes rises from the desert and brings with it a cloud of dust which fills the air and penetrates everything. In the summer afternoons, especially in the month of August, on the seacoast there is apt to blow up from the South a considerable number of low cirro-stratus clouds which seem to fill the air with dampness, making more oppressive the dead heat of summer. These are doubtless the detested “clouds without water” mentioned in (^{<612>}Jude 1:12, and “heat by the shade of a cloud” (^{<2575>}Isaiah 25:5).

II. FIGURATIVE USES.

1. Yahweh’s Presence and Glory:

The metaphoric and symbolic uses of clouds are many, and furnish some of the most powerful figures of Scripture. In the Old Testament, Yahweh’s presence is made manifest and His glory shown forth in a cloud. The cloud is usually spoken of as bright and shining, and it could not be fathomed by man: “Thou hast covered thyself with a cloud, so that no prayer can pass through” (^{<2784>}Lamentations 3:44). Yahweh Himself was present in the cloud (^{<1299>}Exodus 19:9; 24:16; 34:5) and His glory filled the places where the cloud was (^{<1260>}Exodus 16:10; 40:38; ^{<4184>}Numbers 10:34); “The cloud filled the house of Yahweh” (^{<1080>}1 Kings 8:10). In the New Testament we often have “the Son of man coming on” or “with clouds” (^{<1260>}Matthew 24:30; 26:64; ^{<4136>}Mark 13:26; 14:62; ^{<2127>}Luke 21:27) and received up by clouds (^{<4009>}Acts 1:9). The glory of the second coming is indicated in (^{<6007>}Revelation 1:7 for “he cometh with the clouds” and “we that are alive shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord” and dwell with Him (^{<5447>}1 Thessalonians 4:17).

2. Pillar of Cloud:

The pillar of cloud was a symbol of God’s guidance and presence to the children of Israel in their journeys to the promised land. The Lord appeared in a pillar of cloud and forsook them not (^{<4009>}Nehemiah 9:19). They followed the guidance of this cloud (^{<1246>}Exodus 40:36; ^{<1784>}Psalms 78:14).

3. *Bow in Cloud:*

The clouds are spoken of in the Old Testament as the symbol of God's presence and care over His people; and so the "bow in the cloud" (^{<0093>}Genesis 9:13) is a sign of God's protection.

4. *Clouds Blot Out:*

As the black cloud covers the sky and blots out the sun from sight, so Yahweh promises "to blot out the sins" of Israel (^{<2402>}Isaiah 44:22); Egypt also shall be conquered, "As for her, a cloud shall cover her" (^{<2508>}Ezekiel 30:18; compare ^{<2801>}Lamentations 2:1).

5. *Transitory:*

There is usually a wide difference in temperature between day and night in Palestine. The days are warm and clouds coming from the sea are often completely dissolved in the warm atmosphere over the land. As the temperature falls, the moisture again condenses into dew and mist over the hills and valleys. As the sun rises the "morning cloud" (^{<2004>}Hosea 6:4) is quickly dispelled and disappears entirely. Job compares the passing of his prosperity to the passing clouds (^{<1805>}Job 30:15).

6. *God's Omnipotence and Man's Ignorance:*

God "bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds" (^{<1808>}Job 26:8) and the "clouds are the dust of his feet" (^{<3003>}Nahum 1:3). Yahweh "commands the clouds that they rain no rain" (^{<2006>}Isaiah 5:6), but as for man, "who can number the clouds?" (^{<1837>}Job 38:37); "Can any understand the spreadings of the clouds?" (^{<1862>}Job 36:29); "Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of him who is perfect in knowledge?" (^{<1876>}Job 37:16). **See BALANCINGS.** "He that regardeth the clouds shall not reap" (^{<2104>}Ecclesiastes 11:4), for it is God who controls the clouds and man cannot fathom His wisdom. "Thick clouds are a covering to him" (^{<1824>}Job 22:14).

7. *Visions:*

Clouds are the central figure in many visions. Ezekiel beheld "a stormy wind out of the north, a great cloud" (^{<2004>}Ezekiel 1:4), and John saw "a white cloud; and on the cloud one sitting" (^{<6644>}Revelation 14:14). See also ^{<2073>}Daniel 7:13; ^{<6001>}Revelation 10:1; 11:12.

8. *The Terrible and Unpleasant:*

The cloud is also the symbol of the terrible and of destruction. The day of Yahweh's reckoning is called the "day of clouds" (^{<3018>}Ezekiel 30:3) and a day of "clouds and thick darkness" (^{<3015>}Zephaniah 1:15). The invader is expected to "come up as clouds" (^{<2043>}Jeremiah 4:13). Joel (2:2) foretells the coming of locusts as "a day of clouds and thick darkness" which is both literal and figurative. Misfortune and old age are compared to "the cloudy and dark day" (^{<3542>}Ezekiel 34:12) and "the clouds returning after rain" (^{<2122>}Ecclesiastes 12:2).

9. *Various Other Figures:*

Clouds are used in connection with various other figures. Rapidity of motion, "these that fly as a cloud" (^{<2308>}Isaiah 60:8). As swaddling clothes of the newborn earth (^{<3840>}Job 38:9); indicating great height (^{<3506>}Job 20:6) and figurative in ^{<2344>}Isaiah 14:14, "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds," portraying the self-esteem of Babylon. "A morning without clouds" is the symbol of righteousness and justice (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 23:4); partial knowledge and hidden glory (^{<3142>}Leviticus 16:2; ^{<4009>}Acts 1:9; ^{<6007>}Revelation 1:7).

Alfred H. Joy

CLOUD, PILLAR OF.

See CLOUD, II, 2; PILLAR OF CLOUD.

CLOUT

^{<klout>}: As substantive ([^{<twbj>} ^{<Shah>} *sha-sehabhoth*]) a patch or piece of cloth, leather, or the like, a rag, a shred, or fragment. Old "cast clouts and old rotten rags" (^{<2891>}Jeremiah 38:11,12 the King James Version). As verb ([^{<al f>} *Tala*']) "to bandage," "patch," or mend with a clout. "Old shoes and clouted (the American Standard Revised Version "patched") upon their feet" (^{<6005>}Joshua 9:5; compare Shakespeare, *Cym.*, IV, 2: "I thought he slept, And put my clouted brogues from off my feet"; Milton, *Comus*: "And the dull swain treads on it daily with his clouted shoon.")

CLOVEN

<*klo'-v'-n*>: In the Old Testament, represented by a participle from [[*sæ* shasa], “to split,” and applied to beasts that divide the hoof (^{<B11B>}Leviticus 11:3; ^{<B4B>}Deuteronomy 14:7). Beasts with hoofs completely divided into two parts, that were also ruminant, were allowed the Israelites as food; *see CUD; HOOF*. In the New Testament, for [*διαμεριζόμεναι*, *diamerizomenai*], in ^{<41B>}Acts 2:3 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “tongues parting asunder,” i.e. “bifurcated flames.” Another explanation found in the Revised Version, margin applies the word, not to tongues, but to the multitude, “parting among them,” or “distributing themselves among them,” settling upon the head of each disciple.

H. E. Jacobs

CLUB

<*klub*>.

See ARMOR, III, 1; SHEPHERD; STAFF.

CLUSTER

<*klus'-ter*>:

(1) [*ל קֶשֶׁל*, *eshkol*]; compare proper name *VALE OF ESHCOL*. (which see), from root meaning “to bind together.” A cluster or bunch of grapes (^{<0400>}Genesis 40:10; ^{<0433>}Numbers 13:23; ^{<2358>}Isaiah 65:8; Song 7:8; ^{<3001>}Micah 7:1, etc.); a cluster of henna flowers (Song 1:14); a cluster of dates (Song 7:7). “Their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter.” (^{<6322>}Deuteronomy 32:32).

(2) [*βότρυς*, *botrus*], “gather the clusters of the vine of the earth” (^{<6418>}Revelation 14:18).

The “cluster of raisins” (*cimmukim*) of ^{<0258>}1 Samuel 25:18; 30:12, should rather be “raisin cakes” or “dried raisins.”

E. W. G. Masterman

CNIDUS

<ni'-dus>, <kni'-dus> ([**ví**δος, *Knidos*], “age”): A city of Caria in the Roman province of Asia, past which, according to ~~<427>~~ Acts 27:7, Paul sailed. At the Southwest corner of Asia Minor there projects for 90 miles into the sea a long, narrow peninsula, practically dividing the Aegean from the Mediterranean. It now bears the name of Cape Crio. Ships sailing along the southern coast of Asia Minor here turn northward as they round the point. Upon the very end of the peninsula, and also upon a small island off its point was the city of Cnidus. The island which in ancient times was connected with the mainland by a causeway is now joined to it by a sandy bar. Thus were formed two harbors, one of which could be closed by a chain. Though Cnidus was in Caria, it held the rank of a free city. There were Jews here as early as the 2nd century BC.

The ruins of Cnidus are the only objects of interest on the long peninsula, and as they may be reached by land only with great difficulty, few travelers have visited them; they may, however, be reached more easily by boat. The nearest modern village is Yazı Keui, 6 miles away. The ruins of Cnidus are unusually interesting, for the entire plan of the city may easily be traced. The sea-walls and piers remain. The acropolis was upon the hill in the western portion of the town; upon the terraces below stood the public buildings, among which were two theaters and the odeum still well preserved. The city was especially noted for its shrine of Venus and for the statue of that goddess by Praxiteles. Here in 1875-78 Sir C. Newton discovered the statue of Demeter, now in the British Museum. See also the Aphrodite of Cnidus in the South Kensington Museum, one of the loveliest statues in the world. From here also came the huge Cnidian lion. The vast necropolis West of the ruins contains tombs of every size and shape, and from various ages.

E. J. Banks

COAL

<kol> ([**μj** ~~ḡ~~ *peham*], “charcoal”; compare Arabic *fachm*, “charcoal”; [**t l j** ~~ḡ~~ *gacheleth*], “burning coal” or “hot ember”; compare Arabic *jacham*, “to kindle”; [**r/j v**] *shechor*], “a black coal” (~~<208>~~ Lamentations 4:8); compare Arabic *shachchar*, “soot” or “dark-colored sandstone”; [**t x r**, *retseph*] (~~<1106>~~ 1 Kings 19:6), and [**h p x j i**] *ritspah*] (= Rizpah)

(~~2016~~ Isaiah 6:6), margin “a hot stone”; compare [~~tv~~~~r~~, *resheph*], “a flame” (Song 8:6; ~~3885~~ Habakkuk 3:5); [~~ἄνθραξ~~, *anthrax*], “a live coal” (~~5121~~ Romans 12:20) (= *gacheleth* in ~~2152~~ Proverbs 25:22); [~~ἄνθρακιά~~, *anthrakia*], “a live coal” (~~4888~~ John 18:18; 21:9): There is no reference to mineral coal in the Bible. Coal, or more properly lignite, of inferior quality, is found in thin beds (not exceeding 3 ft.) in the sandstone formation (see *GEOLOGY*, Nubian Sandstone), but there is no evidence of its use in ancient times. Charcoal is manufactured in a primitive fashion which does not permit the conservation of any by-products. A flat, circular place (Arabic beidar, same name as for a threshing-floor) 10 or 15 ft. in diameter is prepared in or conveniently near to the forest. On this the wood, to be converted into charcoal, is carefully stacked in a dome-shaped structure, leaving an open space in the middle for fine kindlings. All except the center is first covered with leaves, and then with earth. The kindlings in the center are then fired and afterward covered in the same manner as the rest. While it is burning or smoldering it is carefully watched, and earth is immediately placed upon any holes that may be formed in the covering by the burning of the wood below. In several days, more or less, according to the size of the pile, the wood is converted into charcoal and the heap is opened. The charcoal floor is also called in Arabic mashcharah, from shachchar, “soot”; compare Hebrew [shechor]. The characteristic odor of the mashcharah clings for months to the spot.

In ~~8004~~ Psalm 120:4, there is mention of “coals of juniper,” the Revised Version, margin “broom,” rothem. This is doubtless the Arabic retem, *Retama roetam*, Forsk., a kind of broom which is abundant in Judea and Moab. Charcoal from oak wood, especially *Quercus coccifera*, L., Arabic sindyan, is much preferred to other kinds, and fetches a higher price.

In most of the passages where English versions have “coal,” the reference is not necessarily to charcoal, but may be to coals of burning wood. Pecham in ~~2152~~ Proverbs 26:21, however, seems to stand for charcoal:

*“As coals are to hot embers, and wood to fire,
So is a contentious man to inflame strife.”*

The same may be true of pecham in ~~23412~~ Isaiah 44:12 and 54:16; also of shechor in ~~2408~~ Lamentations 4:8.

Alfred Ely Day

COAST

<kost> ([l WbG] *gebhul*), etc., “boundary”; compare [l bG] *gebhal*], “mountain” and Arabic *jebel*, “mountain”; [l bj , *chebhel*], literally, “a rope”; compare Arabic *chabl* (<1629> Joshua 19:29 the King James Version; <1115> Zephaniah 2:5,6,7); [t/j , *choph*], literally, “that which is washed”; compare Arabic *chaffet* (<1601> Joshua 9:1 the King James Version; <2516> Ezekiel 25:16); [παράλιος, *paralios*], literally, “by the sea” (<1617> Luke 6:17)): “Coast” (from Latin *costa*, “rib” or “side”) in the sense of “seacoast,” occurs but a few times in the Bible. In nearly all the many passages where the King James Version has “coast,” the Revised Version (British and American) correctly has “border,” i.e. “boundary,” translating *gebhul*, etc.; in <427> Acts 27:2 the American Standard Revised Version, “coast” is the translation of [τόπος, *topos*], literally, “place.” That the seacoast is but seldom mentioned arises naturally from the fact that, while the promised land extended to the sea, the coast was never effectively occupied by the Israelites.

RvM in a number of places renders ‘i English Versions of the Bible “isle” or “island” (which see), by “coastland,” e.g. <2311> Isaiah 11:11; 23:6; 24:15; 59:18; <252> Jeremiah 25:22; <2506> Ezekiel 39:6; <2718> Daniel 11:18; <1115> Zephaniah 2:11. In <2316> Isaiah 20:6, the King James Version has “isle,” the King James Version margin “country,” and the Revised Version (British and American) “coast-land.” In <2401> Jeremiah 47:4, the King James Version has “country,” the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) “isle,” and the Revised Version, margin “sea-coast.”

See *ISLE*.

Alfred Ely Day

COAT

<kot>.

See *CLOAK; DRESS, etc.*

COAT OF MAIL

<mal>.

See *ARMOR, ARMS; BRIGANDINE*.

COCK

<kok> ([ἀλέκτωρ, *alektor*]; Latin *gallus*): There is no reference in the Old Testament to domesticated poultry, which was probably first introduced into Judea after the Roman conquest. *See CHICKEN*. The cock is several times mentioned in the New Testament and always with reference to its habit of crowing in eastern countries with such regularity as to be almost clocklike. The first full salute comes almost to the minute at half-past eleven, the second at half-past one, and the third at dawn. So uniformly do the cocks keep time and proclaim these three periods of night that we find cock-crowing mentioned as a regular division of time: “Watch therefore: for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning” (ⲙⲁⲕⲓⲛⲉ Mark 13:35). Jesus had these same periods of night in mind when he warned Peter that he would betray Him. ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲩⲁ Matthew 26:34; ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲩⲁ Luke 22:34; ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲩⲁ John 13:38, give almost identical wording of the warning. But in all his writing Mark was more explicit, more given to exact detail. Remembering the divisions of night as the cocks kept them, his record reads: “And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say into thee, that thou today, even this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice” (ⲙⲁⲕⲓⲛⲉ Mark 14:30). *See CHICKEN*. It is hardly necessary to add that the cocks crow at irregular intervals as well as at the times indicated, according to the time of the year and the phase of the moon (being more liable to crow during the night if the moon is at the full), or if a storm threatens, or there is any disturbance in their neighborhood.

Gene Stratton-Porter

COCKATRICE

<kok'-a-tris>, <kok'-a-tris> ([pæ̃ tsepha`]; [yni/ p̃xi tsph`oni]; Septuagint, [βασιλίσκος, *basiliskos*], “basilisk” (which see), and ἀσπίς, *aspis*], “asp” (*see ADDER; ASP; SERPENT*)): A fabulous, deadly, monster. The name “cockatrice” appears to be a corruption of Latin *calcatrix*, from *calcare*, “to tread,” *calcatrix* being in turn a translation of the Greek [ἰχνεύμων, *ichneumon*], from [ἰχνος, *ichnos*], “track” or “footstep.” *Herpestes ichneumon*, the *ichneumon*, Pharaoh’s rat, or mongoose, a weasel-like animal, is a native of northern Africa and southern Spain. There are also other species, including the Indian mongoose. It preys on rats and snakes, and does not despise poultry and eggs.

Pliny (see *Oxford Dictionary*, under the word “Cockatrice”) relates that the ichneumon darts down the open mouth of the crocodile, and destroys it by gnawing through its belly. In the course of time, as the story underwent changes, the animal was metamorphosed into a water snake, and was confused with the crocodile itself, and also with the basilisk. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th edition, the cockatrice was believed as late as the 17th century to be produced from a cock’s egg and hatched by a serpent, and “to possess the most deadly powers, plants withering at its touch, and men and animals being poisoned by its look. It stood in awe however of the cock, the sound of whose crowing killed it. The weasel alone among animals was unaffected by the glance of its evil eye, and attacked it at all times successfully; for when wounded by the monster’s teeth it found a ready remedy in rue, the only plant which the cockatrice could not wither.” The real ichneumon does kill the most deadly snakes, and has been supposed to resort to a vegetable antidote when bitten. It actually dies however when bitten by a deadly snake, and does not possess a knowledge of herbs, but its extraordinary agility enables it ordinarily to escape injury. It is interesting to see how the changing tale of this creature with its marvelous powers has made a hodge-podge of ichneumon, weasel, crocodile, and serpent.

The Biblical references (the King James Version ^{<2118>}Isaiah 11:8; 59:5; ^{<2487>}Jeremiah 8:17) are doubtless to a serpent, the word “cockatrice,” with its medieval implications, having been introduced by the translators of the King James Version.

See SERPENT.

Alfred Ely Day

COCK-CROWING

^{<kok'-kro-ing>} ([ἀλεκτοροφωνία, *alektorophonia*): An indefinite hour of the night between midnight and morning (^{<4135>}Mark 13:35), referred to by all the evangelists in their account of Peter’s denial (^{<4154>}Matthew 26:34,74; ^{<4143>}Mark 14:30; ^{<2234>}Luke 22:34; ^{<6138>}John 13:38). It is derived from the habit of the cock to crow especially toward morning.

See COCK.

COCKER

<kok'-er> ([τιθηνέω, *titheneo*], “to nurse,” “coddle,” “pamper”): Occurs only in Ecclesiasticus 30:9 with the meaning “to pamper”: “Cocker thy child, and he shall make thee afraid”; so Shakespeare, “a cockered silken wanton”; now seldom used; Jean Ingelow, “Poor folks cannot afford to cocker themselves.”

COCKLE

<kok'-'-l> (King James Version margin “stinking weeds,” the Revised Version, margin “noisome weeds”; [hvaḅ; *bo'shah*], from Hebrew root [vaḅ; *ba'ash*], “to stink”; [βάτος, *batos*]): “Let thistles grow instead of wheat, and cockle instead of barley” (~~18340~~ Job 31:40). On account of the meaning of the Hebrew root we should expect that the reference was rather to repulsive, offensive weeds than to the pretty corn cockle. It is very possible that no particular plant is here intended, though the common Palestinian “stinking” arums have been suggested by Hooker.

CODE OF HAMMURABI

See *HAMMURABI, CODE OF*.

COELE-SYRIA

<se-le-sir'-i-a> (the King James Version Celosyria; [οίλη Συρία, *Koile Suria*], “hollow Syria”): So the Greeks after the time of Alexander the Great named the valley lying between the two mountain ranges, Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. It is referred to in the Old Testament as *Biq'ath ha-Lebhanon*, “the valley of Lebanon” (~~6117~~ Joshua 11:17), a name the echo of which is still heard in el-Buqa', the designation applied today to the southern part of the valley. This hollow, which extends about 100 miles in length, is the continuation northward of the Jordan valley. The main physical features are described under *LEBANON* (which see). The name, however, did not always indicate the same tract of territory. In Strabo (xvi.2) and Ptolemy (v.15), it covers the fertile land between Jebel esh-Sharqy and the desert presided over by Damascus. In 1 Esdras 2:17; 2 Macc 3:8, etc., it indicates the country South and East of Mt. Lebanon, and along with Phoenicia it contributed the whole of the Seleucid dominions which lay South of the river Eleutherus. Josephus includes in

Coele-Syria the country East of the Jordan, along with Scythopolis (Beisan) which lay on the West, separated by the river from the other members of the Decapolis (Ant., XIII, xiii, 2, etc.). In XIV, iv, 5, he says that “Pompey committed Coele-Syria as far as the river Euphrates and Egypt to Scaurus.” The term is therefore one of some elasticity.

W. Ewing

COFFER

<ko^f-er> ([zɔ̃græ^æargaz]): A small box such as that in which the Philistines placed their golden mice and other offerings in returning the Ark (~~4008~~ 1 Samuel 6:8,11,15).

COFFIN

<ko^f-in>.

See CHEST; BURIAL.

COGITATION

<koj-i-ta'-shun>, [ˈy[ræ^æa`yon], “the act of thinking or reflecting,” as in ~~2078~~ Daniel 7:28, “my cogitations much troubled me” (the Revised Version (British and American) “my thoughts”).

COHORT

<ko'-hort>: In the Revised Version, margin of ~~4077~~ Matthew 27:27; ~~4156~~ Mark 15:16; ~~6183~~ John 18:3,12; ~~4100~~ Acts 10:1; 21:31; 27:1, the translation of *speira* (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “band”); the tenth part of a legion; ordinarily about 600 men. In John 18 the word seems to be used loosely of a smaller body of soldiers, a detachment, detail.

See ARMY; BAND.

COINS

<koinz>: There were no coins in use in Palestine until after the Captivity. It is not quite certain whether gold and silver were before that time divided into pieces of a certain weight for use as money or not, but there can be no question of coinage proper until the Persian period. Darius I is credited

with introducing a coinage system into his empire, and his were the first coins that came into use among the Jews, though it seems probable that coins were struck in Lydia in the time of Croesus, the contemporary of Cyrus the Great, and these coins were doubtless the model upon which Darius based his system, and they may have circulated to some extent in Babylonia before the return of the Jews. The only coins mentioned in the Old Testament are the Darics (*see DARIC*), and these only in the Revised Version (British and American), the word “dram” being used in the King James Version (^{<15189>}Ezra 2:69; 8:27; ^{<16170>}Nehemiah 7:70-72). The Jews had no native coins until the time of the Maccabees, who struck coins after gaining their independence about 143-141 BC. These kings struck silver and copper, or the latter, at least (*see MONEY*), in denominations of shekels and fractions of the shekel, until the dynasty was overthrown by the Romans. Other coins were certainly in circulation during the same period, especially those of Alexander and his successors the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Seleucids of Syria, both of whom bore sway over Palestine before the rise of the Maccabees. Besides these coins there were the issues of some of the Phoenician towns, which were allowed to strike coins by the Persians and the Seleucids. The coins of Tyre and Sidon, both silver and copper, must have circulated largely in Palestine on account of the intimate commercial relations between the Jews and Phoenicians (for examples, see under *MONEY*). After the advent of the Romans the local coinage was restricted chiefly to the series of copper coins, such as the mites mentioned in the New Testament, the silver denarii being struck mostly at Rome, but circulating wherever the Romans went. The coins of the Herods and the Procurators are abundant, but all of copper, since the Romans did not allow the Jewish rulers to strike either silver or gold coins. At the time of the first revolt (66-70 AD) the Jewish leader, Simon, struck shekels again, or, as some numismatists think, he was the first to do so. But this series was a brief one, lasting between 3 and 4 years only, as Jerusalem was taken by Titus in 70 AD, and this put an end to the existence of the Jewish state. There was another short period of Jewish coinage during the second revolt, in the reign of Hadrian, when Simon Barcochba struck coins with Hebrew legends which indicate his independence of Roman rule. They were of both silver and copper, and constitute the last series of strictly Jewish coins (*see MONEY*). After this the coins struck in Judea were Roman, as Jerusalem was made a Roman colony.

COLA

<ko'-la>.

See *CHOLA*.

COLD

<kold> ([*ῥῥῥῥ*qor]; [*ψυχρός*, *psuchros*] (adj.), [*ψυχος*, *psuchos*] (noun)): Palestine is essentially a land of sunshine and warmth.

1. TEMPERATURE IN PALESTINE:

The extreme cold of northern latitudes is unknown. January is the coldest month; but the degree of cold in a particular place depends largely on the altitude above the sea. On the seacoast and plain the snow never falls; and the temperature reaches freezing-point, perhaps once in thirty years. In Jerusalem at 2,500 ft. above the sea the mean temperature in January is about 45 degrees F., but the minimum may be as low as 25 degrees F. Snow occasionally falls, but lasts only a short time. On Mt. Hermon and on the Lebanons snow may be found the whole year, and the cold is most intense, even in the summer. In Jericho and around the Dead Sea, 1,292 ft. below sea-level, it is correspondingly hotter, and cold is not known.

2. PROVISION AGAINST COLD:

Cold is of such short duration that no adequate provision is made by the people to protect themselves against the cold. The sun is always bright and warm, and nearly always shines for part of the day, even in winter. After sunset the people wrap themselves up and go to sleep. They prefer to wrap up their heads rather than their feet in order to keep warm. The only means of heating the houses is the charcoal brazier around which as many as possible gather for a little warmth. It is merely a bed of coals in an iron vessel. Peter was glad to avail himself of the little heat of the coals as late as the beginning of April, when the nights are often chilly in Jerusalem: "Having made a fire of coals; for it was cold: and Peter also was with them, standing and warming himself" (~~<BIBIS>~~ John 18:18). There is no attempt made to heat the whole house. In the cold winter months the people of the mountains almost hibernate. They wrap up their heads in shawls and coverings and only the most energetic venture out: "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the winter" (~~<BIBIS>~~ Proverbs 20:4, the King James Version

“cold”). The peasants and more primitive people of the desert often make a fire in the open or in partial shelter, as in Melita where Paul was cast ashore after shipwreck: “The barbarians kindled a fire because of the cold” (^{<438D>}Acts 28:2).

3. DREAD OF COLD:

The cold is greatly dreaded because it causes so much actual suffering: “Who can stand before his cold?” (^{<4177>}Psalms 147:17). The last degree of degradation is to have “no covering in the cold” (^{<434D>}Job 24:7).

4. COLD GRATEFUL IN SUMMER:

In the heat of the long summer, the shadow of a rock or the cool of evening is most grateful, and the appreciation of a cup of cold water can easily be understood by anyone who has experienced the burning heat of the Syrian sun: “As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country” (^{<1255>}Proverbs 25:25); “cold of snow in the time of harvest” (^{<1253>}Proverbs 25:13), probably with reference to the use of snow (shaved ice) in the East to cool a beverage.

Figurative uses: “The love of the many shall wax cold” (^{<4142>}Matthew 24:12); “I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot” (^{<4185>}Revelation 3:15).

Alfred H. Joy

COL-HOZEH

^{<kol-ho'-ze>} ([^hzj ^{Al} ^K; *kol-chozeh*], “all seeing”; Septuagint omits): A man whose son Shallum rebuilt the fountain gate of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemiah (^{<4185>}Nehemiah 3:15). The Col-hozeh of ^{<4185>}Nehemiah 11:5 is probably another man.

COLIUS

^{<ko'-li-us>} ([^{ὄλιος}, *Kolios*], 1 Esdras 9:23).

See CALITAS.

COLLAR

^{<kol'-ar>}, ^{<kol'-er>}:

(1) ([**hpyfi**] *neTphah*], plural [**twpyfi**] *neTphoth*], literally, “drops,” from [**tfæ**] *naTaph*], “to drop”). ^{<0785>}Judges 8:26 includes *neTphoth* among the spoils taken from the Midianites and Ishmaelites; the Revised Version (British and American) “pendants,” the King James Version “collars.” Qimchi at the place suggests “perfume-dropper.”

(2) ([**hP**, *peh*], literally, “mouth”). In ^{<1808>}Job 30:18 the word is used to indicate the collar band, or hole of a robe, through which the head was inserted. Job, in describing his suffering and writhing, mentions the disfiguring of his garment, and suggests that the whole thing feels as narrow or close-fitting as the neckband, or perhaps that in his fever and pains he feels as if the neckband itself is choking him.

(3) ([**q/nyxi**] *tsinoq*], ^{<0906>}Jeremiah 29:26, “stocks”; the Revised Version (British and American) “shackles,” which see; the Revised Version, margin “collar”). An instrument of torture or punishment.

Nathan Isaacs

COLLECTION

^{<ko-lek'-shun>}:

(1) In the Old Testament ([**taejnan**] *mas'eth*], “something taken up”), used in ^{<0906>}2 Chronicles 24:6,9 the King James Version with reference to the tax prescribed in Ex, 30:12,16; the Revised Version (British and American) “tax.”

(2) In the New Testament “collection” is the translation given to [**λογία**, *logia*], found only twice (classical, [**συλλογή**, *sulloge*]). It is used with reference to the collection which Paul took up in the Gentile churches for the poor Christians in Jerusalem, as, for some reason, perhaps more severe persecutions, that church was especially needy (^{<0901>}1 Corinthians 16:1,2; verse 2 the King James Version “gatherings”). Other words, such as bounty, contribution, blessing, alms, ministration, are used to indicate this same ministry. Paul seems to have ascribed to it great importance. Therefore, he planned it carefully long in advance; urged systematic, weekly savings for it; had delegates carefully chosen to take it to Jerusalem; and, in spite of dangers, determined himself to accompany them. Evidently he thought it the crowning act of his work in the provinces of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia, for as soon as it was finished he

purposed to go to Rome and the West (^{<4047>}Acts 24:17; ^{<5155>}Romans 15:25,26; 2 Corinthians 8; 9).

See also **COMMUNION**.

G. H. Trever

COLLEGE

<kol'-ej>: This is the rendering of the King James Version for Hebrew Mishneh ([^[hmyʃ]*mishneh*], ^{<1224>}2 Kings 22:14 = ^{<1402>}2 Chronicles 34:22; compare ^{<3010>}Zephaniah 1:10). It is found in the Targum of Jonathan on ^{<1224>}2 Kings 22:14 and rests on a faulty combination with Mishna, the well-known code of laws of the 2nd century AD. the Revised Version (British and American) renders “second quarter” (of the city); ^{<1402>}2 Chronicles 34:22 the King James Version margin, “the school.”

COLLOP

<kol'-up> ([^[hmyPi]*pimah*]): A slice of meat or “fat,” the King James Version in ^{<18157>}Job 15:27, “maketh collops of fat (thick folds of flesh) on his flanks,” said of the “wicked man.” the American Standard Revised Version reads “(hath) gathered fat upon his loins.”

COLONY

<kol'-o-ni> ([^[kɔlɔnʲia]*kolonia*], Greek transliteration of Latin colonia, from the root, col, “cultivate”): The word occurs but once (^{<4462>}Acts 16:12) in reference to Philippi in Macedonia. Roman colonies were of three kinds and of three periods:

- (1)** Those of the early republic, in which the colonists, established in conquered towns to serve the state as guardians of the frontier, were exempt from ordinary military service. They were distinguished as
 - (a)** c. civium Romanorum, wherein the colonists retained Roman citizenship, also called c. maritumae, because situated on the coast, and
 - (b)** c. Latinae, situated inland among the allies (socii), wherein the colonists possessed the ius Latinum, entitling them to invoke the Roman law of property (commercium), but not that of the family (connubium), and received Roman citizenship only when elected to magistracies.

(2) The colonies of the Gracchan period, established in pursuance of the scheme of agrarian reforms, to provide land for the poorer citizens.

(3) After the time of Sulla colonies were founded in Italy by the Republic as a device for granting lands to retiring veterans, who of course retained citizenship. This privilege was appropriated by Caesar and the emperors, who employed it to establish military colonies, chiefly in the provinces, with various rights and internal organizations. To this class belonged Philippi. Partly organized after the great battle of 42 BC, fought in the neighboring plain by Brutus and Cassius, the champions of the fated Republic, and Antonius and Octavian, it was fully established as a colony by Octavian (afterward styled Augustus) after the battle of Actium (31 BC), under the name Colonia Aug. Iul. Philippi or Philippensis. It received the *ius Italicum*, whereby provincial cities acquired the same status as Italian cities, which possessed municipal self-government and exemption from poll and land taxes.

See *CITIZENSHIP; PHILIPPI; ROMAN*.

William Arthur Heidel

COLOR; COLORS

<*kul'-er*>, <*kul'-erz*>: The word translated “color” in the King James Version is *ʾayin*, which literally means “eye” or “appearance,” and has been so translated in the Revised Version (British and American). In the New Testament the Greek [*πρόφασις*, *prophasis*], has the meaning of pretense or show (^{<423>}Acts 27:30; compare ^{<670>}Revelation 17:4 the King James Version). The references to Joseph’s coat of many colors (^{<1378>}Genesis 37:3,13,12) and “garments of divers colors” (^{<1338>}2 Samuel 13:18,19) probably do not mean the color of the garment at all, but the form, as suggested in the American Revised Version, margin, “a long garment with sleeves.” In ^{<1080>}Judges 5:30 the word for “dip” or “dye” appears in the original and has been so translated in the American Standard Revised Version. (see *DYE*). In ^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 29:2 [*hmqṭi riqmah*], meaning “variegated,” hence, “varicolored,” is found. In ^{<2541>}Isaiah 54:11, *pukh* is used. This name was applied to the sulfide of antimony (Arabic *kochl*) used for painting the eyes. Hence, the American Revised Version, margin rendering “antimony” instead of “fair colors” (see *PAINT*). In ^{<2616>}Ezekiel 16:16 [*al f; Tala’*], is found, meaning “covered with pieces” or “spotted,” hence, by implication “divers colors.”

Although the ancient Hebrews had no specific words for “color,” “paint” or “painter,” still, as we know, they constantly met with displays of the art of coloring among the Babylonians (^{<2314>}Ezekiel 23:14) and Egyptians and the inhabitants of Palestine Pottery, glazed bricks, glassware, tomb walls, sarcophagi, wood and fabrics were submitted to the skill of the colorist. This skill probably consisted in bringing out striking effects by the use of a few primary colors, rather than in any attempt at the blending of shades which characterizes modern coloring. That the gaudy show of their heathen neighbors attracted the children of Israel is shown by such passages as ^{<827>}Judges 8:27; ^{<2312>}Ezekiel 23:12,16.

Two reasons may be given for the indefiniteness of many of the Biblical references to color.

- (1) The origin of the Hebrew people: They had been wandering tribes or slaves with no occasion to develop a color language.
- (2) Their religious laws: These forbade expression in color or form (^{<1204>}Exodus 20:4). Yielding to the attractions of gorgeous display was discouraged by such prophets as Ezekiel, who had sickened of the abominations of the Chaldeans (^{<2314>}Ezekiel 23:14,15,16); “And I said unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes” (^{<207>}Ezekiel 20:7).

Indefiniteness of color language is common to oriental literature, ancient and modern. This does not indicate a want of appreciation of color but a failure to analyze and define color effects. The inhabitants of Syria and Palestine today delight in brilliant colors. Bright yellow, crimson, magenta and green are used for adornment with no evident sense of fitness, according to the foreigners’ eyes, other than their correspondence with the glaring brightness of the eastern skies. A soapmaker once told the writer that in order to make his wares attractive to the Arabs he colored them a brilliant crimson or yellow. A peasant chooses without hesitation a flaring magenta or yellow or green zun-nar (girdle), rather than one of somber hues. The oriental student in the chemical or physical laboratory often finds his inability to distinguish or classify color a real obstacle. His closest definition of a color is usually “lightish” or “darkish.” This is not due to color blindness but to a lack of education, and extends to lines other than color distinctions. The colloquial language of Palestine today is poor in words denoting color, and an attempt to secure from a native a satisfactory description of some simple color scheme is usually disappointing. The

harmonious color effects which have come to us from the Orient have been, in the past, more the result of accident (*see* DYE) than of deliberate purpose, as witness the clashing of colors where modern artificial dyes have been introduced.

This inability of the peoples of Bible lands to define colors is an inheritance from past ages, a consideration which helps us to appreciate the vagueness of many of the Biblical references.

The following color words occur in the King James Version or Revised Version:

- (1) bay,
- (2) black,
- (3) blue,
- (4) brown,
- (5) crimson,
- (6) green,
- (7) grey,
- (8) hoar,
- (9) purple,
- (10) red,
- (11) scarlet,
- (12) sorrel,
- (13) vermilion,
- (14) white,
- (15) yellow.

In addition there are indefinite words indicating mixtures of light and dark:

- (a) grisled (grizzled),

- (b) ringstraked (ringstreaked),
- (c) speckled,
- (d) spotted.

(1) BAY OR RED:

Bay or red is more properly translated “strong” in the Revised Version (British and American).

(2) BLACK (BLACKISH):

Eight different words have been translated “black.” They indicate various meanings such as “dusky like the early dawn,” “ashen,” “swarthy,” “moved with passion.” Black is applied to hair (^{<B13>}Leviticus 13:31; Song 5:11; ^{<B15>}Matthew 5:36); to marble or pavement (Est 1:6); to mourning (^{<B18>}Job 30:28,30; ^{<B42>}Jeremiah 14:2); to passion (^{<B21>}Jeremiah 8:21 the King James Version; ^{<B50>}Lamentations 5:10); to horses (^{<B42>}Zechariah 6:2,6; ^{<B15>}Revelation 6:5); to the heavens (^{<B15>}1 Kings 18:45; ^{<B15>}Job 3:5; ^{<B19>}Proverbs 7:9 the King James Version; ^{<B18>}Jeremiah 4:28; ^{<B15>}Micah 3:6); to the sun (^{<B12>}Revelation 6:12); to the skin (racial) (Song 1:5,6); to flocks (^{<B12>}Genesis 30:32,33,15,40); to brooks because of ice (^{<B16>}Job 6:16).

(3) BLUE:

Blue ([^tl ^kē] *tekheleth*), a color from the cerulean mussel): This word was applied only to fabrics dyed with a special blue dye obtained from a shellfish. See **DYE**. [^vvēshesh] in one passage of the King James Version is translated “blue” (Est 1:6). It is properly translated in the Revised Version (British and American) “white cloth.” “Blueness of a wound” (^{<B19>}Proverbs 20:30) is correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) “stripes that wound.” Blue is applied to the fringes, veil, vestments, embroideries, etc., in the description of the ark and tabernacle (Exodus 25 ff; ^{<B16>}Numbers 4:6 f; 15:38); to workers in blue (^{<B17>}2 Chronicles 2:7,14; 3:14); to palace adornments (Est 1:6); to royal apparel (Est 8:15; ^{<B19>}Jeremiah 10:9; ^{<B21>}Ezekiel 23:6; 27:7,24).

(4) BROWN:

The Hebrew word meaning “sunburnt” or “swarthy” is translated “black” in the Revised Version (British and American) (^{<032>}Genesis 30:32 ff).

(5) CRIMSON:

Crimson ([^{<1>}ymir^{<2>}Ka^{<3>}karmil]): This word is probably of Persian origin and applies to the brilliant dye obtained from a bug. A second word [^{<1>}t[^{<2>}ba^{<3>}th], *tola`ath*, is also found. Its meaning is the same. *See DYE*. Crimson is applied to raiment (^{<4017>}2 Chronicles 2:7,14; 3:14; ^{<4030>}Jeremiah 4:30 the King James Version); to sins (^{<2018>}Isaiah 1:18).

(6) GREEN (GREENISH):

This word in the translation refers almost without exception to vegetation. The Hebrew [^{<1>}qry; *yaraq*], literally, “pale,” is considered one of the three definite color words used in the Old Testament (*see* WHITE; RED). The Greek equivalent is *chloros*; compare English “chlorine.” This word occurs in the following vs: ^{<0033>}Genesis 1:30; 9:3; ^{<2005>}Exodus 10:15; ^{<0024>}Leviticus 2:14 (the King James Version); 23:14 (the King James Version); ^{<1206>}2 Kings 19:26; ^{<0502>}Psalms 37:2; ^{<2456>}Isaiah 15:6; 37:27; ^{<0308>}Job 39:8; *chloros*, ^{<0069>}Mark 6:39; ^{<0007>}Revelation 8:7; 9:4. [^{<1>}b[^{<2>}ba^{<3>}ana^{<4>}nan], closely allied in meaning to [*yaraq*], is used to describe trees in the following passages: ^{<0522>}Deuteronomy 12:2; ^{<1142>}1 Kings 14:23; ^{<1204>}2 Kings 16:4; 17:10; 19:26; ^{<4004>}2 Chronicles 28:4; ^{<0552>}Job 15:32; ^{<0575>}Psalms 37:35; 52:8; Song 1:16; ^{<2505>}Isaiah 57:5; ^{<2421>}Jeremiah 2:20; 3:6; 11:16; 17:2,8; ^{<0063>}Ezekiel 6:13; ^{<2448>}Hosea 14:8. In the remaining verses the Hebrew equivalents do not denote color, but the condition of being full of sap, fresh or unripe (compare similar uses in English) (^{<0337>}Genesis 30:37 (the King James Version); ^{<0707>}Judges 16:7,8; ^{<0202>}Psalms 23:2; Song 2:13; ^{<0086>}Job 8:16; ^{<0724>}Ezekiel 17:24; 20:47; ^{<0231>}Luke 23:31). In Est 1:6 the Hebrew word refers to a fiber, probably cotton, as is indicated by the American Revised Version, margin. Greenish is used to describe leprous spots in ^{<0030>}Leviticus 13:49; 14:37. The same word is translated “yellow” in ^{<0083>}Psalms 68:13.

(7) GRAY:

The Hebrew [^{<1>}hbyc^{<2>}esebhah], means old age, hence, refers also to the color of the hair in old age (^{<0028>}Genesis 42:38; 44:29; 44:31;

<1625> Deuteronomy 32:25; <19718> Psalm 71:18; <3009> Hosea 7:9). See *Hoar*, next paragraph.

(8) HOAR (HOARY):

The same word which in other verses is translated “gray” is rendered “hoar” or “hoary,” applying to the hair in <1006> 1 Kings 2:6,9; <23404> Isaiah 46:4; <16192> Leviticus 19:32; <18412> Job 41:32; <20651> Proverbs 16:31. Another Hebrew word is translated “hoar” or “hoary,” describing “frost” in <12644> Exodus 16:14; <18839> Job 38:29; <19716> Psalm 147:16.

(9) PURPLE:

The Hebrew equivalent is [^ˈmṣr̥ḥæargaman]; Greek [πορφύρα, *porphura*]. The latter word refers to the source of the dye, namely, a shellfish found on the shores of the Mediterranean. *See* **DYE**. This color, which varied widely according to the kind of shellfish used and the method of dyeing, was utilized in connection with the adornment of the tabernacle (Exodus 25; 26; 27; 28; 35; 36; 38; 39; <00413> Numbers 4:13). There were workers in purple called to assist in beautifying the temple (<4117> 2 Chronicles 2:7,14; 3:14). Purple was much used for royal raiment and furnishings (<00835> Judges 8:26; Est 1:6; 8:15; Song 3:10; <4157> Mark 15:17,20; <1892> John 19:2,5). Purple was typical of gorgeous apparel (<1812> Proverbs 31:22; <4109> Jeremiah 10:9; Song 7:5; <13707> Ezekiel 27:7,16; <16169> Luke 16:19; <4164> Acts 16:14; <17704> Revelation 17:4; 18:12,16).

(10) RED:

The Hebrew [ṣ/da; ‘*adhom*], is from [ṣD; *dam*], “blood,” hence, “bloodlike.” This is one of the three distinctive color words mentioned in the Old Testament (*see* **GREEN**; **WHITE**), and is found in most of the references to red. Four other words are used:

(a) [yl yl k] æ*hakhhlili*], probably “darkened” or “clouded” (<0492> Genesis 49:12; <1739> Proverbs 23:29);

(b) [rmjæ *chamar*], “to ferment” (<19718> Psalm 75:8 margin; <2370> Isaiah 27:2 the King James Version);

(c) [fhæ *bahaT*], probably “to glisten” (Est 1:6);

(d) [πυρρός, *purros*] “firelike” (<0662> Matthew 16:2,3; <6604> Revelation 6:4; 12:3). Red is applied to dyed skins (<0276> Exodus 25:5; 26:14; 35:7,23; 36:19; 39: 34); to the color of animals (<0492> Numbers 19:2; <3008> Zechariah 1:8; 6:2; <6604> Revelation 6:4; 12:3); to the human skin (<0255> Genesis 25:25; ruddy, <0662> 1 Samuel 16:12; 17:42; Song 5:10; <3007> Lamentations 4:7); to the eyes (<0492> Genesis 49:12; <1239> Proverbs 23:29); to sores (Leviticus 13); to wine (<0278> Psalm 75:8 m; <1239> Proverbs 23:31; <3207> Isaiah 27:2 the King James Version); to water (<1206> 2 Kings 3:22); to pavement (Est 1:6); to pottage (<0250> Genesis 25:30); to apparel (<3212> Isaiah 63:2); to the sky (<0662> Matthew 16:2,3); to sins (<3008> Isaiah 1:18); to a shield (<3008> Nahum 2:3).

(11) SCARLET:

Scarlet and crimson colors were probably from the same source (*see CRIMSON; DYE*). [τ[~~βαῖ~~, *tola`ath*], or derivatives have been translated by both “scarlet” and “crimson” (Greek *kokkinos*). A Chaldaic word for purple has thrice been translated “scarlet” in the King James Version (<0207> Daniel 5:7,16,29). Scarlet is applied to fabrics or yarn used

(a) in the equipment of the tabernacle (Exodus 25 ff; <0408> Numbers 4:8);

(b) in rites in cleansing lepers (Leviticus 14); in ceremony of purification (<0496> Numbers 19:6); to royal or gorgeous apparel (<0024> 2 Samuel 1:24; <1821> Proverbs 31:21; <3006> Lamentations 4:5; <3007> Daniel 5:7,16,29, “purple”; <3008> Nahum 2:3; <0278> Matthew 27:28; <6604> Revelation 17:4; 18:12,16); to marking thread (<0338> Genesis 38:28,30; <1828> Joshua 2:18,21); to lips (Song 4:3); to sins (<3008> Isaiah 1:18); to beasts (<6603> Revelation 17:3); to wool (<3009> Hebrews 9:19).

(12) SORREL:

This word occurs once in the Revised Version (British and American) (<3008> Zechariah 1:8).

(13) VERMILION:

This word, [rvæ *shashar*], occurs in two passages (<0224> Jeremiah 22:14; <3214> Ezekiel 23:14). Vermilion of modern arts is a sulfide of mercury. It is not at all improbable that the paint referred to was an oxide of iron. This

oxide is still taken from the ground in Syria and Palestine and used for decorative outlining.

(14) WHITE:

The principal word for denoting whiteness in the Hebrew was [ʿb] ; *labhan*], a distinctive color word. Some of the objects to which it was applied show that it was used as we use the word “white” (^{<0492>}Genesis 49:12). Mt. Lebanon was probably named because of its snow-tipped peaks (^{<2484>}Jeremiah 18:14). White is applied to goats (^{<0335>}Genesis 30:35); to rods (^{<0337>}Genesis 30:37); to teeth (^{<0492>}Genesis 49:12); to leprous hairs and spots (Leviticus 13; ^{<0420>}Numbers 12:10); to garments (^{<2008>}Ecclesiastes 9:8; ^{<2009>}Daniel 7:9); as symbol of purity (^{<2715>}Daniel 11:35; 12:10; ^{<2018>}Isaiah 1:18); to horses (^{<3008>}Zechariah 1:8; 6:3,1); to tree branches (^{<2007>}Joel 1:7); to coriander seed (^{<0163>}Exodus 16:31). The corresponding Greek word, [λευκός, *leukos*], is used in New Testament. It is applied to hair (^{<4155>}Matthew 5:36; ^{<6114>}Revelation 1:14); to raiment (^{<4072>}Matthew 17:2; 28:3; ^{<4008>}Mark 9:3; 16:5; ^{<609>}Luke 9:29; ^{<602>}John 20:12; ^{<4010>}Acts 1:10; ^{<6134>}Revelation 3:4,5,18; 6:11; 7:9,13,14; 19,14); to horses (^{<612>}Revelation 6:2; 19:11,14); to a throne (^{<611>}Revelation 20:11); to stone (^{<617>}Revelation 2:17); to a cloud (^{<644>}Revelation 14:14). Besides *labhan*, four other Hebrew words have been translated “white”:

(a) [yrʾj , *chori*], or [rʷj , *chur*], meaning “bleached,” applied to bread (^{<0406>}Genesis 40:16); to linen (Est 1:6; 8:15);

(b) [j xʾsach], or [r/j x; *tsachor*], literally, “dazzling,” is applied to asses (^{<0750>}Judges 5:10); to human appearance (Song 5:10); to wool (^{<3278>}Ezekiel 27:18);

(c) [rDʾdar], probably mother of pearl or alabaster (Est 1:6);

(d) [ryri , *rir*], literally, “saliva,” and, from resemblance, “white of egg” (^{<806>}Job 6:6).

(15) YELLOW:

This word occurs in Est 1:6 to describe pavement; in Leviticus 13 to describe leprous hair; in ^{<1983>}Psalms 68:13 to describe gold.

Mixtures of colors:

- (a) grizzled (grised), literally, “spotted as with hail,” applied to goats (~~0310~~Genesis 31:10,12); to horses (~~3008~~Zechariah 6:3,1);
- (b) ringstreaked (ringstraked), literally, “striped with bands,” applied to animals (~~0085~~Genesis 30:35 ff; 31:8 ff);
- (c) speckled, literally, “dotted or spotted,” applied to cattle and goats (~~0332~~Genesis 30:32 ff; 31:8 ff); to a bird (~~2410~~Jeremiah 12:9); to horses (~~3008~~Zechariah 1:8 the King James Version);
- (d) spotted, literally, “covered with patches,” applied to cattle and goats (~~0082~~Genesis 30:32 ff). In ~~6023~~Jude 1:23 “spotted” means “defiled.”

Figurative: For figurative uses, see under separate colors.

LITERATURE.

Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Ancient Egypt, History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria, History of Art in Phoenicia and its Dependencies*; Wilkinson, *The Ancient Egyptians*; *Jewish Encyclopedia*; EB; Delitzsch, *Iris*.

James A. Patch

COLOSSAE

<ko-los'-e> ([**ολοσσαί**, *Kolossai*], “punishment”; the King James Version *Colosse*): A city of Phrygia on the Lycus River, one of the branches of the Meander, and 3 miles from Mt. Cadmus, 8,013 ft. high. It stood at the head of a gorge where the two streams unite, and on the great highway traversing the country from Ephesus to the Euphrates valley, 13 miles from Hierapolis and 10 from Laodicea. Its history is chiefly associated with that of these two cities. Early, according to both Herodotus and Xenophon, it was a place of great importance. There Xerxes stopped 481 BC (Herodotus vii.30) and Cyrus the Younger marched 401 BC (Xen. Anab. i.2,6). From **<col>**Colossians 2:1 it is not likely that Paul visited the place in person; but its Christianization was due to the efforts of Epaphras and Timothy (**<col>**Colossians 1:1,7), and it was the home of Philemon and Epaphras. That a church was established there early is evident from **<col>**Colossians 4:12,13; **<rev>**Revelation 1:11; 3:14. As the neighboring cities, Hierapolis and Laodicea, increased in importance,

Colosse declined. There were many Jews living there, and a chief article of commerce, for which the place was renowned, was the collossinus, a peculiar wool, probably of a purple color. In religion the people were specially lax, worshipping angels. Of them, Michael was the chief, and the protecting saint of the city. It is said that once he appeared to the people, saving the city in time of a flood. It was this belief in angels which called forth Paul's epistle (^{<5028>}Colossians 2:18). During the 7th and 8th centuries the place was overrun by the Saracens; in the 12th century the church was destroyed by the Turks and the city disappeared. Its site was explored by Mr. Hamilton. The ruins of the church, the stone foundation of a large theater, and a necropolis with stones of a peculiar shape are still to be seen. During the Middle Ages the place bore the name of Chonae; it is now called Chonas.

E. J. Banks

COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE

<ko-losh'-ans>, *<ko-losh'-i-anz>*: This is one of the group of Paul's epistles known as the Captivity Epistles (see *PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO*, for a discussion of these as a group).

I. AUTHENTICITY.

1. External Evidence:

The external evidence for the Epistle to the Colossians, prior to the middle of the 2nd century, is rather indeterminate. In Ignatius and in Polycarp we have here and there phrases and terminology that suggest an acquaintance with Colossians but not much more (Ignat., Ephes., x.3, and Polyc. x.1; compare with ^{<5023>}Colossians 1:23). The phrase in Ep Barnabas, xii, "in him are all things and unto him are all things," may be due to ^{<5016>}Colossians 1:16, but it is quite as possibly a liturgical formula. The references in Justin Martyr's Dialogue to Christ as the firstborn (*prototokos*) are very probably suggested by ^{<5015>}Colossians 1:15, "the firstborn of all creation" (Dial., 84, 85, 138). The first definite witness is Marcion, who included this epistle in his collection of those written by Paul (Tert., Adv. Marc., v. 19). A little later the Muratorian Fragment mentions Colossians among the Epistles of Paul (10b, l. 21, Colosensis). Irenaeus quotes it frequently and by name (Adv. haer., iii.14, 1). It is familiar to the writers of the following centuries (e.g. Tert., Deuteronomy praescrip., 7; Clement of Alexandria, Strom., I, 1; Orig., Contra Celsum, v. 8).

2. Internal Evidence:

The authenticity was not questioned until the second quarter of the 19th century when Mayerhoff claimed on the ground of style, vocabulary, and thought that it was not by the apostle. The Tübingen school claimed, on the basis of a supposed Gnosticism, that the epistle was the work of the 2nd century and so not Pauline. This position has been thoroughly answered by showing that the teaching is essentially different from the Gnosticism of the 2nd century, especially in the conception of Christ as prior to and greater than all things created (see V below). The attack in later years has been chiefly on the ground of vocabulary and style, the doctrinal position, especially the Christology and the teaching about angels, and the relation to the Ephesian epistle. The objection on the ground of vocabulary and style is based, as is so often the case, on the assumption that a man, no matter what he writes about, must use the same words and style. There are thirty-four words in Colossians which are not in any other New Testament book. When one removes those that are due to the difference in subject-matter, the total is no greater than that of some of the acknowledged epistles. The omission of familiar Pauline particles, the use of genitives, of "all" (pas), and of synonyms, find parallels in other epistles, or are due to a difference of subject, or perhaps to the influence on the language of the apostle of his life in Rome (von Soden). The doctrinal position is not at heart contradictory to Paul's earlier teaching (compare Godet, *Introduction to the New Testament; Paul's Epistles*, 440 f). The Christology is in entire harmony with Philippians (which see) which is generally admitted as Pauline, and is only a development of the teaching in 1 Corinthians (8:6; 15:24-28), especially in respect of the emphasis laid on "the cosmical activity of the preincarnate Christ." Finally, the form in which Paul puts the Christology is that best calculated to meet the false teaching of the Colossian heretics (compare V below). In recent years H. Holtzmann has advocated that this epistle is an interpolated form of an original Pauline epistle to the Colossians, and the work of the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians (which see). A modification of this theory of interpolation has recently been suggested by J. Weiss (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, September 29, 1900). Both these theories are too complicated to stand, and even von Soden, who at first followed Holtzmann, has abandoned the position (von Soden, *Einleitung.*, 12); while Sanday (DB2) has shown how utterly untenable it is. Sober criticism today has come to realize that it is impossible to deny the Pauline authorship of

this epistle. This position is strengthened by the close relationship between Colossians and Philemon, of which Renan says: “Paul alone, so it would seem, could have written this little masterpiece” (Abbott, International Critical Commentary, lviii). If Philemon (which see) stands as Pauline, as it must, then the authenticity of Colossians is established beyond controversy.

II. PLACE AND DATE.

The Pauline authorship being established, it becomes evident at once that the apostle wrote Colossians along with the other Captivity Epistles, and that it is best dated from Rome (*see PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO*), and during the first captivity. This would be about 58 or, if the later chronology is preferred, 63 or 64.

III. DESTINATION.

The epistle was written, on the face of it, to the church at COLOSSAE (which see), a town in the Lycus valley where the gospel had been preached most probably by Epaphras (Colossians 17; 4:12), and where Paul was, himself, unknown personally (1:4,8,9; 2:1,5). From the epistle it is evident that the Colossian Christians were Gentiles (1:27) for whom, as such, the apostle feels a responsibility (2:1 ff). He sends to them Tychicus (4:7), who is accompanied by Onesimus, one of their own community (4:9), and urges them to be sure to read another letter which will reach them from Laodicea (4:16).

IV. RELATION TO OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

Beyond the connection with Ephesians (which see) we need notice only the relation between Colossians and Rev. In the letter to Laodicea (~~cf~~ Revelation 3:14-21) we have two expressions: “the beginning of the creation of God,” and “I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne,” in which we have an echo of Colossians which “suggests an acquaintance with and recognition of the earlier apostle’s teaching on the part of John” (Lightfoot, Colossians, 42, note 5).

V. THE PURPOSE.

The occasion of the epistle was, we may be sure, the information brought by Epaphras that the church in Colosse was subject to the assault of a body of Judaistic Christians who were seeking to overthrow the faith of the

Colossians and weaken their regard for Paul (Zahn). This "heresy," as it is commonly called, has had many explanations. The Tübingen school taught that it was gnostic, and sought to find in the terms the apostle used evidence for the 2nd century composition of the epistle. *Pleroma* and *gnosis* ("fullness" and "knowledge") not only do not require this interpretation, but will not admit it. The very heart of Gnosticism, i.e. theory of emanation and the dualistic conception which regards matter as evil, finds no place in Colossians. The use of *pleroma* in this and the sister epistle, Eph, does not imply Gnostic views, whether held by the apostle or by the readers of the letters. The significance in Colossians of this and the other words adopted by Gnosticism in later years is quite distinct from that later meaning. The underlying teaching is equally distinct. The Christ of the Colossians is not the aeon Christ of Gnosticism. In Essenism, on the other hand, Lightfoot and certain Germans seek the origin of this heresy. Essenism has certain affinities with Gnosticism on the one side and Judaism on the other. Two objections are raised against this explanation of the origin of the Colossian heresy. In the first place Essenism, as we know it, is found in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, and there is no evidence for its establishment in the Lycus valley. In the second place, no references are found in Colossians to certain distinct Essene teachings, e.g. those about marriage, washings, communism, Sabbath rules, etc.

The Colossian heresy is due to Judaistic influences on the one hand and to native beliefs and superstitions on the other. The Judaistic elements in this teaching are patent, circumcision (2:11), the Law (2:14,15), and special seasons (2:16). But there is more than Judaism in this false teaching. Its teachers look to intermediary spirits, angels whom they worship; and insist on a very strict asceticism. To seek the origin of angel worship in Judaism, as is commonly done, is, as A. L. Williams has shown, to miss the real significance of the attitude of the Jews to angels and to magnify the bitter jeers of Celsus. Apart from phrases used in exorcism and magic he shows us that there is no evidence that the Jew ever worshipped angels (JTS, X, 413 f). This element in the Colossian heresy was local, finding its antecedent in the worship of the river spirits, and in later years the same tendency gave the impulse to the worship of Michael as the patron saint of Colosse (so too Ramsay, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), under the word "Colossae"). The danger of and the falsehood in this teaching were twofold. In the first place it brought the gospel under the bands of the Law once more, not now with the formality of the Galatian

opponents, but none the less surely. But as the apostle's readers are Gentiles (1:27) Paul is not interested in showing the preparatory aspect of the Law. He simply insists to them that they are quite free from all obligations of the Law because Christ, in whom they have been baptized (2:12), has blotted out all the Law (2:14). The second danger is that their belief in and worship of the heavenly powers, false ideas about Christ and the material world, would develop even further than it had. They, because of their union with Him, need fear no angelic being. Christ has triumphed over them all, leading them as it were captives in His train (2:15), as He conquered on the cross. The spiritual powers cease to have any authority over the Christians. It is to set Christ forward, in this way, as Head over all creation as very God, and out of His relation to the church and to the universe to develop the Christian life, that the apostle writes.

VI. ARGUMENT.

The argument of the Epistle is as follows:

~~<5000>~~ *Colossians 1:1,2:*

Salutation.

~~<5000>~~ *Colossians 1:3-8:*

Thanksgiving for their faith in Christ, their love for the saints, their hope laid up in heaven, which they had in and through the gospel and of which he had heard from Epaphras.

~~<5000>~~ *Colossians 1:9-13:*

Prayer that they might be filled with the full knowledge of God's will so as to walk worthy of the Lord and to be fruitful in good works, thankful for their inheritance of the kingdom of His Son.

~~<5014>~~ *Colossians 1:14-23:*

Statement of the Son's position, from whom we have redemption. He is the very image of God, Creator, pre-existent, the Head of the church, preeminent over all, in whom all the fullness (*pleroma*) dwells, the Reconciler of all things, as also of the Colossians, through His death, provided they are faithful to the hope of the gospel.

~~<5024>~~ *Colossians 1:24 through 2:5:*

By his suffering he is filling up the sufferings of Christ, of whom he is a minister, even to reveal the great mystery of the ages, that Christ is in them, the Gentiles, the hope of glory, the object of the apostle's preaching everywhere. This explains Paul's interest in them, and his care for them, that their hearts may be strengthened in the love and knowledge of Christ.

~~<5016>~~ *Colossians 2:6 through 3:4:*

He then passes to exhortation against those who are leading them astray, these false teachers of a vain, deceiving philosophy based on worldly wisdom, who ignore the truth of Christ's position, as One in whom all the Divine pleroma dwells, and their relation to Him, united by baptism; raised through the faith; quickened and forgiven; who teach the obligation of the observance of various legal practices, strict asceticisms and angel worship. This exhortation is closed with the appeal that as Christ's they will not submit to these regulations of men which are useless, especially in comparison with Christ's power through the Resurrection.

~~<5015>~~ *Colossians 3:5-17:*

Practical exhortations follow to real mortification of the flesh with its characteristics, and the substitution of a new life of fellowship, love and peace.

~~<5018>~~ *Colossians 3:18 through 4:1:*

Exhortation to fulfill social obligations, as wives, husbands, children, parents, slaves and masters.

~~<5042>~~ *Colossians 4:2-6:*

Exhortation to devout and watchful prayer.

~~<5047>~~ *Colossians 4:7-18:*

Salutations and greeting.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon; Abbott, Ephesians and Colossians, International Critical Commentary; Peake, Colossians, Expositor's Greek Testament; Maclaren, Colossians, Expositor's Bible; Alexander, Colossians and Ephesians, Bible for Home

and School; Moule, Colossians, Cambridge Bible; Haupt, Meyer's Krit. u. Exeg. Kom.; von Soden, Hand-Kom. zum New Testament.

C. S. Lewis

COLT; FOAL

<kolt> ([ry[æayir], [ʔB, ben]; [πῶλος, *polos*], [υἱός, *huios*], with some word such as [ὑποζυγίου, *hupozugiou*], understood; *huios* alone = “son”): The English words “colt” and “foal” are used in the Bible of the ass everywhere except in <01325> Genesis 32:15, where the word “colt” is used of the camel in the list of animals destined by Jacob as presents for Esau. In most cases `ayir (compare Arabic `air, “ass”) means “ass’s colt,” but it may be joined with ben, “son,” as in <3909> Zechariah 9:9, where we have: `al-chamor we`al-`ayir ben-`athonoth, literally, “upon an ass, and upon a colt ass, and on an ass’s colt, the son of the she-asses”; compare <1215> Matthew 21:5 [ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου, *epi onon kai epi polon huion hupozugiou*], “upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.” In <6125> John 12:15 we have [ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου, *epi polon onou*], and in the previous verse the diminutive, [ὄνάριον, *onarion*]. The commonest New Testament word for “colt” is *polos*, akin to which is German *Fohle* and English “foal” and “filly.” The Latin *pullus* signifies either “foal” or “chicken,” and in the latter sense gives rise to French *poulet* and English “pullet.”

In view of the fact that horses are but little mentioned in the Bible, and that only in connection with royal equipages and armies, it is not surprising that “colt” does not occur in its ordinary English sense.

Alfred Ely Day

COME

<kum>: The translation of many Hebrew and Greek words. In the phrase “The Spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon him” (<07406> Judges 14:6,19; 15:14; <09000> 1 Samuel 10:10; 11:6; 16:13), the word is *tsaleah*; <07406> Judges 14:6; 15:14 “came mightily,” which is the uniform translation of the Revised Version (British and American) (compare <07125> Judges 13:25 “to move,” i.e. to disturb or stir up). In <07064> Judges 6:34; <13218> 1 Chronicles 12:18; <14201> 2 Chronicles 24:20, it is *labhesh*, “to clothe”; the Revised Version, margin “The Spirit clothed itself with Gideon” and “with Zechariah,” “The Spirit clothed Amasai.”

Among its many changes, the Revised Version (British and American) has “come forth” for “come” (~~4016~~ Matthew 2:6); “gone up” for “come” (~~4043~~ Matthew 14:32, a different text); “come all the way” for “come” (~~4045~~ John 4:15); “got out upon the” for “come to” (~~4200~~ John 21:9); “draw near” for “come” (~~3046~~ Hebrews 4:16); “come” for “come and see” (~~4018~~ Revelation 6:1); “secure” for “come by” (~~4276~~ Acts 27:16); “attain unto” for “come in” (~~4043~~ Ephesians 4:13); and “I come” for “I come again” (~~4043~~ John 14:28).

W. L. Walker

COMELINESS; COMELY

<kum' -li-nes>, *<kum' -li>*: Cognate with “becoming,” namely, what is suitable, graceful, handsome. The servant of Yahweh in ~~2510~~ Isaiah 53:2 is without “comeliness” (*hadhar*, “honor”), i.e. there is in his appearance nothing attractive, while he is bowed beneath man’s sin. “Praise is comely” (*na’wah*, f. of *na’weh*; ~~4690~~ Psalm 33:1; 147:1), i.e. suitable or befitting “for the righteous,” and, therefore, an honor and glory; “uncomely parts,” *aschemona* (~~4123~~ 1 Corinthians 12:23), namely, less honorable. See also ~~0168~~ 1 Samuel 16:18, “a comely person”; Song 6:4, “comely as Jerusalem.” etc.

COMFORT

<kum' -fert> ([~~μ~~ ~~j~~ ~~æ~~ *nacham*]; [~~π~~ ~~α~~ ~~ρ~~ ~~α~~ ~~κ~~ ~~α~~ ~~λ~~ ~~έ~~ ~~ω~~, *parakaleo*]): The New Testament word is variously translated, as “comfort,” “exhort,” “beseech,” the exact translation to be determined by the context. Etymologically, it is “to call alongside of,” i.e. to summon for assistance. To comfort is to cheer and encourage. It has a positive force wanting in its synonym “console,” as it indicates the dispelling of grief by the impartation of strength. the Revised Version (British and American) has correctly changed the translation of *paramutheomai* from the King James Version “comfort,” to “consolation.” So in the Old Testament, “Comfort ye my people” (~~2308~~ Isaiah 40:1) is much stronger than “console,” which affords only the power of calm endurance of affliction, while the brightest hopes of the future and the highest incentives to present activity are the gifts of the Divine grace that is here bestowed.

H. E. Jacobs

COMFORTABLY

<kum'-fer-ta-bli> ([bɪ ʌ [æəl lebh], “to the heart”): “To speak to the heart,” i.e. to speak kindly, to console, to comfort, is the ordinary Hebrew expression for wooing: e.g. Boaz spake “to the heart” of Ruth (^{<18213>}Ruth 2:13 margin; the King James Version “friendly,” the Revised Version (British and American) “kindly”). The beauty of the Hebrew term is illustrated in ^{<18221>}Genesis 50:21 where Joseph “spake kindly” unto his brethren, winning them from fear to confidence. Rendered “comfortably” in five passages: thrice of human speaking, and twice of the tenderness of God’s address to His people. David was urged to win back the hearts of the people by kind words: “speak comfortably” (^{<30807>}2 Samuel 19:7). Hezekiah in like manner comforted the Levites (^{<4812>}2 Chronicles 30:22) and encouraged his captains (^{<4816>}2 Chronicles 32:6). The term has exceptional wealth of meaning in connection with God’s message of grace and forgiveness to His redeemed people. The compassionate love that has atoned for their sins speaks to the heart (“comfortably”) of Jerusalem, saying “that her iniquity is pardoned” (^{<23012>}Isaiah 40:2). The same promise of forgiveness is given to the penitent nation by the prophet Hosea (^{<2024>}Hosea 2:14); “comfortable words” (^{<30113>}Zechariah 1:13), i.e. words affording comfort.

Dwight M. Pratt

COMFORTER

<kum'-fer-ter>: This is translation of the word [παράκλητος, *patakletos*], in the Johannine writings. In the Gospel it occurs in ^{<6146>}John 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7, and refers to the Holy Spirit. The word means literally, “called to one’s side” for help. The translation “Comforter” covers only a small part of the meaning as shown in the context. The word “Helper” would be a more adequate translation. The Spirit does a great deal for disciples besides comforting them, although to comfort was a part of His work for them. The Spirit guides into truth; indeed, He is called the Spirit of truth. He teaches and quickens the memory of disciples and glorifies Christ in them. He also has a work to do in the hearts of unbelievers, convicting the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment (John 14 through 16). The Comforter remains permanently with disciples after He comes in response to the prayers of Christ. The word *parakletos* does not occur elsewhere in the Scriptures except in ^{<6101>}1 John 2:1. In ^{<38162>}Job 16:2 the active form of

the word (*parakletos* is passive) is found in the plural, where Job calls his friends “miserable comforters.” The word “Comforter” being an inadequate, and the word “Helper” a too indefinite, translation of the word in the Gospel of John, it would probably be best to transfer the Greek word into English in so far as it relates to the Holy Spirit (*see PARACLETE*). In ^{<611>}1 John 2:1 the word *parakletos* refers to Christ: “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” Here the translation Advocate is quite correct. As the next verse shows the writer has in mind the intercession of Christ for Christians on the basis of His mediatorial work: “And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world” (^{<611>}1 John 2:2).

See ADVOCATE; HOLY SPIRIT; PARACLETE.

E. Y. Mullins

COMFORTLESS

^{<kum'-fert-les>} ([ὀρφανός, *orphanous*], “orphans”): The Greek original is found but twice in the New Testament; rendered “comfortless” in ^{<614>}John 14:18, the Revised Version (British and American) “desolate”; “fatherless” in ^{<517>}James 1:27 (compare ^{<185>}Psalm 68:5). The term signifies bereft of a father, parents, guardian, teacher, guide, and indicates what must be the permanent ministry of the Holy Spirit to the disciples of Jesus, in comforting their hearts. In harmony with these parting words Jesus had called the chosen twelve “little children” (^{<633>}John 13:33); without Him they would be “orphans,” comfortless, desolate. The coming of the Holy Spirit would make Christ and the Father forever real to them, an abiding spiritual presence.

Dwight M. Pratt

COMING OF CHRIST

See ADVENT; PAROUSIA.

COMING, SECOND

See PAROUSIA.

COMMANDMENT; COMMANDMENTS

^{<ko-mand'-ment>} ([חֻמָּה, *mitswah*]; [ἐντολή, *entole*]): The

commandments are, first of all, prescriptions, or directions of God, concerning particular matters, which He wanted observed with reference to circumstances as they arose, in a period when He spake immediately and with greater frequency than afterward. They were numerous, minute, and regarded as coordinate and independent of each other. In the Ten Commandments, or, more properly, Ten Words, EVm ([*pyrbD*] *debharim*)), they are reduced to a few all-comprehensive precepts of permanent validity, upon which every duty required of man is based. Certain prescriptions of temporary force, as those of the ceremonial and forensic laws, are applications of these “Words” to transient circumstances, and, for the time for which they were enacted, demanded perfect and unconditional obedience. The Psalms, and especially Psalm 119, show that even under the Old Testament, there was a deep spiritual appreciation of these commandments, and the extent to which obedience was deemed a privilege rather than a mere matter of constrained external compliance with duty. In the New Testament, Jesus shows in ^{<1027>}Matthew 22:37,40; ^{<1129>}Mark 12:29,31; ^{<1107>}Luke 10:27 (compare ^{<6138>}Romans 13:8,10) their organic unity. The “Ten” are reduced to two, and these two to one principle, that of love. In love, obedience begins, and works from within outward. Under the New Testament the commandments are kept when they are written upon the heart (^{<8106>}Hebrews 10:16). While in the Synoptics they are referred to in a more abstract and distant way, in both the Gospel and the Epistles of John their relation to Jesus is most prominent. They are “my commandments” (^{<8145>}John 14:15,21; 15:10,12); “my Father’s” (^{<8108>}John 10:18; 15:10); or, many times throughout the epp., “his (i.e. Christ’s) commandments.” The new life in Christ enkindles love, and not only makes the commandments the rule of life, but the life itself the free expression of the commandments and of the nature of God, in which the commandments are grounded. Occasionally the word is used in the singular collectively (^{<1242>}Exodus 24:12; ^{<1396>}Psalm 119:96; ^{<6145>}1 Corinthians 14:37).

See *TEN COMMANDMENTS, THE*.

H. E. Jacobs

COMMANDMENT, THE NEW

^{<nu>} ([*ἐντολή καινή*, *entole kaine*): The word “commandment” is used in the English versions of the Old Testament to translate several Hebrew words, more especially those meaning “word” (*dabhar*) as the ten words of

God (^{<0348>}Exodus 34:28) or king's "command" (Est 1:12); "precept" (*mitswah*) of God (^{<0342>}Deuteronomy 4:2), of a king (^{<0386>}2 Kings 18:36); "mouth" or "speech" (*peh*) of God (^{<0370>}Exodus 17:1), of Pharaoh (^{<0235>}2 Kings 23:35). They express theocratic idea of morality wherein the will or law of God is imposed upon men as their law of conduct (^{<0375>}2 Kings 17:37).

1. CHRIST AND THE OLD COMMANDMENT:

This idea is not repudiated in the New Testament, but supplemented or modified from within by making love the essence of the command. Jesus Christ, as reported in the Synoptics, came not "to destroy the law or the prophets but to fulfill" (^{<0167>}Matthew 5:17). He taught that "whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven" (^{<0169>}Matthew 5:19). He condemned the Pharisees for rejecting the commandments of God as given by Moses (^{<0108>}Mark 7:8-13). There is a sense in which it is true that Christ propounded no new commandment, but the new thing in His teaching was the emphasis laid on the old commandment of love, and the extent and intent of its application. The great commandment is "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, (and) thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets" (^{<0124>}Matthew 22:34-40; ^{<0128>}Mark 12:28-34; compare ^{<0115>}Deuteronomy 6:5; ^{<0118>}Leviticus 19:18).

2. PRINCIPLE INSTEAD OF LAW:

When the law realizes itself as love for God and man in men's hearts, it ceases to bear the aspect of a command. The force of authority and the active resistance or inertia of the subject disappear; the law becomes a principle, a motive, a joyous harmony of man's will with the will of God; and in becoming internal, it becomes universal and transcends all distinctions of race or class. Even this was not an altogether new idea (compare ^{<0128>}Jeremiah 31:31-34; Psalm 51); nor did Christ's contemporaries and disciples think it was.

3. CHRIST'S LOVE FULFILLED IN DEATH BECOMES THE LAW OF THE CHURCH:

The revolutionary factor was the death of Christ wherein the love of God was exemplified and made manifest as the basis and principle of all spiritual

life (^{<B134>}John 13:34). Paul therefore generalizes all pre-Christian morality as a system of law and commandments, standing in antithesis to the grace and love which are through Jesus Christ (Romans 5 through 7). Believers in Christ felt their experience and inward life to be so changed and new, that it needed a new term (*agape* = “love”) to express their ideal of conduct (*see CHARITY*). Another change that grew upon the Christian consciousness, following from the resurrection and ascension of Christ, was the idea that He was the permanent source of the principle of life. “Jesus is Lord” (^{<B128>}1 Corinthians 12:3). Hence, in the Johannine writings the principle described by the new term [*agape*] is associated with Christ’s lordship and solemnly described as His “new commandment.” “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another” (^{<B134>}John 13:34). To the Christians of the end of the 1st century it was already an old commandment which they had from the beginning of the Christian teaching (^{<B107>}1 John 2:7; 2 John 5); but it was also a new commandment which ever came with new force to men who were passing from the darkness of hatred to the light of love (^{<B118>}1 John 2:8-11).

4. THE NEW REVELATION:

The term in the Gospel we may owe to the evangelist, but it brings into relief an element in the consciousness of Jesus which the author of the Fourth Gospel had appreciated more fully than the Synoptists. Jesus was aware that He was the bearer of a special message from the Father (^{<B124>}John 12:49; ^{<B117>}Matthew 11:27), that He fulfilled His mission in His death of love and self-sacrifice (^{<B108>}John 10:18), and that the mission fulfilled gave Him authority over the lives of men, “even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.” The full meaning of Christ’s teaching was only realized when men had experienced and recognized the significance of His death as the cause and principle of right conduct. The Synoptists saw Christ’s teaching as the development of the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament. Paul and John felt that the love of God in Christ was a new thing:

- (a) new as a revelation of God in Christ,
- (b) new as a principle of life in the church, and

(c) new as a union of believers with Christ. While it is love, it is also a commandment of Christ, calling forth the joyous obedience of believers.

See also BROTHERLY LOVE.

T. Rees

COMMANDMENTS, THE TEN

See COMMANDMENT; TEN COMMANDMENTS.

COMMEND

<ko-mend'>:

(1) For [παράτιθμι, *paratithemi*] (<2346> Luke 23:46), translating the Hebrew *paqadh* (<2815> Psalm 31:5), in the dying words of Jesus: “Into thy hands I commend my Spirit.” the King James Version in Psalms has the more general word “commit.” The use of the Greek word in the sense of “deposit what belongs to one into the hands of another” is not uncommon in the classics. So also the derivatives *paratheke* (<5012> 2 Timothy 1:12) and *parakatatheke* (<5150> 1 Timothy 6:20; <5014> 2 Timothy 1:14). *See DEPOSIT.* This sense of the English, while slightly archaic, corresponds to the first meaning of the Latin, whence it comes, “to commit for preservation,” especially of the dying; to commend children, parents, etc., to the care of others (for examples, see Harper’s *Latin Dictionary*).

(2) For [συνίστημι, *sunistemi*], “to stand together,” and then, by standing together, to establish, prove, exhibit, as “righteousness” and “love of God” (<2815> Romans 3:5; 5:8), and thus to attest (<2815> 2 Corinthians 3:1; 4:2), and, finally, to certify or to recommend a stranger (<2815> Romans 16:1; <2814> 2 Corinthians 6:4). The use of *paristemi* in <2818> 1 Corinthians 8:8 is equivalent.

(3) “To praise,” [ἐπαινέω, *epaineo*] (<2108> Luke 16:8), and *sunistemi* in <2702> 2 Corinthians 10:12,18; for the Old Testament, Hebrew *hillel*, in <0125> Genesis 12:15 the King James Version; <0128> Proverbs 12:8.

H. E. Jacobs

COMMENTARIES

<kom'-en-ta-riz>:

I. THE WORD — GENERAL SCOPE.

Etymologically, a commentary (from Latin *commentor*) denotes jottings, annotations, memoranda, on a given subject, or perhaps on a series of events; hence, its use in the plural as a designation for a narrative or history, as the Commentaries of Caesar. In its application to Scripture, the word designates a work devoted to the explanation, elucidation, illustration, sometimes the homiletic expansion and edifying utilization, of the text of some book or portion of Scripture. The primary function of a good commentary is to furnish an exact interpretation of the meaning of the passage under consideration; it belongs to it also to show the connection of ideas, the steps of argument, the scope and design of the whole, in the writing in question. This can only be successfully accomplished by the help of a knowledge of the original language of the writing, and of the historical setting of the particular passage; by careful study of the context, and of the author's general usages of thought and speech; and by comparison of parallel or related texts. Aid may also be obtained from external sources, as a knowledge of the history, archaeology, topography, chronology, manners and customs, of the lands, peoples and times referred to; or, as in Deissmann's recent discoveries, from the light thrown on peculiarities of language by papyri or other ancient remains (see his *Light from the Ancient East*).

II. DIFFERENCES IN CHARACTER OF COMMENTARIES.

It is obvious that commentaries will vary greatly in character and value according as they are more scholarly, technical, and critical, entering, e.g. into philological discussions, and tabulating and remarking upon the various views held as to the meaning; or again, more popular, aiming only at bringing out the general sense, and conveying it to the mind of the reader in attractive and edifying form. When the practical motive predominates, and the treatment is greatly enlarged by illustration, application, and the enforcement of lessons, the work loses the character of commentary proper, and partakes more of the character of homily or discourse.

III. RANGE OF COMMENTARIES.

No book in the world has been made the subject of so much commenting and exposition as the Bible. Theological libraries are full of commentaries of all descriptions and all grades of worth. Some are commentaries on the

original Hebrew or Greek texts; some on the English or other versions. Modern commentaries are usually accompanied with some measure of introduction to the books commented upon; the more learned works have commonly also some indication of the data for the determination of the textual readings (*see CRITICISM, TEXTUAL*). Few writers are equal to the task of commenting with profit on the Bible as a whole, and, with the growth of knowledge, this task is now seldom attempted. Frequently, however, one writer contributes many valuable works, and sometimes, by cooperation of like-minded scholars, commentaries on the whole Bible are produced. It is manifestly a very slight survey that can be taken in a brief article of the work of commenting, and of the literature to which it has given rise; the attempt can only be made to follow the lines most helpful to those seeking aid from this class of books. On the use and abuse of commentaries by the preacher, C. H. Spurgeon's racy remarks in his *Commenting and Commentaries* may be consulted.

1. Early Commentaries:

Rabbinical interpretations and paraphrases of the Old Testament may here be left out of account (see next article; also *TARGUMS; TALMUD*; F. W. Farrar's *History of Interpretation*, Lect II). Commentaries on the New Testament could not begin till the New Testament books themselves were written, and had acquired some degree of authority as sacred writings (*see BIBLE*). The earliest commentaries we hear of are from the heretical circles of the Gnostics. Heracleon, a Valentinian (circa 175 AD), wrote a commentary on the Gospel of John (fragments in Origen), and on parts at least of the Gospel of Luke. Tatian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, about the same time, compiled his *Diatessaron*, or *Harmony of the Four Gospels*, on which, at a later time, commentaries were written. Ephraem Syrus (4th century) wrote such a commentary, of which an Armenian translation has now been recovered. The Church Father Hippolytus (beginning of 3rd century), wrote several commentaries on the Old Testament (Exodus, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Zechariah, etc.), and on Matthew, Luke and Revelation.

(1) Origen, etc.

The strongest impulse, however, to the work of commenting and exposition of Holy Scripture undoubtedly proceeded from the school of Alexandria — especially from Origen (203-254 AD). Clement, Origen's predecessor, had written a treatise called *Hypotuposeis*, or "Outlines," a

survey of the contents of Holy Scripture. Origen himself wrote commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament, Ruth, Est and Ecclesiastes alone excepted, and on most of the books of the New Testament (Mark, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, James, Jude, Revelation excepted). He furnished besides, *scholia*, or notes on difficult passages, and delivered Homilies, or discourses, the records of which fill three folio volumes. "By his Tetrapla and Hexapla," says Farrar, "he became the founder of all textual criticism; by his Homilies he fixed the type of a popular exposition; his *scholia* were the earliest specimens of marginal explanations; his commentaries furnished the church with her first continuous exegesis" (op. cit., 188). Unfortunately, the Alexandrian school adopted a principle of allegorical interpretation which led it frequently into the most extravagant fancies. Assuming a threefold sense in Scripture — a literal, a moral, and a spiritual — it gave reins to caprice in foisting imaginary meanings on the simplest historical statements (Farrar, op. cit., 189 ff). Some of Origen's commentaries, however, are much freer from allegory than others, and all possess high value (compare Lightfoot, Galatians, 217). The later teachers of the Alexandrian school continued the exegetical works of Origen. Pamphilus of Caesarea, the friend of Eusebius, is said to have written Old Testament commentaries.

(2) Chrysostom, etc.

At the opposite pole from the allegorizing Alexandrian school of interpretation was the Antiochinn, marked by a sober, literal and grammatical style of exegesis. Its reputed founder was Lucian (martyred 311 AD); but its real heads were Diodorus of Tarsus(379-94 AD) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (393-428 AD); and its most distinguished representative was John Chrysostom (347-407 AD). Chrysostom wrote continuous commentaries on Isaiah (only Isaiah 1 through 8:10 remaining) and on Galatians; but his chief contributions were his Homilies, covering almost the whole of the Old Testament and New Testament. Of these over 600 remain, chiefly on the New Testament. They are unequal in character, those on Acts being reputed the feeblest; others, as those on Matthew, Romans and Corinthians, are splendid examples of expository teaching. Schaff speaks of Chrysostom as "the prince of commentators among the Fathers" (History, Ante-Nicene Per., 816). Thomas Aquinas is reported to have said that he would rather possess Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew than be master of all Paris. In the West, Ambrose of Milan (340-97 AD) wrote expositions of Old Testament histories and of Luke (allegorical and

typical), and Jerome (346-420 AD) wrote numerous commentaries on Old Testament and New Testament books, largely, however, compilations from others.

2. Scholastic Period:

The medieval and scholastic period offers little for our purpose. There was diligence in copying manuscripts, and producing catenae of the opinions of the Fathers; in the case of the schoolmen, in building up elaborate systems of theology; but the Scriptures were thrown into the background.

Nicolas de Lyra.

The 14th century, however, produced one commentator of real eminence — Nicolas de Lyra (1270-1340). Nicolas was a Franciscan monk, well versed in Hebrew and rabbinical learning. While recognizing the usual distinctions of the various senses of Scripture, he practically builds on the literal, and exhibits great sobriety and skill in his interpretations. His work, which bears the name *Postillae Perpetuae in Universa Biblia*, was much esteemed by Luther, who acknowledged his indebtedness to it. Hence, the jest of his opponents, *Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset* (a notice of Lyra may be seen in Farrar, *op. cit.*, 274-78).

3. Reformation and Post-Reformation Periods:

The Reformation brought men's minds back to the Scriptures and opened a new era in Biblical exposition and commentary. It became the custom to expound the Scriptures on Sundays and week-days in all the pulpits of the Protestant churches. "Luther's custom was to expound consecutively in a course of sermons the Old and New Testaments" (Kostlin). The Reformation began at Zurich with a series of discourses by Zwingli on the Gospel of Matthew. The same was true of Calvin, Beza, Knox and all associated with them. The production of commentaries or expository homilies was the necessary result.

(1) Luther and Calvin.

As outstanding examples may be mentioned Luther's Commentary on Galatians, and the noble commentaries of Calvin. Not all by any means, but very many of the commentaries of Calvin were the fruit of pulpit prelections (e.g. the expositions of Job, the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Daniel). Others, as the commentaries on Romans and the Psalms (reputed

his best), were prepared with great care. Calvin's supreme excellence as a commentator is disputed by no one. From every school and shade of opinion in Christendom could be produced a chorus of testimony to the remarkable gifts of mind and heart displayed in his expositions of Scripture — to his breadth, moderation, fairness and modernness of spirit, in exhibiting the sense of inward genius of Holy Writ. The testimony of Arminius is as striking as any: "I exhort my pupils to peruse Calvin's commentaries for I affirm that he excels beyond comparison in the interpretation of Scripture, and that his commentaries ought to be more highly valued than all that is handed down to us by the library of the Fathers."

(2) Beza, Grotius, etc.

Lutheranism had its distinguished exegetes (Brenz, died 1572), who wrote able commentaries on the Old Testament, and in both the Calvinistic and Arminian branches of the Reformed church the production of commentaries held a chief place. Beza, Calvin's successor, is acknowledged to have possessed many of the best exegetical qualities which characterized his master. Grotius, in Holland (died 1645), occupies the foremost place among the expositors in this century on the Arminian side. His exegetical works, if not marked by much spirituality, show sagacity and learning, and are enriched by parallels from classical literature. The school of Cocceius (died 1669) developed the doctrine of the covenants, and reveled in typology. Cocceius wrote commentaries on nearly all the books of Scripture. His pupil Vitringa (died 1716) gained renown by his expositions of Isaiah and the Apocalypse.

(3) Later writers.

Partly fostered by the habit of basing commentary on pulpit exposition, the tendency early set in to undue prolixity in the unfolding of the meaning of Scripture. "In the Lutheran church," says Van Oosterzee, "they began to preach on whole books of the Bible; sometimes in a very prolix manner, as, e.g. in the case of the 220 sermons by one Striegnitz, a preacher at Meissen, on the history of Jonah, of which four are devoted to the consideration of the words 'Unto Jonah' " (Practical Theol., 120). The habit spread. The commentaries of Peter Martyr (Swiss Reformer, died 1562) on Judges and Romans occupy a folio each; N. Byfield (Puritan, died 1622) on Colossians fills a folio; Caryl (Independent, died 1673) on Job extends to 2 folios; Durham (died 1658) on Isaiah 53 consists of 72

sermons; Venema (Holland, died 1787) on Jeremiah fills 2 quartos, and on the Psalms no less than 6 quartos. These are only samples of a large class. H. Hammond's *A Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament*, from an Arminian Standpoint belong to this period (1675). Another work which long took high rank is M. Poole's elaborate *Synopsis Criticorum Biblicorum* (5 volumes, folio, 1669-76) — a summary of the opinions of 150 Biblical critics; with which must be taken his *English Annotations on the Holy Bible*, only completed up to Isaiah 58 at the time of his death (1679). The work was continued by his friends.

4. 18th Century:

(1) Calmet, M. Henry, etc.

The 18th century is marked by greater sobriety in exegesis. It is prolific in commentaries, but only a few attain to high distinction. Calmet (died 1757), a learned Benedictine, on the Roman Catholic side, produced his *Commentaire litteral sur tous les livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament*, in 23 quarto volumes — a work of immense erudition, though now necessarily superseded in its information. On the Protestant side, Matthew Henry's celebrated *Exposition of the Old and New Testament* (1708-10) easily holds the first place among devotional commentaries for its blending of good sense, quaintness, original and felicitous remark, and genuine insight into the meaning of the sacred writers. It is, of course, not a critical work in the modern acceptation, and often is unduly diffuse. M. Henry's work extends only to the end of Acts; the remaining books were done by various writers after his death (1714). Leviticus Clerc (died 1736) may be named as precursor of the critical views now obtaining on the composition and authorship of the Pentateuch. His commentaries began with Genesis in 1693 and were not Completed till 1731. Other commentators of note of Arminian views were Daniel Whitby (died 1726; converted to Arianism), and, later, Adam Clarke, Wesleyan (1762-1832), whose work extends into the next century. Clarke's *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures* (1810-26), still held by many in high esteem, is marred to some extent by eccentricities of opinion.

(2) Patrick, Lowth, Scott.

In the Anglican church the names of chief distinction in this century are Bishop Patrick, Bishop Lowth, and later, Thomas Scott. Bishop Patrick, usually classed with the Cambridge Platonists (died 1707), contributed

paraphrases and commentaries on the Old Testament from Genesis to Canticles, while Bishop Lowth (died 1787) acquired lasting fame by his *Prelections on Hebrew Poetry*, and *A New Translation, with Notes on Isaiah*. He was among the first to treat the poetical and prophetic writings really as literature. The commentaries of Patrick and Lowth were subsequently combined with those of Whitby and other divines (Arnold, etc.) to form a complete *Critical Commentary* (1809), which went through many editions. The well-known commentary of Thomas Scott (1747-1821), representing a moderate Calvinism, is a solid and “judicious” piece of work, inspired by an earnest, believing spirit, though not presenting any marked originality or brilliance. Brilliance is not the characteristic of many commentators of this age.

(3) **Gill, Doddridge.**

Two other English writers deserving notice are Dr. John Gill (died 1771; Calvinistic Baptist), who wrote *Expositions on the Old Testament and the New Testament* and a separate *Exposition of the Song of Solomon* — learned, but ponderous and controversial; and Dr. Philip Doddridge (died 1751), whose *Family Expositor*, embracing the entire New Testament, with a harmony of the Gospels, and paraphrases of the meaning, is marked by excellent judgment, and obtained wide acceptance.

(4) **Bengel.**

Meanwhile a new period had been preluded in Germany by the appearance in 1742 of the *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* of J. A. Bengel (died 1751), a work following upon his critical edition of the New Testament issued in 1734. Though belonging to the 18th century, Bengel’s critical and expository labors really herald and anticipate the best work in these departments of the 19th century. His scholarship was exact, his judgment sound, his critical skill remarkable in a field in which he was a pioneer; his notes on the text, though brief, were pregnant with significance, and were informed by a spirit of warm and living piety.

The modern period, to which Bengel in spirit, if not in date, belongs, is marked by great changes in the style and character of commentaries. The critical temper was now strong; great advances had been made in the textual criticism of both Old Testament and New Testament (*see CRITICISM, TEXTUAL*); the work of the higher criticism had begun in the Old Testament; in Germany, the spirit of humanism, inherited from

Lessing, Herder and Goethe, had found its way into literature; knowledge of the sciences, of oriental civilizations, of other peoples and religions, was constantly on the increase; scholarship was more precise and thorough; a higher ideal of what commentary meant had taken possession of the mind.

5. The Modern Period — Its Characteristics:

Learning, too, had enlarged its borders, and books on all subjects poured from the press in such numbers that it was difficult to cope with them. This applies to commentaries as to other departments of theological study. Commentaries in the 19th century, and in our own, are legion. Only the most prominent landmarks can be noted.

(1) Germany

(a) The liberal school.

In Germany, as was to be anticipated, the rise of the critical spirit and the profound influence exercised by it are reflected in most of the commentaries produced in the first half of the century. On the liberal side, the rationalistic temper is shown in the rejection of miracle, the denial of prediction in prophecy, and the lowering of the idea of inspiration generally. The scholarship, however, is frequently of a very high order. This temper is seen in Deuteronomy Wette (died 1849), whose commentaries on the New Testament, written when his views had become more positive, show grace and feeling; in Gesenius (died 1842), who produced an epoch-making commentary on Isaiah; in Knobel (died 1863), pronouncedly rationalistic, but with keen critical sense, as evinced in his commentaries on the Pentateuch and Joshua, Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah; in Hupfeld (died 1866) in his Commentary on the Psalms (4 volumes); in Hitzig (died 1875), acute but arbitrary, who wrote on the Psalms and most of the Prophets; above all, in Ewald (died 1875), a master in the interpretation of the poetical and prophetic books, but who commented also on the first three Gospels, on the writings of John, and on Paul's epistles. Ewald's influence is felt in the History of the Jewish Church by Dean Stanley, in England. The Exegetical Handbook (*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*) embraced compendious annotations by Knobel, Hitzig, Bertbeau (school of Ewald), etc., but also Olshausen (died 1839; wrote likewise on the New Testament), on all the books of the Old Testament.

(b) Believing tendency.

On the believing side, from a variety of standpoints, evangelical, critical, mediating, confessional, a multitude of commentaries on the Old Testament and New Testament were produced.

(i) Conservative:

The extremely conservative position in criticism was defended by Hengstenberg (died, 1869; on Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Ezekiel, John, Revelation), by Keil (died 1888) in the well-known Keil and Delitzsch series (Genesis to Esther, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Minor Prophets; also New Testament commentaries), and by Havernick (died 1845; Daniel, Ezekiel). Delitzsch (died 1890) wrote valued commentaries on Genesis, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah; also on Hebrews.

(ii) Critical:

After the rise of the Wellhausen school, he considerably modified his views in the newer critical direction. His New Commentary on Genesis (1887) shows this change, but, with his other works, is still written in a strongly believing spirit. On the other hand, the critical position (older, not newer) is frankly represented by A. Dillmann (died 1894) in his commentaries on the books of the Pentateuch and Joshua (English translation of Genesis, 1897; many also of the above works are translated).

(iii) Mediating:

The mediating school, largely penetrated by the influence of Schleiermacher, had many distinguished representatives. Among the most conspicuous may be named Lucke (died 1855), who wrote on John; Bleek, the Old Testament and New Testament critical scholar (died 1859), who has a work on the first three Gospels, and lectures on Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Hebrews and Revelation (his Commentary on Hebrews is the best known), and Tholuck (died 1877), whose expositions and commentaries on Psalms, John, Romans and Hebrews with his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, are fine pieces of exegetical work.

A special place must be given to two names of high distinction in the present connection. One is J. P. Lange (died 1884), the projector and editor of the great Bibelwerk (theological and homiletical) in 22 volumes,

to which he himself contributed the commentaries on Genesis to Numbers, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, Revelation, with introductions and homiletic hints. The other is H. A. W. Meyer (died 1873), whose Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament from Matthew to Philippians (the remaining books being done by other scholars, Lunemann, Huther, etc.) is an essential part of every New Testament scholar's equipment.

(iv) Confessional:

With the more positive and confessional theologians may be ranked E. R. Stier (died 1862), whose Words of the Lord Jesus (English translation in 8 volumes; Biblical, mystical, tendency to prolixity), with commentaries on 70 selected Psalms, Proverbs, 2nd Isaiah, Ephesians, Hebrews, James and Jude, found much acceptance. A. von Harless (died 1879) wrote a Commentary on Ephesians, praised by Tholuck as one of the finest extant. Philippi (died 1882), of Jewish extraction, best known by his Commentary on Romans, was strictly Lutheran. One of the ablest of the Lutheran Confessionalists was Luthardt (died 1892), whose works include a Commentary on John's Gospel. Ebrard (died 1887), as stoutly confessional on the Reformed side, has an esteemed Commentary on Hebrews.

(v) Godet (Swiss):

An eminent continental theologian who cannot be overlooked is the Swiss F. L. Godet (died 1900), whose admirable Commentary on John's Gospel, and commentaries on Romans and Corinthians are highly appreciated.

(2) Britain and America.

Meanwhile the English speaking countries were pursuing their own paths in the production of commentaries, either in continuing their old traditions, or in striking out on new lines, under the foreign influences which, from the beginning of the century, had begun to play upon them. In England Bishop Blomfield (died 1857) published Lectures on John and Acts. In the United States there appeared from the pen of Dr. J. A. Alexander, of Princeton (died 1860), a noteworthy Commentary on Isaiah, fully abreast of the modern learning, but staunchly conservative; also a Commentary on Psalms. From the same seminary proceeded the massive commentaries of Dr. Charles Hodge (Calvinistic) on Romans, Ephesians and Corinthians. Adapted for popular use and greatly in demand for Sunday-school purposes were the Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical of Albert

Barnes (died 1871; New School Presbyterian). These Notes, the fruit of the use of the early morning hours in a busy pastoral life, covered the whole of the New Testament, with several books of the Old Testament (Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel). Sensible and informative, rather than original or profound, they proved helpful to many. Over 1,000,000 copies are stated to have been sold. Of similar aim, though less widely known, were the Notes of Professor M. W. Jacobus (died 1876; on the New Testament, Genesis and Exodus).

(i) Alford, Eadie:

A new era was opened in critical commentary in England by the publication of the Greek Testament (1849-61) of Dean Alford (died 1871), followed by his New Testament for English Readers (1868). Here was presented a thoroughly critical treatment of the texts, with a full display of the critical apparatus, and notes philological and exegetical, accompanied by learned and lucid introductions, on all the books of the New Testament. About the same time appeared the solid, if more theological and homiletical, commentaries of the Scottish scholar, J. Eadie (died 1876), on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

(ii) Ellicott and Lightfoot:

Anglican scholarship produced its ripest fruits in this line in the classical Critical and Grammatical Commentary of Bishop Ellicott (died 1905) on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Thessalonians, Pastoral Epistles, and the yet more remarkable series of commentaries of Bishop J. B. Lightfoot (died 1889), massive in learning, and wider in outlook than Ellicott's, on Galatians, Philemon, Colossians and Philemon. A large part of the value of Lightfoot's works consists in the special essays or dissertations on important subjects embodied in them (e.g. "St. Paul and the Three", "The Christian Ministry," "The Colossian Heresy," etc.).

(iii) Westcott:

With these names should be associated that of Bishop Westcott, Dr. Lightfoot's successor in the see of Durham (died 1901), whose commentaries on the Gospel and Epistles of John, and on He, take a place among the foremost. Bishop Moule, who, in turn, succeeded Dr. Westcott; has also written commentaries, simpler in character, on Romans, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, in the Cambridge Bible Series, and on Romans in the Expositor's Bible. In Old Testament exposition mention

should be made of Bishop Perowne's valuable work on the Book of Psalms (2nd edition, revised, 1870), with his contributions to the Cambridge Bible (see below).

(iv) Critical Influences — Broad Church

Stanley and Jowett:

The critical and theological liberalism of Germany has made its influence felt in England in the rise of a Broad Church party, the best products of which in commentary were Dean Stanley's (died 1881) graphic and interesting Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians (1855) and Dr. B. Jowett's Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, with Critical Notes and Dissertations (1855). The new spirit culminated in the appearance of the famous Essays and Reviews (1860), and in the works of Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch and Joshua (1862-79). Bishop Colenso had already published a translation of Romans, with commentary (1861).

(v) General Commentaries (Series):

Besides works by individual authors, there appeared during this period several general commentaries, to the production of which many writers contributed. The following may be mentioned. The Speaker's Commentary (10 volumes, 1871-82), under the general editorship of Canon F. C. Cook (died 1889), was called forth by the agitation over Bishop Colenso. Dr. Cook himself wrote introductions to Exodus, Psalms and Acts, and contributed the entire commentaries on Job, Habakkuk, Mark, Luke, 1 Peter, with parts of commentaries on Exodus, Psalms and Matthew. The work is of unequal value. A serviceable series is the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (1877 ff), edited by Bishop Perowne, with Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools, and Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges (still in process). Dr. Perowne (died 1904) himself contributed to the first-named the commentaries on Obadiah, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Galatians. Many valuable contributions appear in this series, e.g. A. F. Kirkpatrick on 1 and 2 Samuel and Psalms, A. B. Davidson on Job and Ezekiel, Driver on Daniel, G. G. Findlay on Thessalonians, etc. Next, under the editorship of Bishop Ellicott, were produced (1877-84) A New Testament Commentary for English Readers (3 volumes), and An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers (5 volumes), which contained some valuable work (Genesis by R. Payne Smith, Exodus by Canon G. Rawlinson, etc.). Akin to this in character was

the Popular Commentary on the New Testament (4 volumes, 1879-83), edited by Dr. W. Schaff. This embraced, with other excellent matter, commentaries on Thessalonians by Dr. Marcus Dods, and on 1 and 2 Peter by Dr. S. D. F. Salmond. The Pulpit Commentary (49 volumes, 1880 ff), edited by J. S. Exell and Canon H. D. M. Spence, has expositions by good scholars, and an abundance of homiletical material by a great variety of authors. The series of Handbooks for Bible Classes (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh) has a number of valuable commentaries, e.g. that of Dr. A. B. Davidson on He.

6. Recent Period:

In the most recent period the conspicuous feature has been the production of commentaries in series or by individual writers embodying the results of an advanced Old Testament criticism — in less degree of a radical New Testament criticism.

(1) Germany.

In Germany, in addition to the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*, of older standing (see above), to which Dillmann contributed, may be mentioned Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Altes Testament* (1897 ff) and Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Altes Testament*; also Strack-and Zockler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar* (Old Testament and New Testament; critical, but moderate). Marti contributes to his *Hand-Commentar* the volumes on Isaiah, Daniel and the Minor Prophets; Nowack contributes to his *Handkommentar* the volumes on Judges and Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel and the Minor Prophets (of special importance in Nowack's series are the volumes on Genesis by H. Gunkel, and on Deuteronomy and Joshua by C. Steuernagel); Strack writes in his own work the volumes on Genesis to Numbers (Oettli contributes Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges). Much more conservative in spirit are the commentaries of H.C. von Orelli (Basel) on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets. In the New Testament, Meyer's Commentary has been "revised" by later writers, many of them (J. Weiss, W. Bousset, etc.) of much more advanced tendency than the original author.

(2) Britain and America.

In Britain and America like currents are observable. Professor T.K. Cheyne, who wrote a helpful commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah (1880-81), and subsequently commentaries on Micah and Hosea

(Cambridge Bible), Jeremiah (Pulpit Commentary), and on The Book of Psalms (1884), has become more and more extreme in his opinions. Of works in series the most important is The International Critical Commentary, edited by Drs. Driver and Plummer in England, and Dr. C. A. Briggs in the United States, of which 16 volumes in the Old Testament and the New Testament have already appeared. It need not be said that the commentaries in this series are always scholarly and able; those on the Old Testament are, however, all built on the Wellhausen foundations (*see CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE*. III). Dr. Driver himself writes on Deuteronomy; Dr. J. Skinner, on Genesis; Dr. G. F. Moore, on Judges; Dr. H. P. Smith, on 1 and 2 Samuel; Dr. Briggs, on Psalms; Dr. Toy, on Proverbs; Dr. W. R. Harper (died 1906), on Amos and Hosea; while Matthew in the New Testament is covered by W. C. Allen, Luke by Dr. Plummer, Romans by Drs. Sanday and Headlam, etc. A similar series is the Westminster Commentary, recently commenced, to which Dr. Driver contributes the volume on Genesis (1904; 7th edition, 1909). Yet another recent popular series is The Century Bible, to which again leading critical scholars lend their aid (Dr. W. H. Bennett on Genesis; also on "General Epistles"; Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy on 1 and 2 Samuel; Dr. Skinner on 1 and 2 Kings; Dr. A. S. Peake on Job; also on Hebrews; Dr. Driver on a group of the Minor Prophets, etc.). A well-planned one-vol Commentary on the Holy Bible, by various writers, has recently been edited by J. R. Dummelow (Cambridge). It is prefaced by a general Introduction, with a large number of articles on the principal subjects with which a reader of the Bible will desire to be acquainted.

It need only be added that very many of the foreign works mentioned above (not simply those specially noted) are now accessible in English translations.

LITERATURE.

Works and articles specially devoted to commentaries are not numerous. Dr. S. Davidson has an article "Commentary" in Kitto's Biblical Encyclopedia, Vol I. See also F. W. Farrar's Hist of Interpretation (Bampton Lects for 1885). G. H. Spurgeon's popular talks on Commenting and Commentaries are accompanied by extensive lists of Commentaries on all parts of the Bible (severely exclusive of works deemed dangerous). Lists of commentaries on the Bible as a whole, on the Old Testament and New Testament separately, and on the several books,

may be seen in most good works on Introduction, or in prolegomena to commentaries on the different books; e.g. in the general Introduction prefixed to Lange's Commentary on Genesis; also in the lengthy sections on Jewish, Greek, Latin and Protestant commentators, and again in the "Index of the More Important Expository Works on the Books of the Old Testament." In Bleek's Introduction to the Old Testament, very full information is given up to the author's date. Full bibliographies of modern books, including commentaries on the Old Testament, are furnished in Dr. Driver's Introduction. Similar lists are given in other works regarding the New Testament. For the writers of the commentaries on the special books in the above-noted German and English series, lists may generally be seen attached to each volume of the series.

James Orr

COMMENTARIES, HEBREW

<he'-broo>:

The following outline alludes to the leading Jewish commentators and their works in chronological order. However widely the principles which guided the various Jewish schools of exegesis, or the individual commentatom, differ from those of the modern school, the latter will find a certain suggestiveness in the former's interpretation which well merits attention.

1. PHILO JUDAEUS:

Philo Judaeus: A Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria, Egypt. Born about 20 BC; died after 40 AD. By his allegorical method of exegesis (a method he learned from the Stoics), Philo exercised a far-reaching influence not only on Jewish thought, but even more so on the Christian church. We have but to mention his influence on Origen and other Alexandrian Christian writers. His purpose in employing his allegorical method was, mainly, to reconcile Greek philosophy with the Old Testament.

See PHILO JUDAEUS.

Josephus cannot be called a Bible commentator in the proper sense of the term.

See JOSEPHUS.

2. TARGUM:

Targum (plural *Targumim*): The Aramaic translation of the Old Testament. Literally, the word designates a translation in general; its use, however, has been restricted to the Aramaic version of the Old Testament, as contrasted with the Hebrew text which was called *miqra*'. The Targum includes all the books of the Old Testament except Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah, which are written in part in Aramaic. Its inception dates back to the time of the Second Temple, and it is considered a first approach to a commentary before the time of Jesus. For the Targum is not a mere translation, but rather a combination of a translation with a commentary, resulting in a paraphrase, or an interpretative translation — having its origin in exegesis. The language of this paraphrase is the vernacular tongue of Syria, which began to reassert itself throughout Palestine as the language of common intercourse and trade, as soon as a familiar knowledge of the Hebrew tongue came to be lost. The Targumim are:

TO THE PENTATEUCH

- (1) Targum Onkelos or Babylonian Targum (the accepted and official);
- (2) Targum yerushalmi or Palestinian Targum ("Pseudo-Jonathan"; aside from this (complete) Targum there are fragments of the Palestinian Targum termed "Fragment Targim").

TO THE PROPHETS

- (1) Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel (being the official one; originated in Palestine and was then adapted to the vernacular of Babylonia);
- (2) A Palestinian Targum, called Targum yerushalmi (Palestinian in origin; edition Lagarde, "Prophetae Chaldaice").

Other Targumim (not officially recognized):

- (1) To the Psalms and Job;
- (2) to Proverbs;
- (3) to the Five Rolls;
- (4) to Chronicles — all Palestinian.

See TARGUM.

3. MIDRASH:

Midrash: Apparently the practice of commenting upon and explaining the meaning of the Scriptures originated in the synagogues (in the time of Ezra), from the necessity of an exposition of the Law to a congregation many of whom did not or might not understand the language in which it was read. Such commentaries, however, were oral and extempore; they were not until much later crystallized into a definite form. When they assumed a definite and, still later, written shape, the name *Midhrash* (meaning “investigation,” “interpretation,” from *darash*, “to investigate” a scriptural passage) was given. The word occurs in ⁴¹³²2 Chronicles 13:22 where the Revised Version (British and American) translates “commentary.” From this fact some have drawn the inference that such *Midhrashim* were recognized and extant before the time of the Chronicler. They are: *Midhrash Rabba*’ on the Pentateuch and the Five Rolls (the one on Genesis occupies a first position among the various exegetical *Midhrashim*, both on account of its age and importance). Next comes the one on Lamentations. (Zunz pointed out that the *Midhrash Rabba*’ consists of ten entirely different *Midhrashim*.) On the same ten books there is a similar collection, called *ha-Midhrash ha-gadol* (the “Great Midrash”), being a collection of quotations from a good many works including the *Midhrash Rabba*’. Other *Midhrashim* are: The *Midhrash Tanchuma*’ on the Pentateuch; the *Mekhilta*’ on Exodus (this has been (Leipzig, 1909) translated into German by Winter and Wuensche; the latter also published, under the main title *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, a collection of the old *Midhrashim* in a German translation with introductions and notes). Further, *Ciphra*’ on Leviticus; *Ciphre* on Numbers and Dr; *peciqta*’, which comments on sections taken from the entire range of Scriptures for various festivals. There are also extant separate *Midhrashim* on the Psalms, Proverbs, etc.

In this connection we have yet to mention the *YalquT Shim`oni*, a haggadic compilation attributed to the 11th or, according to Zunz, the 13th century. The *YalquT* extends over the whole of the Old Testament and is arranged according to the sequence of those portions of the Bible to which reference is made. Further, the *YalquT ha-Maqiri*, a work similar in contents to the *YalquT Shim`oni*, edition Greenup.

See COMMENTARIES; MIDRASH.

4 TALMUD:

Talmud (Talmudh): This term is used here to designate the entire body of literature exclusive of the *Midhrash*. Ample exegetical material abounds in the Talmud as it does in the *Midhrashim*. The critical notes on the Bible by some Talmudists are very characteristic of their intellectual temper. Some of them were extremely radical, and expressed freely their opinions on important problems of Bible criticism, such as on the integrity of the text, on doubtful authorship, etc. An Amora' of the 3rd century AD held the opinion that the story of Job is purely fictitious, both as to the name of the hero and as to his fate. The Talmudists also generalized, and set up critical canons. The "Baraitha', of the Thirty-two Rules" is the oldest work on Biblical hermeneutics (Philo's hermeneutical rules being rather fantastic), and contains exegetical notices valid to this very day. Hermeneutics, of course, is not exegesis proper, but theory of exegesis; one results from the other, however. This Baraitha' calls attention, for instance, to the fact that words occur in the Old Testament in an abbreviated form — a thing now generally accepted.

See TALMUD.

5. KARAITES:

Karaites: "Followers of the Bible." They are sometimes referred to as the "Protestants of the Jews," professing to follow the Old Testament to the exclusion of the rabbinical tradition. The founder of this Jewish sect was a Bah Jew in the 8th century, Anan ben David, by name; hence, they were first called Ananites. The principal Karaite commentators of the 9th, 10th and 11th centuries are: Benjamin Al-Nahawendi (he was the first to use the term "Karaites," "*Ba`ale Miqra*"), Solomon ben Jeroham, Sahl ibn Mazliah, Yusuf al-Basir, Yafith ibn Ali (considered the greatest of this period), and Abu al-Faraj Harun. Of a later date we will mention Aaron ben Joseph and Aaron ben Elijah (14th century).

The struggle between the Rabbinites and the Karaites undoubtedly gave the impetus to the great exegetical activity among the Jews in Arabic speaking countries during the 10th and 11th centuries. The extant fragments of Saadia's commentary on the Pentateuch (not less than his polemical writings proper) are full of polemics against the Karaite interpretation. And the same circumstance aroused Karaites to like efforts.

6. MIDDLE AGES:

Middle Ages: In the old *Midhrashim* as well as elsewhere the consciousness of a simple meaning of a text was never entirely lost. The principal tendencies in exegesis were four; these were afterward designated by the acrostic “PARDEC”: i.e. *PeshaT* (or the simple philological explanation of words); *Remez* (or the allegorical); *Derash* (or the ethicohomiletical); and *Codh* (or the mystical). Naturally enough this division could never be strictly carried out; hence, variations and combinations are to be found.

(1) *Saadia ben Joseph:*

Saadia ben Joseph (892-942), the severest antagonist of the Karaites, translated the Old Testament into Arabic with notes. The parts published are: Pentateuch, Isa, Proverbs and Job.

Moses ha-Darshan (the Preacher) of Narbonne, France, and Tobiah ben Eliezer in Castoria, Bulgaria (11th century), are the most prominent representatives of midrashic-symbolic Bible exegesis. The former's work is known only by quotations, and contained Christian theological conceptions; the latter is the author of “*Leqach Tobh*” or “*Peciqta' ZuTarta*” on the Pentateuch and the five *Meghilloth*.

(2) *Rashi:*

Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac, of Troyes; born 1040, died 1105) wrote a very popular commentary, which extends over the whole of the Old Testament, with the exception of Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and the last part of Job. He strives for the *PeshaT*, i.e. for a sober, natural and rational interpretation of the Bible. His is still a commentary both for the boy and the man among the Jews. Christian exegetes of the Middle Ages as well as of more modern times made Use of his Bible commentary. Nicolas de Lyra (see *COMMENTARIES*) followed Rashi closely; and it is a known fact that Luther's translation of the Bible is dependent upon Nicolas de Lyra. Rashi's commentary has called forth numerous supercommentaries.

(3) *Joseph Kara:*

An independent and important exegete was Joseph Kara' (about 1100). He edited and partly completed Rashi's commentary, particularly the part on the Pentateuch

(4) Abraham ibn Ezra:

Abraham ibn Ezra's (1092-1168) commentary on the Pentateuch, like Rashi's commentaries, has produced many supercommentaries. His is very scholarly. He was the first to maintain that Isaiah contains the work of two authors; and his doubts respecting the authenticity of the Pentateuch were noticed by Spinoza.

(5) Qimchis:

The grammarians and the lexicographers were not merely exegetical expounders of words, but many of them were likewise authors of actual commentaries. Such were the Qimchis, Joseph (father), Moses and David (his sons); especially the latter. The Qimchis were the most brilliant contributors to Bible exegesis and Hebrew philology (like Ibn Ezra) in medieval times.

(6) Maimonides:

Maimonides (1135-1204): Philo employed his allegorical method for the purpose of bringing about a reconciliation of Plato with the Old Testament. Maimonides had something similar in view. To him Aristotle was the representative of natural knowledge and the Bible of supernatural — and he sought for a reconciliation between the two in his religious philosophy. Exegesis proper was the one field, however, to which this great genius made no contribution of first-class importance.

(7) Maimunist:

The Maimunist, those exegetes of a philosophical turn, are: Joseph ibn Aknin, Samuel ibn Tibbon, his son Moses, and his son-in-law, Jacob ben Abba Mari Anatolio, whose Malmadh ha-Talmidhim is the most important work of philosophical exegesis of the period.

Joseph ibn Kacpi, chiefly known as a philosopher of the Maimunist type, deserves attention. Ibn Kacpi is an exegete of the first quality. His exposition of Isaiah 53 might be the work of the most modern scholar. He refers the prophecy to Israel, not to an individual, and in this his theory is far superior to that of some other famous Jewish expositors who interpret the chapter as referring to Hezekiah.

Through the philosophical homily, which began to be used after the death of Maimonides, Aristotle was popularized from the pulpit. The pulpit

changed to a chair of philosophy. Aristotle's concepts — as Matter and Form, the Four Causes, Possibility and Reality — were then something ordinary in the sermon, and were very popular.

(8) Kabbalists:

The principal commentators with a Kabbalistic tendency are: Nachmanides (1194-1270?) whose great work is his commentary on the Pentateuch; Immanuel of Rome (1270?-1330?) who does, however, not disregard the literal meaning of the Scriptures; Bahya ben Asher (died 1340) who formulated the four methods of exegesis of "PaRDeC." referred to above; he took Nachmanides as his model; many supercommentaries were written on his commentary on the Pentateuch; and Gersonides (1288-1334), a maternal grandson of Nachmanides, who sees symbols in many Biblical passages; on account of some of his heretical ideas expressed in his philosophy, some rabbis forbade the study of his commentaries.

(9) The "Zohar":

We must not fail to make mention of the Zohar (the "Bible of the Kabbalists"), the book of all others in the Middle Ages that dominated the thinking and feeling of the Jews for almost 500 years, and which was in favor with many Christian scholars. This work is pseudepigraphic, written partly in Aramaic and partly in Hebrew. It first appeared in Spain in the 13th century, and was made known through Moses de Leon, to whom many historians attribute it.

(10) Isaac Arama:

Mention must also be made of Isaac Arama (1430-94), whose 'Aqedhah, his commentary on the Pentateuch (homiletical in style), was the standard book for the Jewish pulpit for centuries, much esteemed by the Christian world, and is still much read by the Jews, especially in Russia and Poland.

7. MODERN TIMES:

Abarbanel:

Isaac Abravanel (or Abarbanel; 1437-1508): A statesman and scholar who came nearest to the modern idea of a Bible commentator by considering not only the literary elements of the Bible but the political and social life of the people as well. He wrote a general introduction to each book of the Bible, setting forth its character; and he was the first to make use of

Christian commentaries which he quotes without the least prejudice. Moses Alshech (second half of 16th century) wrote commentaries, all of which are of a homiletical character. In the main the Jewish exegesis of the 16th and 17th centuries branched out into homiletics.

We will pass over the critical annotations connected with the various editions of the Hebrew Bible, based upon the comparison of manuscripts, on grammatical and Massoretic studies, etc, such as those of Elijah Levita, Jacob ben Hayyim of Tunis (afterward a convert to Christianity), etc.

8. THE "BI'URISTS":

(1) Mendelssohn:

The "Bi'urists" ("Commentators"): A school of exegetes which had its origin with Mendelssohn's (1729-86) literal German translation of the Bible, at a time when Christian Biblical studies of a modern nature had made some progress, and under whose influence the Bi'urists wrote. They are: Dubno, Wessely, Jaroslav, tt. Homberg, J. Euchel, etc. They laid a foundation for a critico-historical study of the Bible among modern Jews. It bore its fruit in the 19th century in the writings of Philippon, Munk, Fuerst, etc.

(2) Zunz, etc.:

The same century produced Zunz's (1794-1886) *Gottesdienstlichen Vortraege der Juden*, the book of "Jewish science."

(3) Malbim, Ehrlich, etc.:

It also produced three Jewish exegetes, Luzzatto in Italy, Malbim and Ehrlich in Russia (the latter since 1878 residing in New York); he published, in Hebrew a commentary on the Old Testament, entitled *Miqra' ki-PeshuTah* (Berlin, 1899-1901, 3 volumes), and, in German, *Randglossen z. hebr. Bibel*, two scholarly works written from the conservative standpoint (Leipzig, 1908-). Malbim was highly esteemed by the Christian commentators Franz Delitzsch and Muehlau, who studied under him.

(4) Halevy, Hoffmann, Mueller:

Others are Joseph Halevy, a French Jew, a most original Bible investigator, and D. Hoffmann (the last two named are adversaries of "higher criticism")

and D. H. Mueller. M. Heilprin wrote a collection of *Bibelkritische Notizen* (Baltimore, 1893), containing comparisons of various passages of the Bible, and *The Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews* (N.Y., 1879-80, 2 volumes), and the American rabbi B. Szold, a *Commentary on Job* (Baltimore, 1886), written in classic Hebrew, and with accurate scholarship and in which full account is taken of the work of the Massorites. A new Hebrew commentary on the whole of the Old Testament has been since 1903 in progress under the editorship of A. Kahana. This is the first attempt since Mendelssohn's *Bi'ur* to approach the Bible from the Jewish side with the latest philological and archaeological equipment. Among the authors are Kahana on Genesis and Jonah, Krauss on Isaiah, Chajes on Psalms and Amos, Wynkoop on Hosea and Joel, and Lambert on Daniel. This attempt well deserves attention and commendation.

There is still to be mentioned the work of M. M. Kalisch (1828-85), whose special object was to write a full and critical commentary on the Old Testament. Of his *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament*, with a New Tr, only the following parts were published: Exodus, 1855; Genesis, 1858; Leviticus (pts 1-2), 1867-72. They contain a resume of all that Jewish and Christian learning had accumulated on the subject up to the dates of their publication. In his Leviticus he anticipated Wellhausen to a large extent.

(5) Geiger, Graetz, Kohler:

We conclude with some names of the liberals: Geiger (whose *Urschrift* is extremely radical), Graetz, the great Jewish historian, and Kohler (president of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.) whose *Der Segen Jacobs* is one of the earliest essays of "higher criticism" written by a Jew.

LITERATURE.

Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, London. 1857; Zunz. *Gottesdienstlichen Vortraege der Juden*, 2nd edition, Frankfurt a. M., 1892; *Jew Encyclopedia* (articles by Bacher and Ginzberg); *Catholic Encyclopedia* (article "Commentaries"); Rosenau, *Jewish Biblical Commentators*, Baltimore, 1906 (popular); Winter-Wuenschel, *Geschichte der Juedischen Literatur*, Leipzig. 1892-95, 3 volumes (the best existing anthology of Jewish literature in a modern language; it contains very valuable introductions); Wogue, *Histoire de la Bible et l'exegese biblique jusqu' a nos jours*. Paris, 1881.

COMMENTARY

<kom'-en-ta-ri> ([vr̥d̥ɪni, midhrash], “an investigation,” from [vr̥d̥ɪ darash], “to search,” “inquire,” “explore”; the King James Version “story”): “The commentary of the prophet Iddo” (<4132> 2 Chronicles 13:22), “the commentary of the book of the kings” (<4137> 2 Chronicles 24:27). In these passages the word is not used exactly in its modern sense. The Hebrew term means “an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, especially a didactic or homiletic exposition, or an edifying religious story” (Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 5, 497). In the commentaries (*Midhrashim*) mentioned by the Chronicler as among his sources, the story of Abijah’s reign was presumably related and elaborated with a view to moral instruction rather than historic accuracy.

See *CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF; COMMENTARIES, HEBREW*.

M. O. Evans

COMMERCE

<kom'-ers> ([ἐμπορία, *emporía*):

I. OLD TESTAMENT TIMES.

1. Early Overland Commerce:

There were forces in early Hebrew life not favorable to the development of commerce. Intercourse with foreigners was not encouraged by Israel’s social and religious customs. From the days of the appearance of the Hebrews in Canaan, however, some commercial contact with the peoples around was inevitable. There were ancient trade routes between the East and the West, as well as between Egypt and the Mesopotamian valley. Palestine lay as a bridge between these objective points. There were doubtless traveling merchants from very remote times, interchanging commodities of other lands for those of Palestine. Some of the Hebrew words for “trading” and “merchant” indicate this (compare [rj æ, *cachar*], “to travel,” [l kæ, *rakhal*], “to go about”). In the nomadic period, the people were necessarily dependent upon overland commerce for at least a part of their food supply, such as grain, and doubtless for articles of

clothing, too. Frequent local famines would stimulate such trade. Companies or caravans carrying on this overland commerce are seen in ^{<0672>}Genesis 37:25,28, “Ishmaelites” and “Midianites, merchantmen,” on their way to Egypt, with spices, balm and myrrh. Jacob caused his sons to take certain products to Egypt as a present with money to Joseph in return for grain: balsam, spices, honey, myrrh, nuts, almonds (^{<0491>}Genesis 43:11 f). The presence of a “Bab mantle” among the spoils of Ai (^{<0672>}Joshua 7:21) indicates commerce between Canaan and the East.

2. Sea Traffic:

While there are slight indications of a possible sea trade as early as the days of the Judges (^{<0657>}Judges 5:17; compare ^{<0493>}Genesis 49:13), we must wait till the days of the monarchy of David and especially Solomon for the commerce of ships. Land traffic was of course continued and expanded (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:15,28,29; ^{<4016>}2 Chronicles 1:16). Sea trade at this time made large strides forward. The Philistines were earlier in possession of the coast. Friendship with Hiram king of Tyre gave Solomon additional advantages seaward (1 Kings 5; 9:26; 10:19-29; ^{<4487>}2 Chronicles 8:17; 9:14), since the Phoenicians were pre-eminently the Mediterranean traders among all the people of Palestine. Later, commerce declined, but Jehoshaphat attempted to revive it (^{<1128>}1 Kings 22:48; ^{<4486>}2 Chronicles 20:36), but without success. Tyre and Sidon as great commercial centers, however, long impressed the life of Israel (Isaiah 23; Ezekiel 26 through 27). Later, in the Maccabean period, Simon acquired Joppa as a Jewish port (1 Macc 14:5), and so extended Mediterranean commerce.

3. Land Traffic in the Time of the Kings:

During the peaceful reign of Solomon, there came, with internal improvements and foreign friendships, a stimulus to traffic with Egypt and the Far East over the ancient trade routes as well as with Phoenicia on the northwest. He greatly added to his wealth through tariffs levied upon merchantmen (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:15). Trade with Syria in the days of Omri and Ahab is indicated by the permission Benhadad gave to Israelites to open streets, or trading quarters, in Damascus, as Syrians had in Samaria (^{<1178>}1 Kings 20:34). The prophets disclose repeatedly the results of foreign commerce upon the people in the days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, and of Jeroboam II, under whom great material prosperity was attained, followed by simple luxury (^{<2116>}Isaiah 2:6,7,16; ^{<2811>}Hosea 12:1,7,8; ^{<3068>}Amos 6:3-6). The people in their greed of gain could not observe

Sabbaths and feast days (~~<1085>~~ Amos 8:5); compare Sabbath trading and its punishment in the days of the restoration (~~<1635>~~ Nehemiah 13:15-22). “Canaanite” became the nickname for traffickers (~~<3142>~~ Zechariah 14:21; compare ~~<2338>~~ Isaiah 23:8).

II. NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.

After the conquests of Alexander 333 BC, trade between East and West was greatly stimulated. Colonies of Jews for trade purposes had been established in Egypt and elsewhere. The dispersion of the Jews throughout the Greek and Roman world added to their interest in commerce. The Mediterranean Sea, as a great Roman lake, under Roman protection, became alive with commercial fleets. The Sea of Galilee with its enormous fish industry became the center of a large trading interest to all parts. The toll collected in Galilee must have been considerable. Matthew was called from his collectorship to discipleship (~~<4099>~~ Matthew 9:9); Zaccheus and other publicans became rich collecting taxes from large commercial interests like that of balsam. Jesus frequently used the commerce of the day as illustration (~~<4135>~~ Matthew 13:45; 25:14-30). Along the Palestinian coast there were several ports where ships touched: Lydda, Joppa, Caesarea; and further north Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon and Antioch (port Seleucia).

The apostle Paul made use of ships touching at points on the coast of Asia Minor, and the islands along the coast, and also doing coast trade with Greece, Italy and Spain, to carry on his missionary enterprises (~~<4410>~~ Acts 13:4-13; 16:11 f; 18:18; 20:13-16; 21:1-8; 27:1-44; 28:1-14). The rapidity with which the gospel spread throughout the Roman world in the 1st century was due no little to the use of the great Roman highways, built partly as trade routes; as well as to the constant going to and fro of tradesmen of all sorts; some of whom like Aquila and Priscilla (~~<4410>~~ Acts 18:2,18,26), Lydia, (16:14,40) and Paul himself (who was a traveling tent-maker) were active in disseminating the new faith among the Gentiles. In ~~<4013>~~ James 4:13 we have a good representation of the life of a large number of Jews of this period, who would “go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain” (the King James Version).

See also TRADE.

Edward Bagby Pollard

COMMIT

<ko-mit>: Used in two senses:

- (1) “To give in charge” or “entrust”: *sim*, “to put” (<K88> Job 5:8); *galal*, “to roll” (<P575> Psalm 37:5; <T86> Proverbs 16:3); *paqadh*, “to give, in charge” (<P505> Psalm 31:5 the King James Version; compare <D246> Luke 23:46); *tithemi*, “committed to us (the Revised Version, margin “placed in us”) the word of reconciliation” (<A59> 2 Corinthians 5:19); *paratheke*, “that which I have committed unto him” (<S112> 2 Timothy 1:12; the Revised Version, margin “that which he hath committed unto me,” Greek “my deposit”); “that which is committed unto thee” (<S451> 1 Timothy 6:20, Greek “the deposit”); “that good thing,” etc. (<S114> 2 Timothy 1:14, Greek “the good deposit”).
- (2) “To do or practice (evil)”: *prasso* “commit such things” (<R12> Romans 1:32, the Revised Version (British and American) “practice”; compare <R12> Romans 2:2). In <R14> 1 John 3:4,8 “doeth sin” (*poieo*, the King James Version “committeth sin”) shows that it is not committing a single sin that is in view, but sinful practice.

W. L. Walker

COMMODIOUS

<ko-mo'-di-us> ([ἀνεύθετος, *aneuthetos*], “not well placed”): The word occurs only in <A712> Acts 27:12. “As regards wintering, the place was certainly ‘not commodious,’ but as regards shelter from some winds (including Northwest), it was a good anchorage” (Code of Hammurabi, XXIII, 639).

COMMON

<kom'-un>: [κοινός, *koinos*], in the classics, and primarily in the New Testament, means what is public, general, universal, as contrasted with [ἴδιος, *idios*], what is peculiar, individual, not shared with others. Thus, “common faith” (<S104> Titus 1:4), “common salvation” (<R103> Jude 1:3), refer to that in which the experience of all Christians unites and is identical: “common,” because there is but one faith and one salvation (<E104> Ephesians 4:4-6). From this comes the derived meaning of what is ordinary and, therefore, to be disesteemed, as contrasted with what pertains to a class, and to be prized, because rare. This naturally coincides with Old Testament exclusivism, particularity and separation. Its religion was that of a separated people, with a separated class as its ministers, and with minute directions as to distinctions of meat, drink, times, places, rites, vessels, etc.

Whatever was common or ordinary, it avoided. The New Testament, on the other hand, with its universalism of scope, and its spirituality of sphere, rose above all such externals. The salvation which it brought was directed to the redemption of Nature, as well as of man, sanctifying the creature, and pervading all parts of man's being and all relations of life. The antithesis is forcibly illustrated in ^{<4014>}Acts 10:14 f, where Peter says: "I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean," and the reply is: "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common."

H. E. Jacobs

COMMONWEALTH

^{<kom'-un-welth>} ([^{<πολιτεία, politeia>}]): Spoken of theocracy (^{<4012>}Ephesians 2:12). The same word is rendered "freedom," the King James Version; "citizenship" the Revised Version (British and American). Also in the sense of commonwealth in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 4:11; 8:17; 13:14); in the sense of citizenship (3 Macc 3:21,23).

See *CITIZENSHIP*.

COMMUNE; COMMUNICATE; COMMUNICATION

^{<ko-mun'>}, ^{<komun'-i-kat>}, ^{<ko-mu-ni-ka'-shun>}: To commune is to converse confidentially and sympathetically. It is represented in both Hebrew and Greek by several words literally signifying to speak (compare ^{<4011>}Luke 6:11, [^{<διαλαλέω, dialaleo>}]; also ^{<4024>}Luke 22:4; ^{<4026>}Acts 24:26, [^{<ὁμιλέω, homileo>}). To communicate is to impart something to another, so that it becomes common to giver and receiver. In ^{<4018>}1 Timothy 6:18, "willing to communicate" (the Revised Version, margin "sympathize"), represents a single word [^{<κοινωνικοί, koinonikoi>}], and refers to the habit of sharing with others either sympathy or property. the Revised Version (British and American) gives "companionships" for *homiliai* in ^{<4053>}1 Corinthians 15:33 (the King James Version "communications").

See also *COMMUNION*.

COMMUNION; (FELLOWSHIP)

^{<ko-mun'-yun>}: The terms "communion" and "fellowship" of the English Bible are varying translations of the words [^{<κοινωνία, koinonia>}], and [^{<κοινωνέω, koinoneo>}], or their cognates. They designate acts of fellowship observed among the early Christians or express the unique sense of unity and fellowship of which these acts were the outward expression.

The several passages in which these terms are used fall into two groups: those in which they refer to acts of fellowship, and those in which they refer to fellowship as experienced.

I. ACTS OF FELLOWSHIP.

The acts of fellowship mentioned in the New Testament are of four kinds.

1. The Lord's Supper:

Our information concerning the nature of the fellowship involved in the observance of this sacrament is confined to the single notice in ~~4016~~1 Corinthians 10:16,17, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" Owing to the presence of the material elements in the sacrament there is a temptation to limit the word for communion to the sense of partaking. This, however, does not entirely satisfy the requirements of the context. The full significance of the term is to be sought in the light of the argument of the whole section (verses 14-22).

Paul is making a protest against Christians participating in idolatrous feasts on the ground that such feasts are really celebrated in honor of the demons associated with the idols, and that those who participate in them come into fellowship with demons. As a proof of this point the apostle cites the Lord's Supper with which his readers are familiar. By partaking of the cup and the bread the communicants are linked together in unity: "We, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread." Thus the communion of the elements is a real communion of the worshippers one with another and with Christ. Unless the communion be understood in this spiritual sense Paul's illustration falls short of the mark.

See EUCHARIST.

2. Communism:

The term for fellowship as used in ~~4402~~Acts 2:42 is by some interpreted in this sense: "They continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." The fact that the four terms are used in pairs and that three of them refer to specific acts observed by the company of believers suggests that the term for fellowship also refers to some definite act similar to the others. It is very plausible to refer this to the community of goods described in the verses immediately

following (*see* **COMMUNITY OF GOODS**). The author might, however, with equal propriety have regarded the interchange of spiritual experiences as an act of worship in the same class with “the breaking of bread and the prayers.”

3. Contributions:

Christian fellowship found a natural mode of expression in almsgiving. This is enjoined as a duty in ^{<5213>}Romans 12:13; ^{<5088>}1 Timothy 6:18; ^{<8316>}Hebrews 13:16. An example of such giving is the great collection raised among the Gentile converts for the poor saints of Jerusalem (^{<5156>}Romans 15:26; ^{<7004>}2 Corinthians 8:4; 9:13). To this collection Paul attached so much importance as a witness to the spirit of fellowship which the gospel inspires in all hearts alike, whether Jew or Gentile, that he desired even at the peril of his life to deliver it with his own hand.

See **COLLECTION**.

4. Cooperation:

A form of fellowship closely related to almsgiving was that of formal aid or cooperation in Christian work, such as the aid given to Paul by the Philippians (^{<5005>}Philippians 1:5). A unique form of this cooperation is the formal endorsement by giving the right hand of fellowship as described in ^{<8009>}Galatians 2:9.

II. Fellowship as Experienced.

From the very beginning the early Christians experienced a peculiar sense of unity. Christ is at once the center of this unity and the origin of every expression of fellowship. Sometimes the fellowship is essentially an experience and as such it is scarcely susceptible of definition. It may rather be regarded as a mystical union in Christ. In other instances the fellowship approaches or includes the idea of intercourse. In some passages it is represented as a participation or partnership. The terms occur most frequently in the writings of Paul with whom the idea of Christian unity was a controlling principle.

In its various relations, fellowship is represented:

(1) As a communion between the Son and the Father. The gospel record represents Jesus as enjoying a unique sense of communion and intimacy with the Father. Among many such expressions those of ^{<0125>}Matthew 11:25-27 (compare ^{<0020>}Luke 10:21,22) and John 14 through 15 are

especially important.

(2) As our communion with God, either with the Father or the Son or with the Father through the Son or the Holy Spirit. “Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (ⲓⲛⲟⲩ 1 John 1:3; compare also ⲓⲛⲟⲩ John 14:6,23,16).

(3) As our communion one with another. “If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another” (ⲓⲛⲟⲩ 1 John 1:7). Sometimes the idea of communion occurs in relation with abstract ideas or experiences: “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Ephesians 5:11); “the fellowship of his sufferings” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Philippians 3:10); “the fellowship of thy faith” (Philem 1:6). In three passages the relation of the fellowship is not entirely clear: the “fellowship of the Spirit” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Philippians 2:1); “the communion of the Holy Spirit” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ 2 Corinthians 13:14); and “the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ 1 Corinthians 1:9). The fellowship is probably to be understood as that prevailing among Christians by virtue of the grace of Christ and the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

It is not to be inferred that the idea of fellowship is limited to the passages in which the specific words for communion are used. Some of the clearest and richest expressions of unity and fellowship are found in the Gospels, though, these words do not occur in them. In fact, perhaps, the most familiar and forcible expressions of the idea are those in which they are represented symbolically, as in the parable of the Vine and the Branches (ⲓⲛⲟⲩ John 15:1 ff) or in the figure of the Body and its Members (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Matthew 5:29 ff; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Romans 12:5; 1 Corinthians 12).

Russell Benjamin Miller

COMMUNION WITH DEMONS; DEVILS

<de'-monz>, (<dev'-'-lʒ>):

I. USE OF TERM:

The actual expression “communion with demons” ([ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲟⲛⲟⲓ ⲧῶⲛ ⲃⲓⲁⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ, *koinonoi ton daimonion*]) occurs but once in Scripture (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ 1 Corinthians 10:20) where its figurative meaning is evident, but it is implied in the English version of a number of passages by the terms “one who has” or “those who have” “familiar spirits” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Leviticus 19:31; 20:6,27; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ Deuteronomy 18:11; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ 1 Samuel 28:3,7,8,9; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲉ 2 Kings 21:6; 23:24;

~~<3003>~~1 Chronicles 10:13; ~~<4316>~~2 Chronicles 33:6; ~~<2389>~~Isaiah 8:19; 19:3; 29:4). These passages seem to be somewhat incongruous with Paul's statement, but are in reality so intimately related to it as to give and receive light through the connection.

II. TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE.

To begin with, we may safely say, in general, that there is no ground for asserting that the Bible admits the possibility of conscious and voluntary communion with spirits. This is an essential element of popular demonology in all ages, but it is absent from Scripture. Even in the passages mentioned above which refer to necromancers and wizards, while, as we shall see, the words indicate that such practitioners professed to rely upon spirits in their divinations, the Scriptures carefully refrain from sanctioning these claims, and a number of features in the various passages serve to indicate that the true scriptural view is quite the opposite. As this is not a prevalent opinion, we should do well to examine the passages with some little care.

1. *The New Testament:*

(1) We may first deal with the New Testament. In the Gospels the demoniacs are consistently looked upon and treated as unconscious and helpless victims (*see DEMON, DEMONOLOGY*). The frequent use of this term "demonized" (*daimonizomenoi*) together with all that is told us of the methods of treating these cases adopted by our Lord and His apostles (*see EXORCISM*) indicates the belief of the New Testament writers that the control of demons over men is obtained outside of or below the region of conscious volition and that the condition of the sufferers is pathological.

(2) The same must be said of the Lydian maiden whose cure by Paul is recorded in ~~<4416>~~Acts 16:16. This is the one instance in the New Testament where divination is connected with spirits. The account emphasizes the excitable neurosis of the patient; and the belief on the part of the apostles and of the writer of Acts that the girl was not the conscious accomplice of her masters, but their unfortunate victim through her mysterious malady, is clear. She was treated, as the other cases recorded in the New Testament, not as a conscious wrongdoer, but as a sick person to be healed.

2. *The Old Testament:*

(1) Turning now to the Old Testament, the instance which requires the most careful treatment, because it holds the key to all the rest, is the

narrative of Saul's visit to the Witch of Endor in ~~1~~1 Samuel 28:3-25. The Hebrew word *'obh* which is usually translated "one who has a familiar spirit" (see list of passages at beginning of article) occurs in this narrative four times (verses 3, 7 twice, 8). According to the ordinary interpretation it is used in three different senses, two of which occur here. These three senses are

(a) a person who controls a spirit,

(b) the spirit controlled,

(c) the power to control such a spirit. This meaning appears to be altogether too broad. Omitting to translate the word we have: (verse 3) "Saul had put away *'obhoth*, and *yidh'onim*"; (verse 7), a woman, a mistress of an *'obh*; (verse 8) "Divine unto me by the *'obh*." It is extremely unlikely that the same word should be used in two senses so far apart as "person who has a spirit" and the "spirit itself" in the same context. In the last passage mentioned (verse 8) there is a double indication that the word *'obh* cannot have either signification mentioned. Saul says: "Divine unto me by the *'obh* and bring me up whomsoever I shall name unto thee." The expression "divine by" clearly points to some magical object used in divination. Control of a spirit through some magical object is familiar enough. The rest of Saul's statement confirms this view. The result of the divination is the calling up of a spirit. A spirit would hardly be used to call up another spirit. This conclusion is confirmed by the etymology. The word *'obh* is supposed to mean "one who has a familiar spirit," from its root-significance of hollow and its primary meaning of wineskin. According to this derivation the word is applied to a necromancer on the supposition that the spirit inhabits his body and speaks from within. The transference to spirit is extremely unlikely and the explanation is not consistent with primitive ideas on spirit manifestation (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, *'owb* end).

(2) We, therefore, hold with H. P. Smith (International Critical Commentary, "Samuel" in the place cited.), though partly on different grounds, that the word *'obh* has the same meaning in all the passages where it occurs, and that it refers to a sacred object or fetish by which spiritistic divination was carried on.

The significance of this conclusion is that the misleading expression “familiar spirit” disappears from the text, for Dr. Driver’s interpretation of the companion word *yidh`onim* (see International Critical Commentary, Commentary on Deuteronomy in the place cited.) will scarcely be maintained in the face of this new meaning for ‘*obh*. The prohibition contained in the law (~~4817~~ Leviticus 20:27) against ‘*obboth*, and those using them, places them in the same catalogue of offense and futility with idol-worship in general.

(3) This opinion is confirmed by two separate items of evidence.

(a) In the Witch of Endor story Samuel’s appearance, according to the idea of the narrator, was due to a miracle, not to the magic power of the feeble and cheating old woman to whom Saul had resorted. God speaks through the apparition a stern message of doom. No one was more startled than the woman herself, who for once had a real vision (~~4822~~ 1 Samuel 28:12). She not only gave a loud cry of astonishment and alarm but she described the figure which she saw as “a god coming up out of the earth.” The story is told with fidelity and clearly indicates the opinion that the actual appearance of a spirit is so violently exceptional as to indicate the immediate power and presence of God.

(b) In ~~2789~~ Isaiah 8:19 the ‘*obboth* and *yidh`onim* are spoken of as those who “chirp and mutter.” These terms refer to the necromancers themselves Septuagint translates ‘*obboth* by *eggastromuthoi* = ventriloquists) who practiced ventriloquism in connection with their magical rites. In ~~2794~~ Isaiah 29:4 it is said “Thy voice shall be as an ‘*obh*, out of the ground.” Here ‘*obh* is usually interpreted as “ghost,” but it is far more probable (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament sub loc.) that it refers as in 8:19 to the ventriloquistic tricks of those who utter their oracles in voices intended to represent the spirits which they have evoked. They are stamped in these passages, as in the Witch of Endor narrative, as deceivers practicing a fraudulent artifice. By implication their power to evoke spirits with whom they were in familiar intercourse is denied.

3. The Meaning of Idol-Worship:

This leaves the way clear for a brief consideration of the words of Paul in ~~4600~~ 1 Corinthians 10:20 in connection with cognate passages in the Old Testament.

(1) He argues that since idol-worship is really demon-worship, the partaking of heathen sacrifice is a communion with demons and a separation from Christ. It is usually taken for granted that this characterization of heathen worship was simply a part of the Jewish-Christian polemic against idolatry. Our fuller knowledge of the spiritism which conditions the use of images enables us to recognize the fact that from the viewpoint of heathenism itself Paul's idea was strictly correct. The image is venerated because it is supposed to represent or contain an invisible being or spirit, not necessarily a deity in the absolute sense, but a super-human living being capable of working good or ill to men.

(2) In the King James Version the term devils is used in four Old Testament passages (^{<B170>}Leviticus 17:7; ^{<B27>}Deuteronomy 32:17; ^{<4115>}2 Chronicles 11:15; ^{<1967>}Psalms 106:37). In the Revised Version (British and American) "devils" has disappeared from the text — the word he-goats appears in ^{<B170>}Leviticus 17:7 and ^{<4115>}2 Chronicles 11:15, while "demons" appears in ^{<B27>}Deuteronomy 32:17 and ^{<1967>}Psalms 106:37. The translation of *se'irim* as "he-goats" is literally correct, but conveys an erroneous conception of the meaning. The practice reprobated is the worship of Satyrs (*see SATYR*) or wood-demons supposed to be like goats in appearance and to inhabit lonely places. The same word is used in ^{<2332>}Isaiah 13:21; 34:14. The word translated "demons" in the Revised Version (British and American) is *shedhim*, a term used only twice and both times in connection with the rites and abominations of heathen worship. It is interesting to note that the word *shidu* is applied to the beings represented by the bull-colossi of Assyria (Driver, Deuteronomy in the place cited.). Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament holds that the word *shedhim* is an Assyrian loan-word, while Briggs (ICC, ^{<1967>}Psalms 106:37) holds that *shedhim* were ancient gods of Canaan. In either case the word belongs to heathenism and is used in Scripture to describe heathen worship in its own terminology. The interpretation of these beings as evil is characteristic of Biblical demonism in general (*see DEMON*, etc.). The worship of idols was the worship of personal beings more than man and less than God, according to Jewish and Christian ideas (see Driver op. cit., 363). Septuagint translates both the above words by daimonia.

4. Conclusion:

The term “communion with demons” does not imply any power on the part of men to enter into voluntary relationship with beings of another world, but that, by sinful compliance in wrongdoing, such as idol-worship and magical rites, men may enter into a moral identification with evil powers against which it is their duty to fight.

LITERATURE.

The Dictionaries and Commentaries dealing with the passages quoted above contain discussions of the various aspects of the subject. Jewish superstitions are ably treated by Edersheim, *Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (8th edition), II, 771, 773.

Louis Matthews Sweet

COMMUNITY, OF GOODS

<ko-mu'-ni-ti>, ([ἅπαντα κοινὰ εἶχον, *hapanta koina eichon*], literally, “They had all things (in) common”): In ~~Acts~~ Acts 2:44, it is said that, in the infant church at Jerusalem, “all that believed were together, and had all things common,” and (4:34 f) “as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles’ feet.” The inference from this, that there was an absolute disposal of all the property of all the members of the church, and that its proceeds were contributed to a common fund, has been disputed upon the ground that the example of Barnabas in selling “a field” for this purpose (4:37) would not have been mentioned, if this had been the universal rule. The thought conveyed is that all believers in that church held their property as a trust from the Lord, for the benefit of the entire brotherhood, and, as there was need, did as Barnabas.

No commandment, of which record has been preserved, prescribed any such course. It came from the spontaneous impulse of the sense of brotherhood in Christ, when the band of disciples was still small, making them in a sense one family, and under the external constraint of extreme want and persecution. So much there was, that they realized, under such conditions they had in common, that they were ready to extend this to all things. It was, in a sense, a continuance of the practice of a common purse in the band of immediate followers of our Lord during his ministry. The penalty inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira was not for any failure to comply

fully with this custom, but because this freedom which they possessed (<408> Acts 5:4) they falsely professed to have renounced, thus receiving in the estimation of their brethren a credit that was not their due. This custom did not last long. It was possible only within a limited circle, and under very peculiar circumstances. The New Testament recognizes the right of individual property and makes no effort to remove the differences that exist among believers themselves. The community of goods which it renders possible is spiritual (<409> 1 Corinthians 3:21 f), and not one of visible and external things. With respect to the latter, it enjoins upon the Christian, as a steward of God, the possession and administration of property for the progress of the kingdom of God, and the highest interests of men. The spirit of <406> Acts 4:34 is always to pervade the association of believers as a true Christian community. Meyer, on the above passage, has suggested that it is not unlikely that the well-known poverty of the church at Jerusalem, and its long dependence upon the alms of other churches, may be connected with this early communistic practice, which, however justifiable and commendable at the time, bore its inevitable fruits in a subsequent season of great scarcity and lack of employment.

H. E. Jacobs

COMPACT; COMPACTED

<kom-pakt'>, <kom-pakt'-ed> (r**b**je *chabhar*], “to be joined”; [συμβιβάζω, *sumbibazo*], “to raise up together”): “Compact” appears as translation of *chabhar* in <407> Psalm 122:3, “Jerus a city that is compact together” (well built, its breaches restored, walls complete, and separate from all around it); and “compacted” (*sumbibazo*) occurs in the King James Version <406> Ephesians 4:16, “fitly joined together and compacted,” the Revised Version (British and American) “fitly framed and knit together.” In the Revised Version (British and American) “compacted” is also the translation of [συνίστημι, *sunistemi*], “to set together” (<405> 2 Peter 3:5), “an earth compacted out of water and amidst (margin, through) water,” which suggests the idea of water as the primary material (compare <400> Genesis 1:2).

W. L. Walker

COMPANY

<kum'-pa-ni>: The fertility of the original languages in synonyms and varied shades of meaning is seen by the fact that 20 Hebrew and 12 Greek words are represented by this single term. An analysis of these words

shows that “company” is both an indefinite and limitless term, signifying few or many, and all kinds of assemblages of people, e.g.:

(1) Caravan,

(a) migratory (^{<2913>}Isaiah 21:13 the King James Version);

(b) commercial (^{<0375>}Genesis 37:25 the King James Version); ^{<1869>}Job 6:19, “The companies of Sheba waited (in vain) for them.”

(2) Military, *gedhudh*, “troop,” *hamon*, ^{<4402>}2 Chronicles 20:12; *ro’sh*, “head,” “detachment”; ^{<0076>}Judges 7:16,20: “three companies”; 9:34,37,43: “four companies.”

(3) Band (*chebher*) or “gang,” as rendered by Keil and Delitzsch; a gang of murderous priests (^{<2810>}Hosea 6:9).

(4) Camp or encampment (^{<0338>}Genesis 32:8,21; 50:9).

(5) Religious body, “company of prophets” (^{<0921>}1 Samuel 19:20).

(6) Assembly, congregation, “company of nations” (^{<0351>}Genesis 35:11; ^{<2804>}Ezekiel 38:4,7,13,15).

(7) A tumultuous crowd (^{<1917>}2 Kings 9:17).

(8) Associate, companion, often with reference to moral affinity (^{<1848>}Job 34:8; ^{<1213>}Proverbs 29:3; ^{<4408>}Acts 10:28), *kollaomai*, “to glue or cement together,” indicative of the binding power of moral affinity (the Revised Version (British and American) “to join himself”); as a verb, to “company with” or “keep company” (^{<4402>}Acts 1:21; ^{<4100>}1 Corinthians 5:9,11; ^{<0384>}2 Thessalonians 3:14). In Apocrypha in the sense of “to cohabit” (Susanna 1:54,57,58).

(9) A host. “Great was the company,” etc. (^{<0881>}Psalms 68:11 the Revised Version (British and American) “The women are a great host”). In the East it is the women who celebrate victories with song and dance (see ^{<0806>}1 Samuel 18:6,7).

(10) A chorus, dance (*mecholah*). “The company of two armies” (Song 6:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “the dance of Mahanaim”).

(11) Meal party, [*κλισία*, *klisia*], “a reclining company at meals.” “Make them sit down (Greek “recline”) in companies” (^{<0944>}Luke 9:14). Compare

“companion,” from Latin *com*, “together,” and *panis*, “bread.”

(12) A myriad, a ten-thousand, an indefinite number (*urias*; ~~<8122>~~Hebrews 12:22 (the Revised Version (British and American) “hosts”)).

(13) Companions on a journey, *sunodia*, “a journeying together” (~~<0144>~~Luke 2:44).

(14) Signifying kinship of spirit, *idios*, “one’s own.” “They came to their own company” (~~<4023>~~Acts 4:23).

(15) A mob (~~<4175>~~Acts 17:5 (the Revised Version (British and American) “a crowd”)).

Dwight M. Pratt

COMPARATIVE, RELIGION

<kom-par'-a-tiv>:

I. THE SUBJECT IN GENERAL.

The science of comparative religion is perhaps the latest born of all sciences. Largely in consequence of this fact, our knowledge of what it really proves is still far from definite, and men draw most contradictory conclusions on this point. As in the case of all new sciences in the past, not a few people have endeavored under its shelter to attack Christianity and all revealed religion. These assaults already give signs of failure — as in similar cases previously — and a new evidence of Christianity is emerging from the conflict. It is only “a little learning” that is proverbially dangerous. The subject with which the science of comparative religion deals is religion in general and all the facts which can be learnt about all religions ancient and modern, whether professed by savages or prevalent among highly civilized communities, whether to be studied in sacred books or learnt orally from the people.

1. Universality of Religion:

In this way we learn first of all that religion is a universal phenomenon, found among all nations, in all conditions, though differing immensely in its teachings, ceremonies and effects in different places. It is perhaps the most powerful for good or evil of all the instincts (for it is an instinct) which influence mankind.

2. *Theories of Origin and Growth of Religion:*

To account for the origin and growth of religion various theories have been propounded:

(1) “Humanism,” which is the revival of the ancient view of Euhemerios (circa 400 BC) that all religion arose from fear of ghosts, and all the gods were but men who had died;

(2) “Animism,” which traces religion to early man’s fancy that every object in Nature had a personality like his own;

(3) the Astral Theory, which supposes that religion originated from worship of the heavenly bodies. It is clear that there are facts to support each of these hypotheses, yet no one of them satisfies all the conditions of the case. To

(1) it has been replied that most tribes from the earliest times clearly distinguished between those deities who had been men, and the gods proper, who had never been men and had never died. Regarding (2), it should be observed that it admits that man’s consciousness of his own personality and his fancy that it exists in other creatures also does not account for his worshipping them, unless we grant the existence of the *sensus numinis* within him: if so, then this explains, justifies, and necessitates religion.

(3) The Astral Theory is in direct opposition to Euhemerism or Humanism. It ascribes personality to the heavenly bodies in man’s early fancy; but it, too, has to presuppose the *sensus numinis*, without which religion would be impossible, as would be the science of optics if man had not the sense of sight.

3. *Evolution:*

It is often held that religion is due to evolution. If so, then its evolution, resulting *ex hypothesi* in Christianity as its acme, must be the working out of a Divine “Eternal Purpose” (*prothesis ton aionon*, ~~ΕΦΙ~~ Ephesians 3:11), just as has been the evolution of an amoeba into a man on the Evolutionary Theory. This would be an additional proof of the truth of Christianity. But, though doubtless there has been evolution — or gradual progress under Divine guidance — in religion, the fact of Christ is sufficient to show that there is a Divine self-revelation too. Hence, the claim of Christianity to be

the absolute religion. “The pre-Christian religions were the age-long prayer, the Incarnation was the answer” (Illingworth). Christianity as revealed in Christ adds what none of the ethnic faiths could prove their claim to — authority, holiness, revelation.

II. RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO ETHNIC FAITHS AND THEIR TENETS.

It is very remarkable that Christianity — though clearly not a philosophy but a religion that has arisen under historical circumstances which preclude the possibility of supposing it the product of Eclecticism — yet sums up in itself all that is good in all religions and philosophies, without the bad, the fearful perversions and corruptions of the moral sense, too often found in them. The more the study of comparative religion is carried on the more plainly evident does this become. It also supplements in a wonderful way the half-truths concealed rather than revealed in other systems, whether religious or philosophical. We subjoin a few instances of this.

1. Karma:

Karma is strongly insisted on in Hinduism and Buddhism. These teach that every deed, good or bad, must have its result, that “its fruit must be eaten” here or hereafter. So does Christianity quite as forcibly (~~ROM~~ Galatians 6:7,8). But neither Indian faith explains how sin can be forgiven, evil be overruled for good, nor how, by trampling under foot their vices, men may rise higher (Aug., Sermo iii, Deuteronomy Ascensione). They recognize, in some sense, the existence of evil, and illogically teach that rites and certain ascetic practices help to overcome it. They know of no Atonement, though modern Hinduism endeavors to propitiate the deities by sacrifices, as indeed was done in Vedic times. Conscience they cannot explain. Christianity, while showing the heinousness of sin as no other system does, and so supplementing the others, supplements them still further by the Atonement, showing that God is just, and teaching how His very righteousness can be brought to “justify” the sinner (~~ROM~~ Romans 3:26).

2. God:

Mahayana Buddhism proclaims an immanent but not transcendent being (Dharma-kaya), who is “the ultimate reality that underlies all particular phenomena” (Suzuki), who wills and reflects, though not fully personal. He is not the Creator of the world but a kind of Animus mundi. He is the sum total of all sentient beings, and they have no individual existence, no “ego-

soul.” The world of matter has no real existence but is his self-manifestation. Christianity supplements and corrects this by teaching the transcendence as well as the immanence (~~<417>~~Acts 17:28) of the Creator, who is at least personal, if not something higher, who is the Source of reality though not Himself the sole reality, and of our personality and life, and “who only hath immortality” (~~<406>~~1 Timothy 6:16).

3. The “*Summum Bonum*”:

Vedantism and Cuffiism proclaim that ultimate absorption in the impersonal “It” is the summum bonum, and the Chandogya Upanishad says, “There is just one thing, without a second” (Book VI, 2 1, 2). Of this one thing everything is, so to speak, a part: there being no ultimate difference between the human and the Divine. Thus sin is denied and unreality proclaimed (Maya, illusion). The yearning for union with God underlying all this is satisfied in Christianity, which provides reconciliation with God and shows how by new spiritual birth men may become children of God (~~<401>~~John 1:12,13) and “partakers of the divine nature” (~~<600>~~2 Peter 1:4), without being swallowed up therein like a raindrop in the ocean: the union being spiritual and not material.

4. *Self-Revelation of God*:

Orthodox (Sunni) Muslim theology declares God to be separated from man by an impassable gulf and hence, to be unknowable. Philosophically this leads to Agnosticism, though opposed to Polytheism. Among the Jews the philosophy of Maimonides ends in the same failure to attain to a knowledge of the Divine or to describe God except by negations (*Cepher Ha-madda`*, 1 11). The Bible, on the other hand, while speaking of Him as invisible, and unknowable through merely human effort (~~<1800>~~Job 11:7,8; ~~<801>~~John 1:18), yet reveals Him in Christ, who is God and man. Jewish mysticism endeavored to solve the problem of creation by the invention of the ‘*Adham qadhmon*’ (archetypal man), and earlier by Philo’s *Logos* doctrine and the *Memra*’ of the Targums. But these abstractions have neither reality nor personality. The Christian *Logos* doctrine presents no theoretical but the actual historical, eternal Christ (compare ~~<800>~~John 1:1-3; ~~<800>~~Hebrews 1:2).

5. *Incarnation*:

Heathenism seeks to give some idea of the Invisible by means of idols; Vaishnavism has its doctrine of avatars; Babiism and Bahaiism their dogma of “manifestations” (mazhar) in human beings; the `Ali-ilahis are so

called because they regard `Ali as God. Instead of these unworthy theories and deifications, Christianity supplies the holy, sinless, perfect Incarnation in Christ.

6. Salvation:

Hinduism offers mukti (moksha), “deliverance” from a miserable existence; Christianity in Christ offers pardon, deliverance from sin, and reconciliation with God.

7. Faith:

Krishnaism teaches unreasoning “devotion” (bhakti) of “mind, body, property” to certain supposed incarnations of Krishna (Vishnu), quite regardless of their immoral conduct; Christianity inculcates a manly, reasonable “faith” in Christ, but only after “proving all things.”

8. Approach to God:

Pilgrimages in Islam and Hinduism indicate but do not satisfy a need for approach to God; Christianity teaches a growth in grace. and in likeness to Christ, and so a spiritual drawing near to God.

III. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHNIC FAITHS.

1. Tenets Common to All Religions:

In all religions we find, though in many various forms, certain common beliefs, such as:

- (1) the existence of some spiritual power or powers, good or bad, superior to man and able to affect his present and future life;
- (2) that there is a difference between right and wrong, even though not clearly defined;
- (3) that there is an afterlife of some sort, with happiness or misery often regarded as in some measure dependent upon conduct or upon the observance of certain rites here. In the main the fact of the all but universal agreement of religions upon these points proves that they are true in substance. Even such an agnostic philosophy as original Buddhism was, has been constrained by human need to evolve from itself or admit from without deistic or theistic elements, and thus Buddha himself has been deified by the Mahayana School. Yet no

ethnic faith satisfies the “human soul naturally Christian,” as Tertullian calls it (*Liber Apologeticus*, cap. 17), for none of them reveals One God, personal, holy, loving, just, merciful, omniscient and omnipotent. Even Islam fails here. Ethnic religions are either

- (1) polytheistic, worshipping many gods, all imperfect and some evil, or
- (2) mystical, evaporating away, as it were, God’s Personality, thus rendering Him a mental abstraction, as in the Hindu philosophical systems and in Mahayana Buddhism. Christianity as revealed in Christ does just what all other faiths fail to do, reconciling these two tendencies and correcting both.

2. Tendency to Degradation, not to Progress, in Ethnic Faiths:

As a general rule, the nearer to their source we can trace religions, the purer we find them. In most cases a degradation and not to progressive improvement manifests itself as time goes on, and this is sometimes carried to such an extent that, as Lucretius found in Rome and Greece, religion becomes a curse and not a blessing. Thus, for example, regarding ancient Egypt, Professor Renouf says: “The sublimer portions of the Egyptian religion are not the comparatively late result of a process of development. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient, and the last stage of the Egyptian religion was by far the grossest and most corrupt” (Hibbert Lectures, 91). Modern Hinduism, again, is incomparably lower in its religious conceptions than the religion of the Vedas. In Polynesia the same rule holds good, as is evident from the myths about Tangaroa. In Samoa he was said to be the son of two beings, the “Cloudless Heaven” and the “Outspread Heaven.” He originally existed in open space. He made the sky to dwell in. He then made the earth. Somewhat later he was supposed to be visible in the moon! But a lower depth was reached. In Hawaii, Tangaroa has sunk to an evil being, the leader of a rebellion against another god, Tane, and is now condemned to abide in the lowest depths of darkness and be the god of death. In South Africa, Australia and elsewhere, traditions still linger of a Creator of all things, but his worship has been entirely laid aside in favor of lower and more evil deities.

3. Mythology and Religion:

Almost everywhere mythology has arisen and perverted religion into something very different from what it once was. The same tendency has more than once manifested itself in the Christian church, thus rendering a

return to Christ's teachings necessary. As an instance, compare the modern popular religion of Italy with that of the New Testament. It is remarkable that no religion but the Christian, however, has shown its capability of reform.

4. Religion and Morality in Ethnic Faiths:

For the most part, in ethnic religions, there is no recognized connection between religion and morality. The wide extension of phallic rites and the existence of hierodoulai and hierodouloi in many lands show that religion has often consecrated gross immorality. Mythology aids in this degradation. Hence, Seneca, after mentioning many evil myths related of Jupiter, etc., says: "By which nothing else was effected but the removal from men of their shame at sinning, if they deemed such beings goals" (L. A. Seneca, Deuteronomy beata vita cap. 26). With the possibly doubtful exception of the religion of certain savage tribes, in no religion is the holiness of God taught except in Christianity and its initial stage, Judaism. Ethnic deities are mostly born of heaven and earth, if not identified with them in part, and are rarely regarded as creating them. It was otherwise, however, with Ahura Mazda in Zoroastrianism, and with certain Sumerian deities, and there are other exceptions, too. The "religions of Nature" have generally produced gross immorality, encouraged and even insisted upon as a part of their ritual; compare Mylitta-worship in Babylon and that of the "Mater deum," Venus, Anahita, etc.

IV. SUPPOSED RESEMBLANCES TO REVEALED RELIGION.

1. Rites:

Much attention has been called to real or supposed community of rites and "myths," especially when any ethnic faith is compared with Christianity. Sacrifice, for instance, is an essential part of every religion. In Christianity none are now offered, except the "living sacrifice" of the believer, though that of Christ offered once for all is held to be the substance foreshadowed by Jewish sacrifices. Purificatory bathings are found almost everywhere, and that very naturally, because of the universality of conscience and of some sense of sin.

2. Dogmas:

Belief in the fiery end of the world existed among the Stoics, and is found in the Eddas of Scandinavia and the Puranas of India. Traditions of an age

before sin and death came upon mankind occur in many different lands. Many of these traditions may easily be accounted for. But in some cases the supposed resemblance to revealed religion does not exist, or is vastly exaggerated. The Yoga philosophy in India is popularly supposed to aim at union with God, as does Christianity; but (so understood) the Yoga system, as has already been said, implies loss of personality and absorption into the impersonal, unconscious “It” (Tat). The doctrine of a Trinity is nowhere found, only Triads of separate deities. Belief in a resurrection is found in only very late parts of the Persian (Zoroastrian) scriptures, composed after centuries of communication with Jews and Christians. In the earlier Avesta only a “restoration” of the world is mentioned (compare ~~482~~ Acts 3:21). Original (Hinayana) Buddhism teaches “immortality” (amata), but by this is meant Nirvana (“extinction”). Mithraism has been said to teach the “resurrection of the body,” but, according to Eubulus and Porphyry, it taught rather the transmigration of the soul.

3. Asserted Parallels to Gospel History:

The assertion is often made that many of the leading gospel incidents in the life of our Lord are paralleled in other religions. It is said, for instance, that the resurrection of Adonis, Osiris and Mithra was believed in by their followers. It is true that, in some places, Adonis was said to have come to life the day after he had met his death by the tusk of a boar (the cold of winter); but everywhere it was recognized that he was not a man who had been killed, but the representative of the produce of the soil, slain or dying down in the cold weather and growing again in spring. As to Osiris, his tomb was shown in more than one place in Egypt, and his body was never supposed to have come to life again, though his spirit was alive and was ruler of the underworld. Mithra was admitted to be the genius of the sun. He was said to have sprung from a rock (in old Persian and Sanskrit the same word means “sky,” “cloud” and “rock”), but not to have been incarnated, nor to have died, much less to have risen from the dead. The modern erroneous fancy that Mithraists believed in his resurrection rests solely on one or at most two passages in Christian writers, which really refer to the burial of Osiris and the removal of his body from the tomb by his hostile brother Typhon (Set). The high morality attributed to Mithraism and even to the worship of Isis rests on no better foundation than the wrong rendering of a few passages and the deliberate ignoring of many which contradict theory.

4. Virgin Birth:

Virgin birth, we have been told, is a doctrine of many religions. As a matter of fact, it is found in hardly one ethnic faith. Nothing of the kind was believed regarding Osiris, Adonis, Horus, Mithra, Krishna, Zoroaster. Of Buddha it is denied entirely in all the books of the Southern Canon (Pali), and is found expressed only vaguely in one or two late uncanonical works of the Northern (Sanskrit) School. It was doubtless borrowed from Christianity. Supernatural birth of quite a different (and very repulsive) kind is found in many mythologies, but that is quite another thing.

5. Heathen Aspirations and Unconscious Prophecies:

Heathenism contains some vague aspirations and unconscious prophecies, the best example of which is to be found in Vergil's Fourth Eclogue, if that be not rather due to Jewish influence. Any such foregleams of the coming light as are real and not merely imaginary, such, for instance, as the Indian doctrine of the avatars or "descents" of Vishnu, are to be accounted for as part of the Divine education of the human race. The "false dawn," so well known in the East, is not a proof that the sun is not about to rise, nor can its existence justify anyone in shutting his eyes to stud rejecting the daylight when it comes. It is but a harbinger of the real dawn.

6. Lessons Taught by Comparative Religion:

Comparative religion teaches us that religion is essential to and distinctive of humanity. The failures of the ethnic faiths no less than their aspirations show how great is man's need of Christ, and how utterly unable imagination has ever proved itself to be even to conceive of such an ideal character as He revealed to us in the full light of history and in the wonder-working effects of His character upon the lives and hearts of those who then and in all ages since have in Him received life and light.

LITERATURE.

Tylor, Anthropology; Jordan, Comparative Religion, Its Genesis and Growth; Falke, Zum Kampfe der drei Weltreligionen; Gould, Origin and Development of Religious Belief; Jevons, Introduction to the History of Religion; Reville, Prolegomena to the History of Religions; Max Muller, Introduction to the Science of Religion; Hardwick, Christ and Other Masters; Kellogg, The Light of Asia and the Light of the World; Farrar, The Witness of History to Christ; A. Lung, Magic and Religion; The

Making of Religion; Johnson, Oriental Religions and Their Relation to Universal Religion; Farnell, The Evolution of Religion; Howitt, The Native Tribes of Southeast Australia; Smith, Religion of the Semites; Reinach, Cultes, mythes et religions; Dilger, Erloschen des Menschen nach Hinduismus und Christentum; Rhys Davids, Origin and Growth of Religion; Kuenen, National Religions and Universal Religion (Hibbert Lectures, 1882); Dollinger, The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ (1862); Dodson, Evolution and Its Bearing on Religion; MacCulloch, Comparative Theology; Baumann, Über Religionen und Religion; Waitz, Anthropologie der Naturvölker; Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics; Frazer, Adonis, Attis, Osiris; Dufourcq, Hist. comparee des rel. paiennes et de la religion juive; Oesterley, Evolution of Religious Ideas; Martindale, Bearing of Comp. Study of Religions on Claims of Christianity; W. Clair Tisdall, Comparative Religion.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

COMPARE

<kom-par'> ([hmD; damah], [l vœ mashal], [%ræ `arakh]; [παράβαλλω, parabollo], [συγκρίνω, sugkrino]): “Compare” is the translation of [hmD; damah], “to be like” (Song 1:9); of [l vœ mashal], “to liken,” “compare” (<23415> Isaiah 46:5); of [%ræ `arakh], “to set in array,” “compare” (<18916> Psalm 89:6; <2408> Isaiah 40:18); of [hwy; shawah], “to be equal” (<20185> Proverbs 3:15; 8:11).

In the New Testament *sugkrino*, “to judge” or “sift together,” is translated “comparing,” “comparing spiritual things with spiritual” (<41213> 1 Corinthians 2:13 the English Revised Version), the American Standard Revised Version “combining” (“adapting the discourse to the subject,” Thayer), the Revised Version, margin “interpreting spiritual things to spiritual (men).”

W. L. Walker

COMPASS; COMPASSES

<kum'-pas>, <kum'-pas-iz>: “Compass,” noun, is the translation of [qwj , chugh], “a circle,” “vault” or “arch” (“when he set a compass upon the face of the depth” <10827> Proverbs 8:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version “circle”; compare <18310> Job 26:10; and see **CIRCLE; VAULT OF EARTH**); of [bKrKa; karkobh], “a margin” “border” (<12216> Exodus 27:5, “the compass of

the altar,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the ledge round,” so 38:4); the phrase “to fetch a compass” is the translation of [**bbæ** *sabhabh*], “to turn about,” “go round about” (^{<0605>}Numbers 34:5; ^{<0650>}Joshua 15:3, the Revised Version (British and American) “turn about,” ^{<0523>}2 Samuel 5:23; ^{<0301>}2 Kings 3:9, the Revised Version (British and American) “make a circuit”; of *perierchomai*, “to go about” (^{<4013>}Acts 28:13, the Revised Version (British and American) “made a circuit”; margin “Some ancient authorities read *cast loose*”; *see* **CIRCUIT**).

“Compasses” is the Revised Version (British and American) for “compass,” [**hgWj m**] *mechughah*, an instrument for describing a circle: “He marketh it out with the compasses” (^{<2443>}Isaiah 44:13) in making an idol.

The verb “to compass” occurs frequently in the senses of “to surround” and “to go round about,” e.g. ^{<0021>}Genesis 2:11, “which compasseth the whole land of Havilah,” ^{<0101>}Deuteronomy 2:1, “We compassed (went around) mount Seir many days”; in ^{<2612>}Jeremiah 31:22 we have “A new thing on the earth: a woman shall compass a man,” the Revised Version (British and American) “encompass”; possibly as a suitor; but more probably as a protector. In those happy days, the protection of women (under God, 31:28) will be sufficient, while the men are at their work; “to encompass” (“The cords of death compassed me” ^{<0904>}Psalms 18:4; “the waves of death,” ^{<0215>}2 Samuel 22:5). “To gird” (^{<2901>}Isaiah 50:11 the Revised Version (British and American)); “to lie around,” “to be laid around” (^{<0810>}Hebrews 5:2, “compassed with infirmity” (clothed with it); ^{<0811>}Hebrews 12:1, “compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses”).

In Apocrypha we have “compassed about with yawning darkness” (The Wisdom of Solomon 19:17); “compassed the circuit of heaven” (Ecclesiasticus 24:5); “compassed with pomegranates of gold” (Ecclesiasticus 45:9); “The rainbow compasseth the heaven” (Ecclesiasticus 43:12); the course of the sun (1 Esdras 4:34).

W. L. Walker

COMPASSION

<kom-pash'-un>: Compassion is the translation of [**uj æ** *racham*], “to love,” “pity,” “be merciful” (^{<0317>}Deuteronomy 13:17; 30:3); of *rachamim*, “mercies” (^{<0050>}1 Kings 8:50); of [**l mjæ** *chamal*], “to pity,” “spare”

(^{<1016>}Exodus 2:6; ^{<1021>}1 Samuel 23:21); [^{μλ}*ῥαχ*um] (^{<1038>}Psalms 78:38; 86:15; 111:4; 112:4; 145:8), is rendered by the American Standard Revised Version “merciful.” We have [^{σπ}*πλαγχνίζομαι*, *splogchnizomai*], “to have the bowels yearning,” in ^{<1086>}Matthew 9:36; 14:14, etc.; *sumpatheo* (^{<808>}Hebrews 10:34), “to suffer with (another)”; *sumpathes* (^{<1018>}1 Peter 3:8, the Revised Version (British and American) “compassionate,” margin, Greek, “sympathetic”); *metriopatheo* (^{<802>}Hebrews 5:2, the Revised Version (British and American) “who can bear gently with”); *eleeo*, “to show mildness,” “kindness” (^{<1033>}Matthew 18:33; ^{<1059>}Mark 5:19; ^{<1022>}Jude 1:22, the Revised Version (British and American) “mercy”); *oikteiro*, “to have pity” or “mercy” (^{<1015>}Romans 9:15 bis).

Both *racham* and *splogchnizomai* are examples of the physical origin of spiritual terms, the bowels being regarded as the seat of the warm, tender emotions or feelings. But, while *racham* applied to the lower viscera as well as the higher, *splogchnon* denoted chiefly the higher viscera, the heart, lungs, liver.

The Revised Version (British and American) gives “compassion” for “mercy” (^{<2017>}Isaiah 9:17; 14:1; 27:11; 49:13; ^{<2134>}Jeremiah 13:14; 30:18; ^{<2009>}Daniel 1:9 the King James Version “tender love with”; for “bowels of compassion,” ^{<1017>}1 John 3:17); for “mercy” (^{<808>}Hebrews 10:28); “full of compassion” for “merciful” (the American Standard Revised Version “merciful” in all cases) (Ex, 34:6; ^{<1017>}Nehemiah 9:17; ^{<1038>}Psalms 103:8; ^{<2013>}Joel 2:13; Jon 4:2); “compassions for mercies” (^{<2515>}Isaiah 63:15; ^{<1011>}Philippians 2:1), for “repentings” (^{<808>}Hosea 11:8).

Compassion, literally a feeling with and for others, is a fundamental and distinctive quality of the Biblical conception of God, and to its prominence the world owes more than words can express.

(1) It lay at the foundation of Israel’s faith in Yahweh. For it was out of His compassion that He, by a marvelous act of power, delivered them from Egyptian bondage and called them to be His own people.

Nothing, therefore, is more prominent in the Old Testament than the ascription of compassion, pity, mercy, etc., to God; the people may be said to have gloried in it. It is summed up in such sayings as that of the great declaration in ^{<1036>}Exodus 34:6: “Yahweh — a God full of compassion (the American Standard Revised Version merciful) and gracious” (compare ^{<1038>}Psalms 78:38; 86:15; 111:4; 112:4; 145:8; ^{<1022>}Lamentations 3:22, “His compassions fail not”). And, because this

was the character of their God, the prophets declared that compassion was an essential requirement on the part of members of the community (~~3066~~ Hosea 6:6; ~~3068~~ Micah 6:8; compare ~~3097~~ Proverbs 19:17).

(2) In Jesus Christ, in whom God was “manifest in the flesh,” compassion was an outstanding feature (~~4086~~ Matthew 9:36; 14:14, etc.) and He taught that it ought to be extended, not to friends and neighbors only, but to all without exception, even to enemies (~~4056~~ Matthew 5:43-48; ~~4080~~ Luke 10:30-37).

The God of the New Testament, the Father of men, is most clearly revealed as “a God full of compassion.” It extends to the whole human race, for which He effected not merely a temporal, but a spiritual and eternal, deliverance, giving up His own Son to the death of the cross in order to save us from the worst bondage of sin, with its consequences; seeking thereby to gain a new, wider people for Himself, still more devoted, more filled with and expressive of His own Spirit. Therefore all who know the God and Father of Christ, and who call themselves His children, must necessarily cultivate compassion and show mercy, “even as he is merciful.” Hence, the many apostolic injunctions to that effect (~~4082~~ Ephesians 4:32; ~~5082~~ Colossians 3:12; ~~5027~~ James 1:27; ~~4017~~ 1 John 3:17, etc.). Christianity may be said to be distinctively the religion of Compassion.

W. L. Walker

COMPEL

<kom-pel>: Our English word always has in it now the flavor of force, not always, however, physical. It may be strong moral urgency, though “constrain” better expresses this.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

There are several words indicative of such strong pressure:

(1) [~~snæ~~, *‘anac*] “to press”: “none could compel” to drink (Est 1:8);

(2) [~~j dæ~~*nadhach*], “to drive,” “force”: “compelled Judah thereto” (the King James Version, the Revised Version, margin); “led Judah astray” the Revised Version (British and American) (~~4211~~ 2 Chronicles 21:11). The same word rendered “force,” as the adulteress by flattering words her victim (~~3072~~ Proverbs 7:21);

(3) [**dbæ** ‘*adhadh*], “to serve”: not to compel him to serve as a bond servant (^{<1859>}Leviticus 25:39 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “make him serve”);

(4) [**ræ** *parats*], “to break forth upon,” “urge”: “his servants compelled him” (^{<1823>}1 Samuel 28:23 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “constrained”).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In the New Testament two words are found:

(1) [**ἄγγαρεύω**, *aggareuo*]: The word is of Persian origin and means to employ a courier. The Aggaroi were public couriers stationed by appointment of the kings of Persia, at fixed localities, with horses ready for use, to transmit speedily from one to another the royal messages. These couriers had authority to press into their service, in case of need, horses, vessels, and even men, they might meet (Josephus, *Ant*, XIII ii, 3); “compel thee to go a mile” (^{<1654>}Matthew 5:41 the King James Version; the Revised Version, margin “impress”); “compelled Simon to bear his cross” (^{<1772>}Matthew 27:32; ^{<1152>}Mark 15:21 the King James Version; the Revised Version, margin “impressed”).

(2) [**ἀναγκάζω**, *anagkazo*], “to constrain,” whether by force, threats, entreaties, persuasion, etc.: “compel them to come in” (^{<2143>}Luke 14:23 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “constrain”). This has been a favorite text of religious persecutors. As Robertson says in his history of Charles V, “As they could not persuade, they tried to compel men to believe.” But it simply means that utmost zeal and moral urgency should be used by Christians to induce sinners to enter the Kingdom of God. Compare ^{<451>}Acts 26:11.

George Henry Trever

COMPLAINING

<*kom-plan’-ing*> ([**hj wx**] *tsewachah*], “cry,” “outcry,” [**j ʔe**] *siach*], “meditation,” “complaint”): *tsewachah* is translated “complaining” (^{<1344>}Psalms 144:14, the Revised Version (British and American) “outcry,” “no complaining (outcry) in our streets,” i.e. “open places” where the people commonly assembled near the gate of the city (compare ^{<1416>}2 Chronicles 32:6; ^{<1610>}Nehemiah 8:1); a picture of peace in the city (compare ^{<2341>}Isaiah 24:11; ^{<2442>}Jeremiah 14:2); some render “battlecry”; *siach* (the

Revised Version (British and American) ^{<1829>}Proverbs 23:29, the King James Version “babbling”), of the drunkard.

COMPLETE

<kom-plet’>: In the King James Version for [*πληρόω*, *pleroo*], the verb ordinarily used for the coming to pass of what had been predicted. the King James Version translates this “complete” in ^{<5120>}Colossians 2:10; 4:12 to express the final and entire attainment of what is treated, leaving nothing beyond to be desired or hoped for; otherwise rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (“made full”). In the Revised Version (British and American), c. appears once for Greek *artios*, from *aro*, “to join,” in ^{<5187>}2 Timothy 3:17, in sense of “accurately fitted for,” where the King James Version has “perfect.”

COMPOSITION; COMPOUND

<kom-po-zish’-un>, **<kom’-pound>** ([*tnKōmāzathkoneth*], “measure”); (subst.) ([*j qæ raqach*], “to make perfume,” [*j qæ roqach*], “perfume”): Used of the sacred anointing oil (^{<1225>}Exodus 30:25,32,33) and of the holy perfume (^{<1237>}Exodus 30:37,38), which were not to be used for any profane purpose.

COMPREHEND

<kom-pre-hend’>: Used in a twofold sense in both the Old Testament and New Testament. This double meaning appears in two Hebrew and two Greek words which signify in turn

(1) mental or spiritual perception,

(2) capacity to hold or contain, as in a measure or in an all-inclusive principle, e.g.:

(1) [*dye yadha`*], “to see with the eyes or the mind,” hence, “know,” “understand.” Job was urged by Elihu to accept as inscrutable the ways of God, inasmuch as His operations in the physical world are so mighty and mysterious that “we cannot comprehend” them (^{<1875>}Job 37:5). Modern science, in unveiling the secrets of Nature, is opening the way for a better understanding of God’s creative purpose and plan.

[*καταλαμβάνω*, *katalambano*], “to lay hold of,” hence, mentally to

apprehend: used of the spiritual capacity of the Christian “to comprehend (the Revised Version (British and American) “apprehend”) with all saints” (~~4018~~ Ephesians 3:18) the measureless love of God; and of the inability of the unrenewed heart to know or perceive the revelation of God made in Christ: “the darkness comprehended it not” (~~4006~~ John 1:5 the Revised Version (British and American) “apprehended”; the Revised Version, margin “overcame”; compare ~~4025~~ John 12:35).

(2) [~~1~~ WK, *ku*l], “to measure” or “contain,” as grain in a bushel. So God’s immeasurable greatness is seen in His being able to hold oceans in the hollow of His hand and “comprehend the dust of the earth in a measure” (~~2302~~ Isaiah 40:12).

[ἀνακεφαλαιόω, *anakephalaioo*], “to sum up under one head,” e.g. love includes every other moral principle and process. The entire law on its manward side, says Paul, “is comprehended (the Revised Version (British and American) “summed up”) in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” (~~4610~~ Romans 13:9).

Dwight M. Pratt

CONANIAH

<*kon-a-ni’-a*> ([~~Whyni~~ak, *konanyahu*], “Jah has rounded or sustained”; the King James Version Cononiah):

(1) A Levite, appointed with his brother Shimei by Hezekiah, the king, and Azariah, the ruler of the house of God, to be overseer of the oblations and tithes and the dedicated things (~~4612~~ 2 Chronicles 31:12,13).

(2) One of the chiefs of the Levites mentioned in connection with the passover celebration in Josiah’s reign (~~4610~~ 2 Chronicles 35:9).

CONCEAL

<*kon-sel’*> ([~~παρακαλύπτω~~, *parakalupto*]): Found but once in the New Testament (~~4095~~ Luke 9:45). The primary meaning is to cover by hanging something in front of the object hidden. The purpose of the one concealing is made prominent. There is, therefore, a reserve and studied progress in regard to the statement of facts, that is not always a suppression of truth (~~4026~~ Proverbs 12:16,23). God withholds more than He reveals (~~4050~~ Proverbs 25:2; compare ~~4970~~ Psalm 97:2; ~~5066~~ 1 Timothy 6:16).

CONCEIT

<*kon-set*'>: An idiomatic rendering of a phrase, [φρόνιμοι ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, *phronimoi en heautois*], in ^{<5125>}Romans 11:25; 12:16; meaning literally, “wise with one’s self,” i.e. “in one’s own opinion,” or, as in parallel Old Testament passages (^{<1016>}Proverbs 26:5,12 the Revised Version, margin), “in his own eyes” (Hebrew *`ayin*).

CONCEPTION; CONCEIVE

<*kon-sep'-shun*>, <*kon-sev'*> ([*hrh*; *harah*], and derivatives; [συλλαμβάνω, *sullambano*]): Physically, the beginning of a new life in the womb of a mother, “to catch on,” used thus some forty times, as in ^{<1016>}Genesis 3:16; 4:1; ^{<1505>}Psalms 51:5. Metaphorically, applied to the start and growth within the heart, of thought, purpose, desire, e.g. “conceive mischief” (^{<1855>}Job 15:35; ^{<1074>}Psalms 7:14), “conceive chaff” (^{<2331>}Isaiah 33:11). This figure is carried out in details in ^{<5015>}James 1:15: “Lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin.”

CONCEPTION, IMMACULATE

See *IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*.

CONCERNING

<*kon-surn'-ing*>:

The Revised Version (British and American) makes frequent changes, such as “for,” “as for,” “from,” “about,” for “concerning”; “concerning” instead of “for,” “of,” “over,” “in,” “against,” etc. Some of the other changes are, “unto that which is good” for “concerning” (^{<5169>}Romans 16:19), “concerning” instead of “because of” (^{<2219>}Jeremiah 23:9), for “the miracle of” (^{<4062>}Mark 6:52); for “with” (^{<4104>}Mark 10:41), for “of the Lord” (^{<4185>}Acts 18:25), “concerning Jesus” (different text), “by way of disparagement” (^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 11:21), instead of “concerning reproach”; “Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?” (^{<4197>}Matthew 19:17) instead of “Why callest thou me good?” (different text; see the Revised Version, margin).

W. L. Walker

CONCISION

<kon-sizh'-un> ([κατατομή, *katatome*], “mutilation,” “cutting”): A term by which Paul contemptuously designates the merely fleshly circumcision upon which the Judaizers insisted as being necessary for Gentile converts (^{<SJB>}Philippians 3:2), as distinguished from *peritome*, the true circumcision (^{<SJB>}Philippians 3:3). Compare ^{<KJB>}Galatians 5:12 and ^{<KJB>}Deuteronomy 23:1, and *see* **CIRCUMCISION**.

CONCLUDE

<kon-klood'> ([συμβιβάζω, *sumbibazo*): Used only in ^{<KJB>}Acts 16:10, where the King James Version has “assuredly gathering,” i.e. “inferring.” Where the King James Version has “conclude,” the Revised Version (British and American) more accurately renders “reckon” (^{<KJB>}Romans 3:28); “giving judgment” (^{<KJB>}Acts 21:25); “shut up” (^{<KJB>}Romans 11:32; ^{<KJB>}Galatians 3:22).

CONCLUSION

<kon-kloo'-zhun> ([t/s, *coph*): In ^{<KJB>}Ecclesiastes 12:13 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has “the end,” namely, a summary of the entire argument of the book.

CONCORDANCE

<kon-kor'-dans>:

1. NATURE OF WORK:

The object of a concordance of Scripture is to guide the reader to any passage he is in search of by means of an alphabetical arrangement of the words found in Scripture, and the bringing together under each word of all the passages in which that word occurs. Thus, in the verse: “Cast thy burden upon Yahweh” (^{<KJB>}Psalm 55:22), the reader will look in the concordance under the words “cast” or “burden,” and there will find a reference to the text. The merit of a concordance is obviously exhaustiveness and clearness of arrangement. There are abridged concordances of the Bible which give only the most important words and passages. These are seldom satisfactory, and a fuller work has in the end frequently to be resorted to.

2. CLASSES OF CONCORDANCES:

The ordinary reader is naturally most familiar with concordances of the English Bible, but it will be seen that, for scholarly purposes, concordances are just as necessary for the Scriptures in their original tongues, and for versions of the Scriptures other than English. There are required concordances of the Old Testament in Hebrew, of the New Testament in Greek, of the Septuagint version (Greek) of the Old Testament, of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) version (Latin) of the New Testament, as well as of the translations of the Scriptures into German, French and other living languages. There are now, further, required concordances of the RVV of the English Old Testament and New Testament, as well as of the King James Version. There are needed, besides, good concordances to the Apocrypha, alike in its the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) forms. Textual criticism leads to modifications of the earlier concordances of the Hebrew and Greek texts. It is customary in concordances of the English version to facilitate reference by giving not only single words, but also phrases under which several passages are grouped, and to make the work more useful by furnishing lists of Scripture proper names, with their meanings, and, in the larger works, references to the Hebrew or Greek words for which the English words stand.

3. THEIR INDISPENSABLENESS:

The indispensableness of a good concordance for the proper study of the Bible is so apparent that it is not surprising that, since the idea was first conceived, much labor has been expended on the preparation of such works. The wonder rather is that the idea did not occur earlier than it did. No single scholar could ever hope to produce a perfect work of the kind by his own efforts. Modern concordances are based upon the labors of previous generations.

4. CONCORDANCES TO LATIN VULGATE:

The oldest concordances date from the 13th century, and are based, as was then natural, upon the Latin Vulgate. A *Concordantie Morales* is attributed to Antony of Padua (died 1231). The first concordance of which we have actual knowledge is that of Hugo of Caro, Dominican monk and cardinal (died 1263). It was called *Concordantie S. Jacobi* from the monastery in which it was compiled. 500 monks are said to have been

engaged upon its preparation. Hugo's Concordance became the basis of others into which successive improvements were introduced. The words of passages, at first wanting, were inserted; indeclinable particles were added; alphabetic arrangement was employed. Verse divisions were unknown till the time of Robert Stephens (1555).

See BIBLE.

5. CONCORDANCES TO HEBREW OLD TESTAMENT:

The earliest Hebrew concordance seems to have been that of Rabbi Mordecai ben Nathan (1438-48). It went through several editions and was translated into Latin by Reuchlin the (1556). Both original and translation contained many errors. It was improved by Calasio, a Franciscan friar (1621), and more thoroughly by John Buxtorf, whose Concordance was published by his son (1632). This latter formed the basis of Dr. Julius Furst's *Libr. Sacrorum Vet. Test. Concordantie Hebrews atque Chaldaic*; 1840 (English translation, Hebrew and Chaldean Concordance). A later Hebrew Concordance in Germany is that of Solomon Mandelkern (1896). In England, in 1754, appeared the valuable Hebrew Concordance, Adapted to the English Bible, by Dr. Taylor, of Norwich. With it may be classed *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldaic Concordance* (1843; revised edition, 1876).

6. CONCORDANCES TO THE SEPTUAGINT:

Though earlier attempts are heard of, the first printed concordance of the Septuagint (the Greek Old Testament) was that of Trommius, published in Amsterdam in 1718, in the author's 84th year. This important work remained the standard till quite lately.

It is very complete, giving references not only to the Septuagint, but to other versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) in which the words occur, and showing by an index at the end the Hebrew or Chaldaic words to which the Greek words correspond. In 1887 Bagster published *A Handy Concordance of the Septuagint*. Earlier works are superseded by the recent publication (1892, 1897, 1900) of Hatch and Redpath's scholarly *Concordance to the Septuagint, and Other Greek versions of the Old Testament*.

7. CONCORDANCES TO THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT:

Concordances of the Greek New Testament began with that of Xystus Betulius (his real name was Birck) in 1554. The Concordance (*Tameion*) of Erasmus Schmid (1638) has often been reprinted and reedited. On it is based the useful abridged Concordance published by Bagster. Recent works are Bruder's (1842; 4th edition, 1888; based on Schmid, with many improvements); in America, Hudson's Critical Greek and English Concordance, revised by Ezra Abbot (1870); in England, Moulton and Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers (1897).

8. CONCORDANCES TO THE ENGLISH BIBLE:

The list of concordances to the English Bible is a long one; it is necessary here to particularize only a few of the chief. The oldest is a Concordance of the New Testament, brought out before 1540 by one Thomas Gybson, though, as appears from the Preface, it was principally the work of the printer John Day (the producer of Foxe's Book of Martyrs). The first Concordance to the whole Bible was that of John Marbeck (1550). In the same year was published a translation by Walter Lynne of the Index Librorum of Bullinger, Conrad Pelican and others, under the title of A Briefe and a Compendious Table, in manor of a Concordance, opening the way to the principall Histories of the whole Bible, etc. Alex. Cruden, whose own Concordance, the most adequate of all, was published in 1737, enumerates most of his predecessors in the intervening period. Cruden's personal history is a pathetic one. A recurring mental malady overshadowed his career; but his indomitable perseverance and fixity of purpose, joined with a clear idea of what he wished to accomplish, enabled him to overcome all obstacles, and produce a book for which the Christian world is grateful. The work is entitled A Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, etc.; to which is added, a Concordance to the Books called Apocrypha. Mr. Spurgeon said regarding it, "Be sure you buy a genuine unabridged Cruden, and none of the modern substitutes, good as they may be at the price. You need only one; have none but the best." Many editions of this valuable book have been published. It no longer remains, however, the only authority, nor even the most complete and serviceable, though perhaps still the most convenient, for the purpose of the student. In 1873 was published the Analytical Concordance to the Bible by Robert Young, LL.D., to which an appendix

has since been added. This bulky work contains “every word in alphabetical order, arranged under its Hebrew or Greek original; with the literal meaning of each and its pronunciation.” It marks 30,000 various readings, and gives geographical and antiquarian notes. Yet more comprehensive is The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible by James Strong, LL.D. This includes the new feature of a comparative concordance of the Authorized and Revised (English) versions. It embraces also condensed Dictionaries of the Hebrew and Greek words, to which references are made from the English words by figures. It thus differs in plan from Young’s, which gives the Hebrew and Greek words in the body of the concordance at the head of the passages coming under them. Lastly must be noticed the very valuable work published in the same year (1894) in America by J.B.R. Walker, Comprehensive Concordance, with an Introduction by Marshall Curtiss Hazard. It is stated to give 50,000 more passages than Cruden.

LITERATURE.

See articles on “Concordance” in the various Dictionaries and Encyclopedias; articles by Dr. Beard in Kitto’s Encyclopedia (Volume I); and by Dr. C. R. Gregory in the New The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge Encyclopedia (Volume III); Preface to Cruden’s complete Concordance, and Introduction by Hazard to Walker’s Comprehensive Concordance.

James Orr

CONCOURSE

<kon'-kors> ([hmk; hamah], “to hum,” “to make a noise”; [συστροφή, *sustrophe*], “a turning” or “twisting together”): *Hamah*, usually translated by some word signifying “sound” is rendered “concourse” in 202 Proverbs 1:21 (perhaps from the noise made by people thronging and talking together; compare 104 1 Kings 1:41, “uproar”), “She (wisdom) crieth in the chief place of concourse,” the Revised Version, margin, Hebrew “at the head of the noisy (streets)”); *sustrophe* is translated “concourse” (490 Acts 19:40), a riotous crowd. Compare Judith 10:18.

CONCUBINAGE

<kon-ku'-bi-naj>.

See FAMILY.

CONCUPISCENCE

<kon-ku'-pi-sens> ([ἐπιθυμία, *epithumia*): Not used in the Revised Version (British and American), but in the King James Version, ^{<6008>}Romans 7:8; ^{<5005>}Colossians 3:5; ^{<5045>}1 Thessalonians 4:5. The Greek noun, like the verb from which it comes, meaning “to yearn,” “to long,” “to have the heart set upon a thing,” is determined in its moral quality by the source whence it springs or the object toward which it is directed. Thus, our Lord uses it to express the intensest desire of His soul (^{<0215>}Luke 22:15). As a rule, when the object is not expressed, it refers to longing for that which God has forbidden, namely, lust. It is not limited to sexual desire, but includes all going forth of heart and will toward what God would not have us to have or be, as its use in the Septuagint of the Ten Commandments clearly shows, for “Thou shalt not covet” (^{<0217>}Exodus 20:17).

H. E. Jacobs

CONDEMN; CONDEMNATION

<kon-dem'>, <kon-dem-na'-shun>:

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

(1) The causative stem of [[^{væ} *rasha`*] “to declare (or make) wrong,” “to condemn,” whether in civil, ethical or religious relations. Taken in this sense the word needs no comment (^{<0219>}Exodus 22:9; ^{<5201>}Deuteronomy 25:1; ^{<1808>}Job 40:8); “Who then can condemn?” (^{<1890>}Job 34:29, the King James Version “make trouble”).

(2) [^{vn} ; *`anash*], “to fine.” “Condemned the land” (^{<1818>}2 Chronicles 36:3 the King James Version; the King James Version margin “mulcted”; the Revised Version (British and American) “amerced”; the American Standard Revised Version “fined”); “wine of the condemned” (^{<3018>}Amos 2:8; the Revised Version (British and American) “fined” (unjustly)).

(3) The active participle of [^{fpæ} *shaphaT*], “to judge.” “From those that condemn his soul” (^{<19451>}Psalms 109:31 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “that judge his soul”).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The New Testament usage is much more complicated, both because of the greater number of Greek words rendered “condemn” and “condemnation,” and because the King James Version translates the same word in several different ways, apparently with no rule whatever.

(1) The most important word is [κρίνω, *krino*], “to judge.” From it are a number of derivative verbs and nouns. the Revised Version (British and American) has rigidly excluded the harsh words “damn” and “damnation,” substituting “judge,” “condemn,” “judgment,” “condemnation.” This is proper, since the word damn (Latin, *damnare*, “to inflict loss” upon a person, “to condemn”), and its derivatives has, in process of time, suffered degradation, so that in modern English it usually refers to eternal punishment. This special application of the word for some centuries ran side by side with the original meaning, but even as late as Wycliffe’s version the word “damn” is usually employed in the sense of condemn, as in ^{<400>}Job 9:20, “My mouth shall dampne me.” It is even applied to the condemnation of Jesus by the chief priests and scribes (^{<4103>}Mark 10:33). This degeneration of the word is perhaps due, as Bishop Sanderson says, “not so much to good acts as to bad manners.” *Krino* is rendered uniformly “judge” by the Revised Version (British and American), even where the context. compels the thought of condemnation (^{<4007>}John 3:17,18; 12:47; ^{<4007>}Acts 7:7; “might be damned,” ^{<3012>}2 Thessalonians 2:12 the King James Version; ^{<5142>}Romans 14:22; ^{<3009>}James 5:9).

(2) The more specific sense of condemn, however, is found in [κατακρίνω, *katakrino*], “to judge one down” (^{<4241>}Matthew 12:41,42; ^{<41461>}Mark 14:64): “is damned if he eat” (^{<5143>}Romans 14:23; ^{<6113>}1 Corinthians 11:32 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “condemned”). See also ^{<4166>}Mark 16:16; ^{<6006>}2 Peter 2:6.

(3) For “condemnation” there is the noun [κρίμα, *krima*], or [κρίμα, *krima*] (for accent see Thayer’s *Lexicon*), in a forensic sense, “the sentence of the judge” (^{<4230>}Luke 23:40; ^{<4234>}Matthew 23:14, omitted in the Revised Version (British and American); “condemnation of the devil” ^{<4006>}1 Timothy 3:6; 5:12; ^{<6104>}Jude 1:4).

(4) Much stronger is [κατάκριμα, *katakrima*], “condemnation” (^{<616>}Romans 5:16,18; 8:1) with reference to the Divine judgment against sin.

(5) [κρίσις, *krisis*], “the process of judgment,” “tribunal” (^{<4009>}John 3:19; 5:24), with reference to “the judgment brought by men upon themselves

because of their rejection of Christ.”

(6) A stronger word is the adjective [αὐτοκατάκριτος, *autokatakritos*], “self-condemned” (†Titus 3:11; compare †1 John 3:20,21).

G. H. Trever

CONDESCENSION, OF CHRIST

<kon-de-sen'-shun>.

See *KENOSIS*.

CONDUCT

<kon'-dukt>.

See *ETHICS*.

CONDUIT

<kon'-dit>.

See *CISTERN*.

CONEY

<ko'-ni> ([ᾤπν; *shaphan*] (†Leviticus 11:5; †Deuteronomy 14:7; †Psalm 104:18; †Proverbs 30:26)): The word “coney” (formerly pronounced *cooney*) means “rabbit” (from Latin *cuniculus*). *Shaphan* is rendered in all four passages in the Septuagint [χοιρογρύλλιος, *choirogrullios*], or “hedge-hog,” but is now universally considered to refer to the Syrian hyrax, *Procavia* (or *Hyrax*) *Syriaca*, which in southern Palestine and Sinai is called in Arabic *wabar*, in northern Palestine and Syria *Tabsum*, and in southern Arabia *shufun*, which is etymologically closely akin to *shaphan*. The word “hyrax” ([υραξ, *hurax*]) itself means “mouse” or “shrew-mouse” (compare Latin *sorex*), so that it seems to have been hard to find a name peculiar to this animal. In †Leviticus 11:5 the Revised Version, margin, we find “rock badger,” which is a translation of *klip das*, the rather inappropriate name given by the Boers to the Cape hyrax. The Syrian hyrax lives in Syria, Palestine and Arabia. A number of other species, including several that are arboreal, live in Africa. They are not found in other parts of the world. In size, teeth and habits the Syrian hyrax somewhat resembles the rabbit, though it is different in color, being

reddish brown, and lacks the long hind legs of the rabbit. The similarity in dentition is confined to the large size of the front teeth and the presence of a large space between them and the back teeth. But whereas hares have a pair of front teeth on each jaw, the hyrax has one pair above and two below. These

teeth differ also in structure from those of the hare and rabbit, not having the persistent pulp which enables the rabbit's front teeth to grow continually as they are worn away. They do not hide among herbage like hares, nor burrow like rabbits, but live in holes or clefts of the rock, frequently in the faces of steep cliffs. Neither the hyrax nor the hare is a ruminant, as seems to be implied in ^{<B116>}Leviticus 11:5 and ^{<B147>}Deuteronomy 14:7, but their manner of chewing their food may readily have led them to be thought to chew the cud. The hyrax has four toes in front and three behind (the same number as in the tapir and in some fossil members of the horse family), all furnished with nails that are almost like hoofs, except the inner hind toes, which have claws. The hyraxes constitute a family of ungulates and, in spite of their small size, have points of resemblance to elephants or rhinoceroses, but are not closely allied to these or to any other known animals.

The camel, the coney and the hare are in the list of unclean animals because they “chew the cud but divide not the hoof,” but all three of these are eaten by the Arabs.

The illustration is from a photograph of a group of conies in the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut, prepared by Mr. Douglas Carruthers, who collected these specimens in a cliff in the neighborhood of Tyre. Specimens from the Dead Sea are redder than those from Syria.

Alfred Ely Day

CONFECTION; CONFECTIONARY

<kon-fek'-shun>, <kon-fek'-shun-a-ri> ([^hqæ^{ro}qach] “perfume,” “spice,” [^hhQræ^{aa}qqahah], feminine “perfumer”):

(1) “Confection” is found in the King James Version only and but once “a confection after the art of the apothecary” (^{<B135>}Exodus 30:35; the Revised Version (British and American) “perfume”); but the Revised Version (British and American) renders ^{<B390>}1 Chronicles 9:30, “the confection (the King James Version “ointment”) of the spices.” It stands for something

“made up,” a mixture of perfumes or medicines, but never sweetmeats, as confection means with us.

(2) Likewise a “confectionary” is a perfumer. This word, too, is found but once (^{<0083>}1 Samuel 8:13), “He will take your daughters to be perfumers (the King James Version “confectionaries”), and to be cooks, and to be bakers.”

See *PERFUMES*.

George B. Eager

CONFEDERATE; CONFEDERACY

<kon-fed'-er-at>, *<kon-fed'-er-a-si>*: “Confederate” as an adjective in the sense of united or leagued is twice the translation of [*tyrB*] *berith*] “covenant,” in several instances translated “league” (^{<0143>}Genesis 14:13, *ba'al berith*, “lord or master of a covenant,” “an ally,” “these were confederate with Abram”; compare ^{<0036>}Psalms 83:5; once of [*j We*, *nuach*], “to rest,” “Syria is confederate with Ephraim” (^{<2102>}Isaiah 7:2, the Revised Version, margin “resteth on Ephraim”; also 1 Macc 10:47).

As a noun “confederate” occurs in 1 Macc 10:16, *summachos*, “confederates” (1 Macc 8:20,24,31; 14:40; 15:17).

Confederacy, as a “league,” occurs as the translation of *berith*, “the men of thy confederacy” (Obad 1:7); as a conspiracy it occurs in ^{<2102>}Isaiah 8:12 twice, as translation of *qesher* from *qashar*, “to bind”: “Say ye not, a confederate.” Compare ^{<0152>}2 Samuel 15:12; ^{<2121>}2 Kings 12:20, etc.

W. L. Walker

CONFER; CONFERENCE

<kon'-fer>, *<kon'-ferens>*: The equivalent of three Greek words of different shades of meaning. In ^{<8016>}Galatians 1:16, [*προσανατίθημι*, *prosanatithemi*], had been used in classical writers for resorting to oracles (Lightfoot on ^{<8016>}Galatians 2:6; Ellicott on ^{<8016>}Galatians 1:16); hence, “to take counsel with,” “to consult.” In ^{<4015>}Acts 4:15, [*συμβάλλω*, *sumballo*], “to compare views,” “discuss”; and in ^{<40512>}Acts 25:12, [*συνλαλέω*, *sullaleo*], “to talk together.” Compare the single passage in the Old Testament (^{<1007>}1 Kings 1:7).

CONFESSION

<kon-fesh'-un> ([hdy; yadhah]; [ὁμολογέω, *homologeō*], and their derivatives): The radical meaning is “acknowledgment,” “avowal,” with the implication of a change of conviction or of course of conduct on the part of the subject. In English “profession” (the King James Version ^{<SAB>}1 Timothy 6:12; ^{<SRB>}Hebrews 3:1; 4:14), besides absence of the thought just suggested, emphasizes the publicity of the act. Confession, like its Greek equivalent, connotes, as its etymology shows (Latin, *con*; Greek, *homou*), that the act places one in harmony with others. It is the uniting in a statement that has previously been made by someone else. Of the two Greek words from the same root in the New Testament, the compound with the Greek preposition *ek* found, among other places, in ^{<ARB>}Matthew 3:6; ^{<ABRS>}Acts 19:18; ^{<SAB>}Romans 14:11; ^{<ABZ>}Philippians 2:11, implies that it has come from an inner impulse, i.e. it is the expression of a conviction of the heart. It is referred anthropopathically to God in ^{<SBOL>}Job 40:14, where Yahweh says to the patriarch sarcastically: “Then will I also confess of (unto) thee”; and in ^{<ARB>}Revelation 3:5, where it means “to recognize” or “acknowledge.”

When man is said to confess or make confession, the contents of the confession are variously distinguished. All, however, may be grouped under two heads, confession of faith and confession of sin. Confessions of faith are public acknowledgments of fidelity to God, and to the truth through which God is revealed, as ^{<ABRS>}1 Kings 8:33. They are declarations of unqualified confidence in Christ, and of surrender to His service; ^{<ARB>}Matthew 10:32: “Every one who shall confess me before men.” In ^{<ABZ>}Philippians 2:11, however, confession includes, alongside of willing, also unwilling, acknowledgment of the sovereignty of Jesus. The word confession stands also for everything contained in the Christian religion — “the faith” used in the objective and widest sense, in ^{<SRB>}Hebrews 3:1; 4:14. In both these passages, the allusion is to the New Testament. The “High Priest of our confession” (^{<SRB>}Hebrews 3:1) is the High Priest, of whom we learn and with whom we deal in that new revelation, which in that epistle is contrasted with the old.

Confessions of sins are also of various classes:

(1) To God alone. Wherever there is true repentance for sin, the penitent freely confesses his guilt to Him, against whom he has sinned. This is described in ^{<ABZ>}Psalms 32:3-6; compare ^{<ABO>}1 John 1:9; ^{<ABZ>}Proverbs 28:13.

Such confession may be made either silently, or, as in ~~<2798>~~ Daniel 9:19, orally; it may be general, as in Psalm 51, or particular, as when some special sin is recognized; it may even extend to what has not been discovered, but which is believed to exist because of recognized inner depravity (~~<19912>~~ Psalm 19:12), and thus include the state as well as the acts of sin (~~<11718>~~ Romans 7:18).

(2) To one's neighbor, when he has been wronged (~~<21704>~~ Luke 17:4): "If he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him." It is to this form of c. that James refers (5:16): "Confess your sins one to another"; compare ~~<10523>~~ Matthew 5:23 f.

(3) To a spiritual adviser or minister of the word, such as the c. of David to Nathan (~~<1023>~~ 2 Samuel 12:13), of the multitudes to John in the wilderness (~~<1016>~~ Matthew 3:6), of the Ephesians to Paul (~~<11918>~~ Acts 19:18). This c. is a general acknowledgment of sinfulness, and enters into an enumeration of details only when the conscience is particularly burdened.

(4) To the entire church, where some crime has created public scandal. As "secret sins are to be rebuked secretly, and public sins publicly," in the apostolic age, where there was genuine penitence for a notorious offense, the acknowledgment was as public as the deed itself. An illustration of this is found in the well-known case at Corinth (compare ~~<1113>~~ 1 Corinthians 5:3 ff with ~~<1016>~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6 f).

For auricular confession in the sense of the medieval and Roman church, there is no authority in Holy Scripture. It is traceable to the practice of examining those who were about to make a public confession of some notorious offense, and of giving advice concerning how far the circumstances of the sin were to be announced; an expedient that was found advisable, since as much injury could be wrought by injudicious publishing of details in the confession as by the sin itself. The practice once introduced for particular cases was in time extended to all cases; and the private confession of sin was demanded by the church as a condition of the absolution, and made an element of penitence, which was analyzed into contrition, confession and satisfaction. See the *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (1st edition, 1565) of Dr. Martin Chemnitz, superintendent of Brunswick, for a thorough exegetical and historical discussion of this entire subject. On the historical side, see also Henry Charles Lea, *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church* (3 volumes, Philadelphia, 1896).

CONFIDENCE

<kon'-fi-dens> ([j fB, baTach], and forms, [l sK, kecel]; [παρρησία, parrhesia]; [πεῖθω, peitho], [πεποίθησις, pepoithesis], [ὑπόστασις, hypostasis]): The chief Hebrew word translated “confidence” ([baTach], and its forms) means, perhaps, radically, “to be open,” showing thus what originated the idea of “confidence”; where there was nothing hidden a person felt safe; it is very frequently rendered “trust.” In ^{<118>}Psalm 118:8,9 we have “It is better to take refuge in Yahweh than to put confidence in princes,” and in 65:5, “O God of our salvation, thou that art the confidence (*mibhTach*) of all the ends of the earth.” *MibhTach* is translated “confidence” in ^{<184>}Job 18:14; 31:24; ^{<172>}Proverbs 21:22, etc.

Kecel (“firmness,” “stoutness”) is rendered “confidence” in ^{<186>}Proverbs 3:26, and *kiclah* in ^{<16>}Job 4:6; *peitho* (“to persuade”) is translated “confidence” in ^{<118>}2 Corinthians 2:3; ^{<150>}Galatians 5:10, etc.; *pepoithesis*, in ^{<115>}2 Corinthians 1:15; 8:22, etc.; *hypostasis* (“what stands under”), in ^{<117>}2 Corinthians 11:17; ^{<14>}Hebrews 3:14; ^{<190>}2 Corinthians 9:4; *parrhesia* (“out-spokenness,” “boldness”) is invariably translated in the Revised Version (British and American) “boldness” (^{<18>}Acts 28:31; ^{<186>}Hebrews 3:6; 4:16; 10:35; ^{<128>}1 John 2:28; 3:21; 5:14); *tharseo* or *tharrheo* (“to have good courage”) is so translated in the Revised Version (British and American), “being therefore always of good courage” (^{<186>}2 Corinthians 5:6); “I am of good courage concerning you” (^{<176>}2 Corinthians 7:16), the King James Version “confident” and “confidence.”

Revised Version has “confidence” for “hope” (^{<184>}Job 8:14); for “assurance” (^{<177>}Isaiah 32:17); for “trust” (^{<184>}2 Corinthians 3:4); for “same confident boasting” (^{<190>}2 Corinthians 9:4); “is confident” for “trusted” (^{<123>}Job 40:23); “to have confidence” for “thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust” (^{<104>}Philippians 3:4); “confidently” for “constantly” (^{<125>}Acts 12:15); “confidently affirm” for “affirm” (^{<107>}1 Timothy 1:7); conversely, we have for “his confidence” (^{<184>}Job 18:14), “wherein he trusteth,” for “with confidence” (^{<195>}Ezekiel 28:26) “securely therein.”

The Bible teaches the value of confidence (^{<15>}Isaiah 30:15; ^{<186>}Hebrews 10:35), but neither in “gold” (^{<124>}Job 31:24), nor in man, however great (^{<188>}Psalm 118:8,9; ^{<175>}Jeremiah 17:5), nor in self (^{<146>}Proverbs 14:16; ^{<188>}Philippians 3:3), but in God (^{<155>}Psalm 65:5; ^{<186>}Proverbs 3:26; 14:26), as revealed in Christ (^{<182>}Ephesians 3:12; ^{<153>}1 John 5:13,14).

CONFIRM; CONFIRMATION

<kon-furm>, <konfer-ma'-shun>: In the Old Testament represented by several Hebrew words, generally with reference to an increase of external strength, as “c. the feeble knees” (<238B> Isaiah 35:3); “c. the kingdom” (<1259> 2 Kings 15:19); “c. inheritance” (<198D> Psalm 68:9). In the New Testament, this external, objective sense is expressed by [βεβαιόω, *bebaioo*], as in <416D> Mark 16:20; <513B> Romans 15:8. The strengthening of mind, purpose, conviction, i.e. the inner or subjective sense (<4442> Acts 14:22; 15:32,41) corresponds to [ἐπιστηρίζω, *episterizo*]. Used also of ratifying or making valid ([κυρόω, *kuroo*]) a covenant (<8085> Galatians 3:15). The noun is used in the second sense (<8066> Hebrews 6:16; <10007> Philippians 1:7). Confirmation, the rite, in some denominations, of admission to the full communion of the church, which the Roman church has elevated to the place of a sacrament, has only ecclesiastical, but no Scriptural, authority. It is grounded, however, in the Scriptural precedent of the laying on of hands after baptism.

See *HANDS, IMPOSITION OF*.

H. E. Jacobs

CONFISCATION

<kon-fis-ka'-shun>.

See *PUNISHMENTS*.

CONFLICT

<kon'-flikt> ([ἀγών, *agon*], “contest,” “fight”): In <1003> Philippians 1:30, “having the same c. which ye saw in me,” and <1006> Colossians 2:1 the King James Version; <1001> 1 Thessalonians 2:2 (the King James Version “contention”); [ἄθλησις, *athlesis*] (literally, “combat in the public games”), in <8082> Hebrews 10:32 (the King James Version “fight”).

See also *AGONY*.

CONFORM; CONFORMABLE

<kon-form'>, <kon-form'-a-b'-l> ([συμμορφόω, *summorphoo*] “to become or be like,” or “of the same form”): Indicating an inner change of

nature, working into the outward life (^{<4182>}Romans 8:29; ^{<51810>}Philippians 3:10,21); while [^{<50>}συσχηματίζω, *suschematizo*], “fashioned according to” (^{<4121>}Romans 12:21 the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version. “conformed”), refers to that which is external.

CONFOUND

<kon-found'>: The physical origin of spiritual terms is well illustrated by the principal Hebrew words for “confounded” (rendered also “ashamed,” etc.); [^{<v>}^{}, *bosh*], is “to become pale” (^{<1295>}2 Kings 19:26; ^{<1610>}Job 6:20; ^{<1817>}Psalms 83:17; 129:5 the King James Version; ^{<2309>}Isaiah 19:9, etc.); [^{<rp>}^{<je>}, *chapher*], “to become red” (^{<1914>}Psalms 35:4; ^{<2109>}Isaiah 1:29; 24:23, “the moon shall be confounded,” ^{<3107>}Micah 3:7); [^{<vb>}^{<ye>} *yabhash*], “to be dried up” (^{<2453>}Jeremiah 46:24 the King James Version; 48:1,20 the King James Version; 50:2 the King James Version; ^{<3105>}Zechariah 10:5); [^{}^{<ke>} *kalam*], “to blush” (^{<1916>}Psalms 69:6 the King James Version; ^{<2311>}Isaiah 41:11, etc.). In ^{<1110>}Genesis 11:7,9, of the confusion of tongues, the word is [^{<ll>}^{<be>} *balal*], “to mix,” “mingle.” In ^{<2417>}Jeremiah 1:17 the King James Version it is [^{<tt>}^{<je>} *chathath*], “to bring or put down.”

In New Testament, *kataischuno*, “to put to shame” (^{<4127>}1 Corinthians 1:27 the King James Version; ^{<4116>}1 Peter 2:6 the King James Version); and *sugchuno*, “to pour together,” “bewilder” (“^{<4116>}Acts 2:6; 9:22). the Revised Version (British and American) frequently gives “ashamed” and “put to shame” instead of “confounded.”

W. L. Walker

CONFUSION

<kon-fu'-zhun> ([^{<tv>}^{}, *bosheth*], “shame, paleness,” [^{<hm>}^{<l>} *kelimmah*], “blushing,” [^{<wh>}^{<to>} *tohu*]; [^{<ak>}^{<ata>}^{<st>}^{<as>}^{<ia>} *akatastasia*], [^{<sy>}^{<gh>}^{<us>}^{<is>} *sugchusis*]): In the Old Testament *bosheth* (^{<1018>}1 Samuel 20:30; ^{<1949>}Psalms 109:29 the King James Version) and *kelimmah* (^{<1945>}Psalms 44:15; ^{<2318>}Isaiah 30:3) are the words most frequently translated “confusion”; *tohu*, “wastiness,” “emptiness” is so translated (^{<2340>}Isaiah 24:10; 34:11; 41:29), also *qalon*, “lightness,” “contempt” (^{<1815>}Job 10:15 = ignominy, the American Standard Revised Version) and *tebhel*, “profanation” (^{<1823>}Leviticus 18:23; 20:12); *ra`ash*, “shaking,” “trembling,” rendered “confused” in ^{<2305>}Isaiah 9:5 the King James Version; compare the Revised Version (British and American). Greek *akatastasia*, “instability” is

translated “confusion” (^{<443>}1 Corinthians 14:33; ^{<3016>}James 3:16); sugchusis, “a pouring out together” (^{<4429>}Acts 19:29). In The Wisdom of Solomon 14:26, “changing of kind” (the King James Version) is rendered “confusion of sex.”

W. L. Walker

CONFUSION OF TONGUES

See BABEL, TOWER OF; TONGUES, CONFUSION OF

CONGREGATION

<kon-gre-ga'-shun> ([l hq; qahal], [hd[ɛ`edhah]).

1. TERMS EMPLOYED:

These two words rendered by “congregation” or “assembly” are used apparently without any difference of sense. They appear to include an assembly of the whole people or any section that might be present on a given occasion. Indeed, sometimes the idea appears to correspond closely to that conveyed by “horde,” or even by “crowd.” *`Edhah* is once used of bees (^{<0748>}Judges 14:8). It has been sought to distinguish the two words by means of ^{<0413>}Leviticus 4:13, “if the whole *`edhah* of Israel err, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the qahal.” The *qahal* would then be the smaller body representing the whole *`edhah*, but the general usage is not favorable to this view (compare e.g. ^{<0229>}Exodus 12:19, “cutting off from the *`edhah* of Israel,” with ^{<0420>}Numbers 19:20, “cutting off from the *qahal*”). The idea denoted by these words is said by Wellhausen to be “foreign to Hebrew antiquity,” though it “runs through the Priestly Code from beginning to end” (Prolegomena 78). Yet it is Deuteronomy that presents us with laws excluding certain classes from the *qahal*, and the word is also found in ^{<0416>}Genesis 49:6; ^{<0214>}Numbers 22:4 (the Revised Version (British and American) “multitude”); ^{<0852>}Deuteronomy 5:22; 9:10; 31:30; ^{<0885>}Joshua 8:35; ^{<0747>}1 Samuel 17:47; ^{<1084>}1 Kings 8:14; ^{<3015>}Micah 2:5, and other early passages, while *`edhah* occurs in ^{<1120>}1 Kings 12:20 (see further, Eerdmans, *Das Buch Exodus*, 80 f). On the other hand taste and euphony appear to be responsible for the choice of one or other of the words in many cases. Thus the Chronicler uses *qahal* frequently, but *`edhah* only once (^{<1406>}2 Chronicles 5:6 = ^{<1085>}1 Kings 8:5).

2. LEGAL PROVISIONS:

Moses provided for the summoning of the congregation by trumpets (^{<Q102>}Numbers 10:2-8). For the sin offering to be brought if the whole congregation erred, see ^{<R113>}Leviticus 4:13-21.

^{<S201>}Deuteronomy 23:1-8 (in Hebrews 2 through 9) excludes bastards, Ammonites and Moabites from the assembly, even to the tenth generation, while Edomites and Egyptians were admitted in the third. Those who suffer from certain physical defects are also excluded.

3. OTHER TERMS:

One other word must be noted, [d[^{em}, mo`edh]. It occurs often in the phrase ‘ohel mo`edh (“tent of meeting”; see **TABERNACLE**). But in ^{<Q112>}Numbers 16:2 we find it used of certain princes who were “men of renown called to the assembly.”

For [tr^x[[}]atsereth], rendered by the Revised Version (British and American) “solemn assembly”, see **FEASTS**. On [ar^q[ⁿⁱ miqra’], see **CONVOCATION**.

Harold M. Wiener

CONGREGATION, MOUNT OF

([d[^{em}Ar^{ha}har-mo`edh] ^{<S113>}Isaiah 14:13): The prophet has depicted the excitement caused in Sheol by the descent of the once mighty king of Babylon into the world of shades, and now himself points the contrast between the monarch’s former haughty boastings and his present weak and hopeless condition: “Thou saidst in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; and I will sit upon the mount of congregation, in the uttermost parts of the north.” Instead he is brought down “to the uttermost parts of the pit” (^{<S115>}Isaiah 14:15). By the “mount of congregation” (meeting or assembly) is evidently meant the fancied Olympus of the gods on some lofty northern height. The king vaunted that he would make his abode with the gods in heaven; now he is cast down to the depths of Sheol.

James Orr

CONIAH

<ko-ni'-a> ([~~W~~hynK; konyahu], “Jah is creating”): A form of the name Jehoiachin, found in ~~2022~~ Jeremiah 22:24,28; 37:1.

See JEHOIACHIN.

CONONIAH

kon-o-ni'a>.

See CONANIAH.

CONQUEROR

<kon'-ker-er>: Known only in the compound verb ([~~ὑ~~περνικῶ, μεν, hupernikomen], ~~8187~~ Romans 8:37): A usual meaning of the preposition in composition is “above all measure”; hence, “more than conquerors,” the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version. The comparison is to the completeness of the victory. Others may place their enemies in subjection; those here mentioned master not only their foes, but themselves. Others destroy their foes and their resources; while those who are “more than conquerors” convert foes into means of still farther promoting the interests for which they struggle (~~8188~~ Romans 3:3-5). Nor is the victory external and transient, but internal and permanent.

H. E. Jacobs

CONSCIENCE

<kon'-shens> ([~~ἡ~~ συνείδησις, he suneidesis]):

I. SEQUENT CONSCIENCE.

The aspect of conscience earliest noticed in literature and most frequently referred to at all times is what is called the Sequent Conscience — that is to say, it follows action.

1. Judicial:

This is judicial. No sooner is a decision formed than there ensues a judgment favorable or adverse, a sentence of guilty or not guilty. Conscience has often been compared to a court of law, in which there are

culprit, judge, witnesses and jury; but these are all in the subject's own breast, and are in fact himself.

2. Punitive:

It is punitive. In the individual's own breast are not only the figures of justice already mentioned, but the executioner as well; for, on the back of a sentence of condemnation or acquittal, there immediately follows the pain of a wounded or the satisfaction of an approving conscience; and of all human miseries or blisses this is the most poignant. Especially has the remorse of an evil conscience impressed the human imagination, in such instances as Cain and Judas, Saul and Herod; and the poets, those knowers of human nature, have found their most moving themes in the delineation of this aspect of human experience. The ancient poets represented the terrors of conscience under the guise of the Erinyes or Furies, who, with swift, silent, unswerving footstep, tracked the criminal and pulled him down, while Shakespeare, in such dramas as Macbeth and Richard the Third, has burned the same lessons into the imagination of all readers of his works. The satisfaction of a good conscience may stamp itself on the habitual serenity of one face, and the accusations of an evil conscience may impart a hunted and sinister expression to another (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 17:11).

3. Predictive:

It is predictive. There is no instinct in the soul of man more august than the anticipation of something after death — of a tribunal at which the whole of life will be revised and retribution awarded with perfect justice according to the deeds done in the body. It is this which imparts to death its solemnity; we instinctively know that we are going to our account. And such great natural instincts cannot be false.

4. Social:

It is social. Not only does a man's own conscience pass sentence on his conduct, but the consciences of others pass sentence on it too; and to this may be due a great intensification of the consequent sensations. Thus, a crime may lie hidden in the memory, and the pain of its guilt may be assuaged by the action of time, when suddenly and unexpectedly it is found out and exposed to the knowledge of all; and, only when the force of the public conscience breaks forth on the culprit, driving him from society, does he feel his guilt in all its magnitude. The "Day of Judgment" (which

see), as it is represented in Scripture, is an application of this principle on a vast scale; for there the character and conduct of everyone will be submitted to the conscience of all. On the other hand, a friend may be to a man a second conscience, by which his own conscience is kept alive and alert; and this approval from without may, in some cases, be, even more than the judgment within, an encouragement to everything that is good or a protection against temptation.

II. ANTECEDENT CONSCIENCE.

From the Sequent is distinguished the Antecedent Conscience, which designates a function of this faculty preceding moral decision or action. When the will stands at the parting of the ways, seeing clearly before it the right course and the wrong, conscience commands to strike into the one and forbids to choose the other. This is its imperative; and — to employ the language of Kant — it is a categorical imperative. What conscience commands may be apparently against our interests, and it may be completely contrary to our inclinations; it may be opposed to the advice of friends or to the solicitations of companions; it may contradict the decrees of principalities and powers or the voices of the multitude; yet conscience in no way withdraws or modifies its claim. We may fail to obey, giving way to passion or being overborne by the allurements of temptation; but we know that we ought to obey; it is our duty; and this is a sublime and sacred word. The great crises of life arise when conscience is issuing one command and self-interest or passion or authority another, and the question has to be decided which of the two is to be obeyed. The interpreters of human life have known how to make use of such moments, and many of the most memorable scenes in literature are of this nature; but the actual history of mankind has also been dignified with numerous instances in which confessors and martyrs, standing on the same ground, have faced death rather than contravene the dictates of the authority within; and there never passes an hour in which the eye of the All-seeing does not behold someone on earth putting aside the bribes or self-interest or the menaces of authority and paying tribute to conscience by doing the right and taking the consequences.

III. INTUITIONAL AND ASSOCIATIONAL THEORIES.

Up to this point there is little difficulty or difference of opinion; but now we come to a point at which very differing views emerge. It was remarked

above, that when anyone stands at the parting of the ways, seeing clearly the right course and the wrong, conscience imperatively commands him which to choose and which to avoid; but how does anyone know which of the two alternatives is the right and which the wrong? Does conscience still suffice here, or is he dependent on another faculty? Here the Intuitional and the Associational, or — speaking broadly — the Scotch and the English, the German and the French schools of ethics diverge, those on the one side holding that conscience has still essential guidance to give, while those on the other maintain that the guidance must now be undertaken by other faculties. The Sensational or Experimental school holds that we are dependent on the authority of society or on our own estimate of the consequences of actions, while the opposite school teaches that in the conscience there is a clear revelation of certain moral laws, approving certain principles of action and disapproving others. The strong point of the former view is the diversity which has existed among human beings in different ages and in different latitudes as to what is right and what is wrong. What was virtuous in Athens might be sinful in Jerusalem; what is admired as heroism in Japan may be despised as fool-hardiness in Britain. To this it may be replied, first, that the diversity has been greatly exaggerated; the unanimity of the human conscience under all skies being greater than is allowed by philosophers of this school. “Let any plain, honest man,” says Butler, “before he engages in any course of action, ask himself, Is this I am going about right, or is it wrong? Is it good, or is it evil? and I do not in the least doubt but that this question will be answered agreeably to truth and virtue by almost any fair man in almost any circumstances.” Then, there are many moral judgments supposed to be immediate verdicts of conscience which are really logical inferences from the utterances of this faculty and are liable to all the fallacies by which reasoning in any department of human affairs is beset. It is only for the major premise, not for the conclusion, that conscience is responsible. The strong point of the Intuitional school, on the other hand, is the power and right of the individual to break away from the habits of society, and, in defiance of the commands of authority or the voices of the multitude, to follow a course of his own. When he does so, is it a logical conclusion as to the consequences of action he is obeying, or a higher intuition? When, for example, Christianity announced the sinfulness of fornication in opposition to the laxity of Greece and Rome, was it an argument about consequences with which she operated successfully, or an instinct of purity which she divined at the back of the actions and opinions of heathendom?

The lettering of the moral law may have to be picked out and cleansed from the accumulations of time, but the inscription is there all the same.

IV. THE EDUCATION OF CONSCIENCE.

It may be, however, that a more exact analysis of the antecedent conscience is requisite. Between the categorical imperative, which commands to choose the right path and avoid the wrong, and the indicative, which declares that this is the right way and that the wrong, there ought perhaps to be assumed a certainty that one of the alternative ways is right and must be pursued at all hazards, while the other is wrong and must be abandoned at whatever cost. This perception, that moral distinctions exist, separate from each other as heaven and hell, is the peculiarity of conscience; but it does not exclude the necessity for taking time to ascertain, in every instance, which of the alternatives has the one character and which the other, or for employing a great variety of knowledge to make this sure. Those who would limit conscience to the faculty which utters the major premises of moral reasoning are wont to hold that it can never err and does not admit of being educated; but such a use of the term is too remote from common usage, and there must be room left for the conscience to enlighten itself by making acquaintance with such objective standards as the character of God, the example of Christ, and the teaching of Scripture, as well as with the maxims of the wise and the experience of the good.

Another question of great interest about the conscience is, whether it involves an intuition of God. When it is suffering the pain of remorse, who is it that inflicts the punishment? Is it only the conscience itself? Or is man, in such experiences aware of the existence of a Being outside of and above himself? When the will is about to act, it receives the command to choose the right and refuse the wrong; but who issues this command? Is it only itself, or does the imperative come with a sanction and solemnity betokening a higher origin? Conscience is an intuition of moral law — the reading, so to speak, of a luminous writing, which hangs out there, on the bosom of Nature — but who penned that writing? It used to be thought that the word Conscience implied, in its very structure, a reference to God, meaning literally, “knowledge along with another,” the other being God. Though this derivation be uncertain, many think that it exactly expresses the truth. There are few people with an ethical experience of any depth who have not sometimes been overwhelmingly conscious of the approval

or disapproval of an unseen Being; and, if there be any trustworthy argument for the existence of a Deity, prior to supernatural revelation, this is where it is to be found.

V. HISTORY AND LITERATURE.

Only a few indications of history can be given here.

1. Earlier Views:

The conscience, at least the sequent conscience, was identified in the ancient world, and the rise of a doctrine on the subject belongs to the period when the human mind, being shut out from public activity through political changes, was thrown back upon itself and began to watch closely its own symptoms. The word has a specially prominent place in the philosophical writings of Cicero. Strange to say, it does not occur in the Old Testament; but, though not the name, the thing appears there frequently enough. On the very first page of revelation, the voice of God is heard calling among the trees of the garden (~~<0088>~~Genesis 3:8); and, in the very next incident, the blood of Abel cries out to heaven from the ground (~~<0040>~~Genesis 4:10). In the New Testament the word occurs with tolerable frequency, especially in the speeches (~~<4246>~~Acts 24:16, etc.) and writings of Paul (~~<825>~~Romans 2:15; 9:1; 13:5; ~~<4107>~~1 Corinthians 6:7-12, etc.); and this might have been expected to secure for it a prominent place in the doctrine of the church. But this did not immediately take effect, although Chrysostom already speaks of Conscience and Nature as two books in which the human mind can read of God, previous to supernatural revelation. In the Middle Ages the conscience received from two sources so much stimulation that both thing and name were certain to come into greater prominence in the speculations of the schools. The one of these influences was the rise of Monasticism, which, driving human beings into solitude, made the movements of their own minds the objects of everlasting study to themselves; and the other was the practice of auricular confession, which became, especially to many of the inmates of the houses of religion, the most interesting business of life; because, in order to meet the confessor, they scanned every thought and weighed every scruple, becoming adepts at introspection and self-discipline. Thus it came to pass that ethics took the form of Cases of Conscience, the priest having to train himself, or to be trained by professors and through books, to be able to answer every query submitted to him in the confessional. The ripest fruit of

this method appears in the Summa of Aquinas, who discusses elaborately the doctrine of conscience, dividing it into two parts — synderesis (from [συντήρησις, *sunteresis*]) and conscientia — the one of which supplies the major premises and cannot err, while the other draws the inferences therefrom and is liable to make mistakes. The Mystics identified the synderesis as the point in the spirit of man at which it can be brought into contact and connection with the Spirit of God.

2. Reformation and After:

At the Reformation the conscience was much in the mouths of men, both because the terrors of conscience formed a preparation for comprehending justification by faith and because, in appearing before principalities and powers in vindication of their action, the Reformers took their stand on conscience, as Luther did so memorably at the Diet of Worms; and the assertion of the rights of conscience has ever since been a conspicuous testimony of Protestantism; whereas Romanists, especially as represented by the Jesuits, have treated the conscience as a feeble and ignorant thing, requiring to be led by authority — that is, by themselves. The forms of medievalism long clung even to Protestant literature on this subject. It may not be surprising to find a High Churchman like Jeremy Taylor, in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, discussing ethics as a system of cases of conscience, but it is curious to find a Puritan like Baxter (in his *Christian Directory*), and a Scottish Presbyterian like David Dickson (in his *Therapeutica Sacra*) doing the same. Deism in England and the Enlightenment in Germany magnified the conscience, to which they ascribed such a power of revealing God as made any further revelation unnecessary; but the practical effect was a secularization and vulgarization of the general mind; and it was against these rather than the system which had produced them that Butler in England and Kant in Germany had to raise the standard of a spiritual view of life. The former said of the conscience that, if it had power as it had right, it would absolutely govern the world; and Kant's sublime saying is well known, at the close of his great work on Ethics: "Two things fill the soul with ever new and growing wonder and reverence, the oftener and the longer reflection continues to occupy itself with them — the starry heavens above and the moral law within." The rise of an Associational and Developmental Philosophy in England, represented by such powerful thinkers as the Mills, father and son, Professor Bain and Herbert Spencer, tended to dissipate the halo surrounding the conscience, by representing it as merely an emotional equivalent for the authority of law and the claims of

custom, so stamped on the mind by the experience of generations that, its earthly source forgotten, it came to be attributed to supernatural powers. But this school was antagonized with success by such thinkers as Martineau and T. H. Green. R. Rothe regarded conscience as a term too popular and of too variable signification to be of much use in philosophical speculation; but most of the great succession of writers on Christian ethics who followed him have treated it seriously; Dörner especially recognizing its importance, and Newman Smyth bestowing on it a thoroughly modern treatment. Among German works on the subject that of Gass, which contains an appendix on the history of the term *synderesis*, is deserving of special attention; that by Kahler is unfinished, as is also the work in English by Robertson; *The Christian Conscience* by Davison is slight and popular. Weighty discussions will be found in two books on Moral Philosophy — the *Handbook of Calderwood*, and the *Ethics of Mezes*. But there is abundance of room for a great monograph on the subject, which would treat conscience in a comprehensive manner as the subjective standard of conduct, formed by progressive familiarity with the objective standards as well as by practice in accordance with its own authority and with the will of God.

James Stalker

CONSECRATE; CONSECRATION

<kon'-se-krat>, <kon-se-kra'-shun>.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the Old Testament for several Hebrew words of different meanings:

(1) [*ṣḥḥ*, *charam*]: “I will consecrate (the Revised Version (British and American) “devote”) their gain unto the Lord,” i.e. the spoil of the nations shall be dedicated to the service of Yahweh (^{<ṣḥḥ>} Micah 4:13).

See *BAN*; *CURSE*.

(2) [*ṣḥḥ*, *nazar*], [*ṣḥḥ*, *nezer*] (^{<ṣḥḥ>} Numbers 6:7,9,12; the Revised Version (British and American) “separate”).

See *NAZIRITE*.

(3) [*qḏḥ*; *qadhesh*]: “to be set apart,” or “to be holy”: of Aaron and his sons (^{<qḏḥ>} Exodus 28:3; 30:30; the Revised Version (British and American)

“sanctify”). The silver and gold and brass and iron of the banned city of Jericho are “consecrated” things (the Revised Version (British and American) “holy”) unto the Lord (^{<0659>}Joshua 6:19); of the priests (^{<4058>}2 Chronicles 26:18); of sacrifices (^{<4033>}2 Chronicles 29:33; 31:6; ^{<4075>}Ezra 3:5).

See HOLINESS.

(4) [^{<0299>}**dyæLmj** *mille' yadh*], literally, “to fill the hand”; and substantive plural [^{<0299>}**µyaLmj** *millu'im*], a peculiar idiom used frequently and generally for the installation of a priest into his office; and substantive for the installation offerings which were probably put into the priest's hands to symbolize his admission into office; hence, the phrase, “and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons” (^{<0299>}Exodus 29:9; so 28:41; 29:29:33,15; 32:29; ^{<0883>}Leviticus 8:33; 16:32; 21:10; ^{<0883>}Numbers 3:3; ^{<0775>}Judges 17:5,12; ^{<4038>}2 Chronicles 29:31); of Jeroboam's non-Levitical priesthood (^{<1133>}1 Kings 13:33; ^{<4139>}2 Chronicles 13:9); of the altar (^{<3593>}Ezekiel 43:26) and of those who contributed to build the temple (^{<1395>}1 Chronicles 29:5). Subst. of an act of installation (^{<0873>}Leviticus 7:37; 8:33), and of installation offerings (^{<0292>}Exodus 29:22,26,27,31; ^{<0882>}Leviticus 8:22,28,29,31).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In the New Testament [^{<0710>}**τελειόω**, *teleioo*], “to make perfect” (^{<3078>}Hebrews 7:28; the Revised Version (British and American) “perfected”); [^{<0801>}**ἐγκαινίζω**, *egkainizo*], “to make new” (^{<3010>}Hebrews 10:20; the Revised Version (British and American) “dedicated”).

T. Rees

CONSENT

^{<kon-sent>}: The verb implies compliance with the guidance and direction of another, and, therefore, a secondary and subordinate relation of approval, sympathy and concurrence on the part of the one who consents. He does not take the initiative, but yields to what the principal proposes. The phrase [^{<0175>}**ἐκ συμφόνου**, *ek sumphonou*], “by consent,” means “by mutual agreement” (^{<0175>}1 Corinthians 7:5), both parties concerned being placed on an equality. “With one consent” (^{<3089>}Zephaniah 3:9, Hebrew “with one shoulder”; ^{<0148>}Luke 14:18) suggests, although it does not necessarily imply, the result of deliberation and consultation; it may have no other force than that of unanimity.

CONSIDER

<*kon-sid'-er*>: In the New Testament the force of the word is brought out most vividly in ^{<406>}Matthew 6:26 ([*καταμανθάνω*, *katamanthano*]), where it means to “examine closely,” as though the observer had to bend down for this purpose, and in ^{<2127>}Luke 12:27; ^{<9104>}Hebrews 10:24 (*katanoeo*, to “observe well”), while in ^{<9107>}Hebrews 13:7 the *anatheoreo*, “look up toward” or “look again at” is consistent with the reverential regard commended in the context. Used in the Old Testament for a variety of Hebrew terms, signifying inspecting (^{<2116>}Proverbs 31:16), examining (^{<9113>}Leviticus 13:13), giving serious thoughts to (^{<9715>}Psalms 77:5 ; ^{<2108>}Isaiah 1:3), it often means little more than “see” or “behold” (^{<9108>}Psalms 8:3; 9:13).

H. E. Jacobs

CONSIST

<*kon-sist'*> ([*συνίστημι*, *sunistemi*): To stand together, exist, subsist (^{<5107>}Colossians 1:17, “in him all things consist,” i.e. the continuance of the universe is dependent upon His support and administration). In ^{<2125>}Luke 12:15, it translates the verb [*εἰμί*, *eimi*], “to be,” to express the thought that wealth is only an accident, not an essential to the highest ideal of life.

CONSOLATION

<*kon-so-la'-shun*> ([*παράκλησις*, *paraklesis*): “Consolation of Israel” (^{<4125>}Luke 2:25), refers to the fulfillment of the promises in ^{<2101>}Isaiah 40:1 ff. *See* COMFORT. “Son of consolation” (^{<4065>}Acts 4:36 the King James Version and the American Revised Version, margin).

See **BARNABAS**.

CONSORT

<*kon-sort'*> ([*προσκληρόω*, *proskleroo*], “to allot,” ^{<4170>}Acts 17:4). The verb may be either in the middle or passive voice. the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version, and Luther’s German translation regard it as middle, and render it: “cast their lots with,” “associated,” “united with.” In advocacy of the passive, see Alford’s Greek Testament, proposing: “were added,” as if by lot, the allotment eing

determined by God who gave them the Holy Spirit directing their choice. The English has the Latin for “lot” as its base.

CONSPIRACY

<kon-spir'-a-si>.

See *CONFEDERACY*.

CONSTANT; CONSTANTLY

<kon'-stant>, <kon'-stant-li>: In 1 Chronicles 28 (*chazaq*) meaning “firm,” “strong.” In ^{<1913>}Proverbs 21:28 the adverb (“constantly”) of the King James Version is replaced in the American Standard Revised Version by “shall speak so as to endure,” the English Revised Version “unchallenged.” the Revised Version (British and American) gives “confidently” for the King James Version “constantly” in ^{<4125>}Acts 12:15; ^{<4118>}Titus 3:8.

CONSTELLATIONS

<kon-ste-la'-shuns> ([^μyl jysK] *kecilim*), literally, “Orions”).

See *ASTRONOMY, II, 11*.

CONSTRAIN

<kon-stran'>: Generally in the sense of pressing urgently (^{<1248>}2 Kings 4:8; ^{<1249>}Luke 24:29; ^{<4165>}Acts 16:15), to impel or carry away (^{<1754>}2 Corinthians 5:14); sometimes to be compelled of necessity (^{<1828>}Job 32:18; ^{<4389>}Acts 28:19; compare ^{<4162>}Galatians 6:12).

See *COMPEL*.

CONSULT

<kon-sult'> ([l aæ sha'al], [Ël æ malakh], [6[^{ye}ya`ats] (Aramaic) [f[^{ye}ye`aT]; [^{συμβουλευόμεναι}, *sumbouleuomai*]):

(1) “To ask,” “inquire,” “seek advice.” Ezekiel speaks of the king of Babylonian consulting the teraphim (^{<1721>}Ezekiel 21:21) and the Israelites were admonished to have noting to do with “a consulter with a familiar spirit” (^{<1511>}Deuteronomy 18:11).

See *ASTROLOGY; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS; DIVINATION.*

(2) “To take counsel,” “devise,” “plan.” The various officials of Babylon “consulted together to establish a royal statute” (^{<2017>}Daniel 6:7; compare ^{<0104>}Matthew 26:4).

(3) “To deliberate with one’s self,” “make up one’s mind.” Nehemiah consulted with himself as to what might be done for Jerusalem (^{<1017>}Nehemiah 5:7). Jesus spoke of a king “consulting” (the King James Version) whether he be able to wage a war (^{<0141>}Luke 14:31; the Revised Version (British and American) “take counsel”).

A. W. Fortune

CONSUME

^{<kon-sum>} ([l kæ akhal], [hl k; kalah], [ʁmæ tamam]; [ἀναλίσκω, *analisko*]): In Old Testament ‘*akhal*’ (“to eat,” “devour”) occurs very frequently, and is translated “consumed” (^{<0344>}Genesis 31:40; ^{<0147>}Exodus 15:7; ^{<0765>}Psalms 78:63, etc.); *kalah* (“to finish”) is also frequently translated “consume,” “consumed” (^{<0443>}Genesis 41:30; ^{<0220>}Exodus 32:10; ^{<0513>}Psalms 59:13, etc.); *tamam*, “to be perfect,” “finished” (^{<0473>}Numbers 17:13; ^{<0115>}Deuteronomy 2:15; ^{<0739>}Psalms 73:19, etc.). There are many other words translated “consume” and “consumed,” e.g. *cuph*, “to end” (^{<0413>}Jeremiah 8:13; ^{<2004>}Daniel 1:44; ^{<0102>}Zephaniah 1:2,3); *balah*, “to fade,” “wear away” (^{<0133>}Job 13:28; ^{<0404>}Psalms 49:14); *gagal*, implying violence (^{<0219>}Job 24:19); *caphah*, “to end” (^{<0195>}Genesis 19:15,17; ^{<0220>}Isaiah 7:20, etc.); *ashesh*, “to be old” (^{<0107>}Psalms 6:7; 31:9,10 the King James Version); *maqaq*, “to become completed” (^{<0417>}Ezekiel 4:17; ^{<0342>}Zechariah 14:12 *bis*); *asah kalah* is rendered “utterly consume” (^{<1018>}Nehemiah 9:31); *analisko*, “to use up,” occurs in ^{<0154>}Luke 9:54; ^{<0155>}Galatians 5:15; ^{<0118>}2 Thessalonians 2:8 (the King James Version); *dapanao*, “to spend,” is translated “consume” in ^{<0103>}James 4:3 (the Revised Version (British and American) “spend”); *katanalisko*, “to consume utterly,” occurs only in ^{<0129>}Hebrews 12:29; “for our God is a consuming fire.”

In the Revised Version (British and American) “devour,” “devoured” are several times substituted for “consume,” “consumed,” e.g. ^{<0126>}Job 20:26; ^{<0427>}Jeremiah 49:27; ^{<0155>}Numbers 16:35; “boil well” (^{<0340>}Ezekiel 24:10); for “be consumed with dying” (^{<0473>}Numbers 17:13), “perish all of us”; “consume” is substituted for “corrupt” in ^{<0119>}Matthew 6:19; “my spirit is consumed,” for “my breath is corrupt” (^{<0171>}Job 17:1); instead of “the flame consumeth the chaff” (^{<0124>}Isaiah 5:24) we have “as the dry grass sinketh

down in the flame”; and for “whom the Lord shall consume” (^{<3018>}2 Thessalonians 2:8), the Revised Version (British and American) reads (after a different text) “whom the Lord Jesus shall slay,” “consume” in the American Revised Version, margin.

W. L. Walker

CONSUMMATION

^{<kon-su-ma'-shun>} ([[^]/yLKⁱ killayon] from [^hl K; kalah]): The word, meaning destruction, completion, or failing (^{<3013>}Isaiah 10:23; 28:22; ^{<2927>}Daniel 9:27) is translated interchangeably in the King James Version for another Hebrew word referring to a physical disease, and best translated “consumption”; compare ^{<3316>}Leviticus 26:16; ^{<3322>}Deuteronomy 28:22. Not used in the Revised Version (British and American). The Hebrew variously but more accurately translated “full end”; compare ^{<2927>}Daniel 9:27; ^{<3013>}Isaiah 10:23; and “destruction”; compare ^{<3012>}Isaiah 10:22; 28:22. There seems therefore to be an inconsistency on the part of both the Authorized and Revised translations.

Walter G. Clippinger

CONSUMPTION

^{<kon-sump'-shun>} ([^{tpj} va^sshachepheth], “wasting away”): One of the punishments which was to follow neglect or breach of the law. It may mean pulmonary consumption, which occurs frequently in Palestine; but from its association with fever in the texts, ^{<3316>}Leviticus 26:16; ^{<3322>}Deuteronomy 28:22, it is more likely to be the much more common condition of wasting and emaciation from prolonged or often recurring attacks of malarial fever.

CONTAIN

^{<kon-tan'>}.

See CONTINENCY.

CONTEND; CONTENTION

^{<kon-tend'>}, ^{<kon-ten'-shun>}: The meeting of effort by effort, striving against opposition; sometimes physically, as in battle (^{<3119>}Deuteronomy 2:9), or with horses (^{<2415>}Jeremiah 12:5), sometimes orally (^{<1315>}Nehemiah

13:11), sometimes spiritually (^{<25716>}Isaiah 57:16). In the New Testament [**διακρίνειν**, *diakrinein*], for the hostile separation of one from another, dispute (^{<6100>}Jude 1:9), or [**ἐπαγωνίζομαι**, *epagonizomai*] (^{<6100>}Jude 1:3), descriptive of the strain to which a contestant is put. The noun is almost universally used with an unfavorable meaning, and as worthy of condemnation, for an altercation arising from a quarrelsome disposition. “By pride cometh only contention” (^{<21310>}Proverbs 13:10). The contentions at Corinth (^{<4011>}1 Corinthians 1:11) called forth the rebukes of Paul. Where used in the King James Version in a good sense (^{<5012>}1 Thessalonians 2:2) the Revised Version (British and American) has “conflict.” In ^{<4159>}Acts 15:39, the noun has a peculiar force, where English Versions of the Bible translates *paroxysmos* (whence English “paroxysm”) by “sharp contention.” The Greek word refers rather to the inner excitement and irritation than to its outward expression.

H. E. Jacobs

CONTENT; CONTENTMENT

<kon-tent'>, <kon-tent'-ment> ([^{<1>} **קָנָה**, *qanah*]; [**ἀρκέω**, *arkeo*]): To be free from care because of satisfaction with what is already one's own. The Hebrew means simply “to be pleased.” The Greek brings out the full force of the word in ^{<5018>}1 Timothy 6:8; ^{<8135>}Hebrews 13:5. Contentment (^{<5016>}1 Timothy 6:6) is more inward than satisfaction; the former is a habit or permanent state of mind, the latter has to do with some particular occurrence or object.

CONTINENCY

<kon'-ti-nen-si> ([**ἐγκρατεύομαι**, *egkrateuomai*] “to have self-control” or “continency” the Revised Version (British and American), “to contain” the King James Version): Paul, although he would that all men were like himself unmarried, yet advises that they should marry if they cannot control their sexual passions, and hold them in complete subjection to Christian motives (^{<4100>}1 Corinthians 7:9). The same Greek verb is used in ^{<4105>}1 Corinthians 9:25, and translated “is temperate” (the King James Version and the English Revised Version) of the athlete who during the period of training abstains from all indulgence in food, ‘drink, and sexual passion. For the general principle as expressed in substantive *egkrateia* (^{<4025>}Acts 24:25; ^{<4123>}Galatians 5:23; ^{<5006>}2 Peter 1:6) and adjective *egkrates* (^{<5008>}Titus 1:8) *see* TEMPERANCE, TEMPERATE.

CONTINUAL; CONTINUALLY

<kon-tin'-u-al>, <kon-tin'-u-a-li>: Without cessation, although there may be intervals between its presence; that which regularly recurs throughout a period, as ^{<Q263>}Luke 24:53: “(They) were continually in the temple”; “lest ... by her continual coming” (^{<Q285>}Luke 18:5). In Old Testament for Hebrew *tadhir*, “pursue,” as one drop of rain follows another in swift succession, but more frequently by *tamidh* for offerings repeated at intervals, as ^{<Q292>}Exodus 29:42; occasionally the Hebrew has the phrase literally meaning “all the day” (*kol ha-yom*), as ^{<Q065>}Genesis 6:5. In the New Testament most frequently for *dia pantos*, “through all” (“always” ^{<Q380>}Matthew 18:10; ^{<S1315>}Hebrews 13:15), “sometimes,” *adialeptos*, “incessantly” (^{<S102>}Romans 9:2 the King James Version) and *dienekes*, “continuously” (^{<S1078>}Hebrews 7:3).

H. E. Jacobs

CONTINUANCE

<kon-tin'-u-ans>: Not in the Revised Version (British and American); in ^{<Q916>}Psalms 139:16 the King James Version, as an interpretation of Hebrew *yamim*, “days,” treating of God’s prevision, where the Revised Version (British and American) has: “They were all written, even the days that were ordained for me,” i.e. all my days were in view, before one of them actually existed. In ^{<S1415>}Isaiah 64:5 the King James Version, for *`olam*, “of long time,” the Revised Version (British and American); in ^{<S107>}Romans 2:7, for *hupomone*, “patience,” the Revised Version (British and American), or still better, “steadfastness,” the Revised Version, margin.

CONTRADICTION

<kon-tra-dik'-shun>: the King James Version for [*ἀντιλογία*, *antilogia*] (^{<S1078>}Hebrews 7:7; 12:3). In the former passage, the Revised Version (British and American) has “without any dispute,” i.e. what has been said requires no argument; in the latter “gainsaying” which is scarcely an improvement, the reference being to the oral attacks upon the words and character of Jesus.

CONTRARY

<kon'-tra-ri> ([**yr̥q**, *qeri*]; [**ἐναντίος**, *enantios*]): In the Old Testament it has the sense of antagonistic, as one person opposed or hostile to the other, especially in ^{<132>}Leviticus 26:21,23,14,27,28,40,41, where Yahweh declares His attitude toward the people in such phrases as: "If ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto you in wrath."

In the New Testament it has a more varied significance and is applied to both material and human relations as simply opposite, set over against an object or thing. Used of the wind as in ^{<104>}Matthew 14:24; ^{<168>}Mark 6:48; ^{<27>}Acts 27:4, where it is spoken of as contrary. Refers also to conflicting doctrines, customs or beliefs, as ^{<10>}1 Timothy 1:10, "and if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine." Several other Greek words are translated with almost an identical meaning. Occasionally a prefix gives a slightly different shade of meaning.

Walter G. Clippinger

CONTRIBUTION

<kon-tri-bu'-shun> ([**κοινωνία**, *koinonia*], "communion" or "fellowship," ^{<53>}Romans 15:26; ^{<103>}2 Corinthians 9:13): The meaning "contribution" is drawn from the context, rather than from the Greek word. The phrase in the passage cited, literally rendered, would be "to exercise" or "put fellowship into activity." The *koinonia* subsisting among believers because of their inner communion with Christ places them and their gifts and possessions at the service of one another (*see COMMUNION*). They are enjoined not to forget to communicate (^{<36>}Hebrews 13:16). To be "communicative" (*koinonikoi*) is to be a habit of their lives, the Christian principle being that of the holding of all property as a trust, to be distributed as there is need (^{<14>}Acts 2:44 f; ^{<14>}2 Corinthians 8:14 f). The first occasion for calling this fellowship into activity, by way of "contributions," was within the church at Jerusalem and for its needy members (*see COMMUNITY OR GOODS*). The second occasion was repeatedly from the infant Gentile churches for the poor within the same church (^{<12>}Acts 11:29; ^{<53>}Romans 15:26; ^{<100>}2 Corinthians 8:1-4; 9:2); the fellowship thus widening from intra-congregational to general church benevolence. These contributions were gathered weekly (^{<12>}1 Corinthians 16:2 f), were proportioned to the means of the givers (^{<12>}Acts 11:29;

<6112>1 Corinthians 16:2), were not exacted or prescribed, in a legalistic manner, but were called forth as the free-will offerings of grateful hearts (<4187>2 Corinthians 8:7), springing from the community spirit, and were sent to their destination by accredited representatives of the congregations (<6113>1 Corinthians 16:3; <4113>Acts 11:30).

H. E. Jacobs

CONTRITE; CONTRITION

<kon'-trit>, <kontrish'-un> ([aKD, dakka'], "bruise"): Only in Old Testament (<1948>Psalm 34:18; <1517>Psalm 51:17; <2575>Isaiah 57:15); [hkə, nakkeh], "smitten" (<3612>Isaiah 66:2). Contrite, "crushed," is only the superlative of "broken"; "a contrite heart" is "a heart broken to pieces." In Holy Scripture, the heart is the seat of all feeling, whether joy or sorrow. A contrite heart is one in which the natural pride and self-sufficiency have been completely humbled by the consciousness of guilt. The theological term "contrition" designates more than is found in these passages. It refers to the grief experienced as a consequence of the revelation of sin made by the preaching of the law (<3239>Jeremiah 23:29). The Augsburg Confession (Article XII) analyzes repentance into two parts: "Contrition and faith," the one the fruit of the preaching of the law, the other of the gospel. While contrition has its degrees, and is not equal in all persons, the promise of forgiveness is not dependent upon the degree of contrition, but solely upon the merit of Christ. It is not simply a precondition of faith, but, as hatred of sin, combined with the purpose, by God's aid, to overcome it, grows with faith.

H.E. Jacobs

CONTROVERSY

<kon'-tro-ver-si> ([byri ribh], "strife," "contention"; [ὁμολογουμένως, homologoumenos], "confessedly," "without controversy"): Used frequently of disputes among men (as <1578>Deuteronomy 17:8) and then transferred to the justice of God as directed against the sins of men. Thus we read of Yahweh's controversy with the nations (<2531>Jeremiah 25:31); with the inhabitants of the land (<2948>Hosea 4:1); with His people (<3312>Micah 6:2). "Without controversy" (<5416>1 Timothy 3:16), a positive rather than a negative expression, "by common consent," or better, "as unanimously confessed," introducing a quotation from a hymn or rhythmical confession of the early church.

CONVENIENT

<kon-ven'-yent>: In the Revised Version (British and American) limited to translation of [καιρός, *kairos*], “suitable time,” “season,” and its compounds: “that which is seasonable” or “opportune” (Mark 6:21; Acts 24:25). the King James Version is replaced, in Proverbs 30:8 the Revised Version (British and American), by “needful” (Hebrew *choq*), “feed me with the food that is needful for me”; Jeremiah 40:4, by “right”; Ephesians 5:4, by “befitting”; in Romans 1:28, by “fitting,” and in 1 Corinthians 16:12, by “opportunity.”

CONVENT

<kon-vent'>: Found in the King James Version margin of Jeremiah 49:19: “Who will convent me in judgment?” and in Jeremiah 50:44: “Who will convent me to plead?” The Hebrew term which is rendered convent is *ya`adh*, and it means to summon to a court, to call on to plead. Convent is obsolete, but it was formerly used, and meant to summon, or to call before a judge. Shakespeare used it several times. In *King Henry VIII*, Act V, he said, “The lords of the council hath commanded that the archbishop be converted to the council board.”

CONVERSANT

<kon-vur'-sant> ([*ἔλβε* *halakh*], “to go on,” “to walk”): This word is translated “conversant” in Joshua 8:35 the King James Version (margin “walked”), and 1 Samuel 25:15 the King James Version meaning “going along with them;” the American Standard Revised Version “went.”

CONVERSATION

<kon-ver-sa'-shun> ([*ἀναστροφή*, *anastrophe*], [*ὁμιλία*, *homilia*]): This word is another illustration of the changes which time makes in a living language. The modern sense of the term is mutual talk, colloquy, but in the King James Version it never means that, but always behavior, conduct. This broader meaning, at a time not much later than the date of the King James Version, began to yield to the special, limited one of today, perhaps, as has been suggested, because speech forms so large a part of conduct. The New Testament words for “converse” in the modern sense are *homileo* (Luke 24:14,15; Acts 20:11) and *sunomileo* (Acts 10:27).

(1) In the Old Testament the word used to indicate conduct is [ἔρD, *derekh*], “way” the course one travels (the King James Version ^{<8574>}Psalm 37:14; margin 50:23). It is the common Hebrew idea of conduct, possibly due, as Hatch thinks, to the fact that in Syria intercourse between village and village was so much on foot, with difficulty on stony tracks over the hills, and this is reflected in the metaphor.

(2) In the New Testament the idea of deportment is once rendered by *tropos*, “Let your conversation be without covetousness” (^{<8135>}Hebrews 13:5 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “be ye free from the love of money”; the Revised Version, margin “let your turn of mind be free”). But the usual Greek word is *anastrophe*, “a turning up and down,” possibly due to the fact, as Hatch again avers, that life in the bustling streets of Athens and Rome gave rise to the conception of life as quick motion to and fro. “Ye have heard of my conversation” (^{<8013>}Galatians 1:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “manner of life”). So also ^{<8022>}Ephesians 4:22; ^{<5042>}1 Timothy 4:12; ^{<8137>}Hebrews 13:7; “Let him show out of a good conversation” (^{<5083>}James 3:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “by his good life”); “vexed with the filthy conversation” (^{<6027>}2 Peter 2:7 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “lascivious life”); “holy conversation” (^{<6081>}2 Peter 3:11 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “holy living”); “Our conversation is in heaven” (^{<5080>}Philippians 3:20 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “citizenship” (which see)). See also in the Apocrypha (Tobit 4:14; 2 Macc 5:8).

The translations in the Revisions put a wholesome emphasis upon conduct, and eliminate the danger of much misunderstanding. See further Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*.

G. H. Trever

CONVERSION

<kon-vur'-shun>:

I. THE WORDS “CONVERSION,” “CONVERT,” IN BIBLICAL USAGE.

1. In the English Bible:

The noun “conversion” ([ἐπιστροφή, *epistrophe*]) occurs in only one passage in the Bible, “They passed through both Phoenicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles” (4153 Acts 15:3). Derived forms of the verb “convert” are used in the Revised Version (British and American) in 959 James 5:19, “convert,” “converteth” (5:20), “converted” (9513 Psalm 51:13, margin “return”), “converts” (2027 Isaiah 1:27, margin “they that return”). In other instances where the King James Version uses forms of the verb “convert” the Revised Version (British and American) employs “turn again” (2160 Isaiah 6:10; 222 Luke 22:32; 4189 Acts 3:19), or “turn” (2105 Isaiah 60:5; 1035 Matthew 13:15; 18:3; 4042 Mark 4:12; 624 John 12:40; 4827 Acts 28:27). In 9197 Psalm 19:7 the reading of the King James Version, “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul,” has been changed by the revisers into “restoring the soul.” The words commonly used in the English Bible as equivalent with the Hebrew and Greek terms are “turn,” “return,” “turn back,” “turn again” (compare 489 Deuteronomy 4:30; 257 Isaiah 55:7; 2482 Jeremiah 3:12 ff; 25:5; 35:15; 3821 Ezekiel 18:21-23; 33:11; 3017 Malachi 3:7). Thus “convert” is synonymous with “turn,” and “conversion” with “turning.”

2. In the Old Testament:

The principal Hebrew word is [bʷv, *shubh*]; other words are [hnp; *panah*], [Ēpæ, *haphakh*], [bbæ, *cabhabh*], in Hiphil. They are used

(1) in the literal sense, for instance, 1447 Genesis 14:7; 6716 Deuteronomy 17:16; 950 Psalm 56:9; 2308 Isaiah 38:8.

(2) In the later prophetic writings the verb [shubh] refers, both in the Qal and Hiphil forms, to the return from the captivity (2027 Isaiah 1:27; 224 Jeremiah 29:14; 30:3; 3653 Ezekiel 16:53; 3017 Zephaniah 2:7).

(3) In the figurative, ethical or religious sense

(a) from God (4443 Numbers 14:43; 951 1 Samuel 15:11; 1006 1 Kings 9:6);

(b) more frequently to turn back to God (^{<907>}1 Samuel 7:3; ^{<108>}1 Kings 8:33; ^{<392>}Isaiah 19:22; ^{<102>}Joel 2:12; ^{<104>}Amos 4:6 ff; ^{<361>}Hosea 6:11; 7:10).

3. In the New Testament:

The words used in the Septuagint and New Testament are [στρέφειν, *strephein*], and its compounds, [ἀπο, *apostr.*], [ἀνα, *anastr.*], [ἐπανα, *epanastr.*], [ὑπο, *hupostr.*], and especially [ἐπιστρέφειν, *epistrephein*]. The latter word occurs 39 times in the New Testament. It is used

- (1) in the literal sense in ^{<402>}Matthew 9:22; 10:13; 24:18; ^{<494>}Acts 9:40; 15:36, etc.;
- (2) in the figurative sense, in transitive form. (^{<116>}Luke 1:16 f; ^{<59>}James 5:19 f). In ^{<849>}Galatians 4:9 and ^{<102>}2 Peter 2:21 it denotes to turn from the right way to the wrong. The opposite meaning, to turn from the wrong way to the right, we find in ^{<222>}Luke 22:32; ^{<495>}Acts 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18; ^{<486>}2 Corinthians 3:16; ^{<109>}1 Thessalonians 1:9; ^{<102>}1 Peter 2:25. In connection with metanoein, “repent,” it is used in ^{<499>}Acts 3:19; 26:20. The root word *strephein* is used in the figurative sense in ^{<108>}Matthew 18:3; ^{<824>}John 12:40. Septuagint and Textus Receptus of the New Testament have here *epistrephein*.

II. THE DOCTRINE.

While the words “conversion” and “convert” do not occur frequently in our English Bible the teaching contained therein is fundamental in Christian doctrine. From the words themselves it is not possible to derive a clearly defined doctrine of conversion; the materials for the construction of the doctrine must be gathered from the tenor of Biblical teaching.

1. Vague Use of the Word:

There is a good deal of vagueness in the modern use of the term. By some writers it is used in “a very general way to stand for the whole series of manifestations just preceding, accompanying, and immediately following the apparent sudden changes of character involved” (E.D. Starbuck, *The Psychology of Religion*, 21). “`To be converted,’ `to be regenerated,’ `to receive grace,’ `to experience religion,’ `to gain an assurance,’ are so many phrases which denote the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self, hitherto divided and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior and happy in consequence of its

hold upon religious realities. This at least is what conversion signifies in general terms” (William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, 189). In this general, vague way the term is used not only by psychologists, but also by theological writers and in common religious parlance. A converted man is a Christian, a believer, a man who has religion, who has experienced regeneration.

2. Specific Meaning:

In its more restricted meaning the word denotes the action of man in the initial process of salvation as distinguished from the action of God. Justification and regeneration are purely Divine acts, repentance, faith, conversion are human acts although under the influence and by the power of the Divine agency. Thus, conversion denotes the human volition and act by which man in obedience to the Divine summons determines to change the course of his life and turns to God. Arrested by God’s call man stops to think, turns about and heads the opposite way. This presupposes that the previous course was not directed toward God but away from Him. The instances of conversion related in the Bible show that the objective point toward which man’s life was directed may be either the service of idols (~~2009~~ 1 Thessalonians 1:9) or a life of religious indifference, a self-centered life where material things engross the attention and deaden the sense of things spiritual (rich young ruler, ~~2002~~ Luke 18:22), or a life of sensuality, of open sin and shame (prodigal son, ~~2013~~ Luke 15:13) or even a mistaken way of serving God (Saul, ~~4009~~ Acts 26:9). Accordingly in conversion either the religious or the ethical element may predominate. The moral man who turns from self to God or, as Saul did, from an erroneous notion concerning God’s will to a clear conception of his relation to God is more conscious of the religious factor. Conversion brings him into vital, conscious fellowship with God through Jesus Christ. The immoral man who is awakened to a realization of the holiness of God, of the demands of His law, and of his own sin and guilt is more conscious of the outward change in his manner of life. The ethical change is the more outstanding fact in his experience, although it can never be separated from the religious experience of the changed relation to God.

3. Mode:

The mode of conversion Varies greatly according to the former course of life. It may be a sudden crisis in the moral and intellectual life. This is very frequently the case in the experience of heathen who turn from the worship

of idols to faith in Jesus Christ. A sudden crisis is frequently witnessed in the case of persons who, having lived a life of flagrant sin, renounce their former life. Conversion to them means a complete revolution in their thoughts, feelings and outward manner of life. In other instances conversion appears to be the climax of prolonged conflict for supremacy of divergent motives; and, again, it may be the goal of a gradual growth, the consummation of a process of discerning ever more clearly and yielding ever more definitely and thus experiencing ever more vitally truths which have been implanted and nurtured by Christian training. This process results in the conscious acceptance of Jesus Christ as the personal Saviour and in the consecration of life to His service. Thus conversion may be an instantaneous act, or a process which is more or less prolonged. The latter is more frequently seen in the case of children and young people who have grown up in Christian families and have received the benefit of Christian training. No conversions of this kind are recorded in the New Testament. This may be explained by the fact that most of our New Testament writings are addressed to the first generation of Christians, to men and women who were raised in Jewish legalism or heathen idolatry, and who turned to Christ after they had passed the age of adolescence. The religious life of their children as distinguished in its mode and manifestations from that of the adults does not appear to have been a matter of discussion or a source of perplexity so as to call forth specific instruction.

4. Conversion and Psychology:

Conversion comprises the characteristics both of repentance and of faith. Repentance is conversion viewed from its starting-point, the turning from the former life; faith indicates the objective point of conversion, the turning to God.

Of late the psychology of conversion has been carefully studied and elaborately treated by psychologists. Much valuable material has been gathered. It is shown that certain periods of adolescent life are particularly susceptible to religious influences (compare G. Stanley Hall, *Adolescence*, II, chapter xiv; E.D. Starbuck, *Psychology of Religion*, etc.). Yet conversion cannot be explained as a natural process, conditioned by physiological changes in the adolescent, especially by approaching puberty. The laws of psychology are certainly God's laws as much as all other laws of Nature, and His Spirit works in harmony with His own laws. But in genuine conversion there is always at work in a direct and immediate

manner the Spirit of God to which man, be he adolescent or adult, consciously responds. Any attempt to explain conversion by eliminating the direct working of the Divine Spirit falls short of the mark.

See **REGENERATION; REPENTANCE.**

LITERATURE.

See **REGENERATION.**

J. L. Nuelsen

CONVICT; CONVICTION

<kon-vikt'>, **<kon-vik'-shun>** ([ἐλέγχω, *elegcho*] and compounds, “to prove guilty”): Usual translation of English Versions of the Bible, where the King James Version has “convince,” as in ~~RB6~~ John 8:46; ~~SMB~~ Titus 1:9; ~~SMB~~ James 2:9; once also replacing the King James Version “reprove” (~~RB6~~ John 16:8), while the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version “convince” into “reprove” in ~~RB4~~ 1 Corinthians 14:24. It always implies the presentation of evidence. It is a decision presumed to be based upon a careful and discriminating consideration of all the proofs offered, and has a legal character, the verdict being rendered either in God’s judgment (~~RB6~~ Romans 3:19), or before men (~~RB6~~ John 8:46) by an appeal to their consciences in which God’s law is written (~~RB5~~ Romans 2:15). Since such conviction is addressed to the heart of the guilty, as well as concerning him externally, the word “reprove” is sometimes substituted. To “convict in respect of righteousness, and of judgment” (~~RB6~~ John 16:8), refers to the conviction of the inadequacy and perversity of the ordinary, natural standards of righteousness and judgment, and the approval of those found in Christ, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, as the great interpreter and applier of the work of Christ.

H. E. Jacobs

CONVINCE

<kon-vins'> ([ἐλέγχω, *elegcho*): Another form etymologically of “convict,” means to bring to a decision concerning the truth or the falsehood of a proposition (~~RB2~~ Job 32:12). As usually applied to what is of a more individual and private character, and having reference to what is either good or bad, or what is in itself without moral quality, it has given

way in the Revised Version (British and American) to either “convict,” “reprove” or “confute.”

See **CONVICT**.

CONVOCATION

<*kon-vo-ka'-shun*>: A rendering for [*arqini miqra'*] chiefly in the frequent “Holy Convocation”; but the word is sometimes used alone, e.g. ^{<4002>}Numbers 10:2; ^{<2013>}Isaiah 1:13; 4:5. On a holy convocation no work could be done. The phrase differs from “solemn assembly,” which in the Pentateuch is only applied to the concluding festivals at the end of Passover and Tabernacles, while “Holy Convocation” is used of the Sabbath and all the great holy days of the Mosaic legislation.

CONVULSING

<*kon-vuls'-ing*> (^{<4002>}Mark 1:26 margin (the King James Version torn)).

See **UNCLEAN SPIRIT**.

COOKING

<*kook'-ing*>.

See **FOOD**.

COOL

<*kool*> ([*j we*, *ruach*], “wind”; [*κατα ύχω*, *katapsucho*], “to cool down”): “Cool of the day” (^{<0008>}Genesis 3:8, margin “wind”), when the evening breeze has tempered the heat of the day, enabling Orientals to walk abroad. “Cool my tongue” (^{<2162>}Luke 16:24), a phrase reflecting the Jewish notion that Abraham had power to rescue his descendants from the fires of Hades.

COOS

<*ko'-os*>.

See **COS**.

COPING

<ko'-ping>.

See *HOUSE*.

COPPER

<kop'-er> ([**t****v****j** **n**] *nechosheth*): The word is translated “copper” in only one passage (^{<1987>} Ezra 8:27 the King James Version). In the American Standard Revised Version of this passage, “brass” has been substituted. Neither describes the actual alloy according to present definitions so well as the word “bronze.” Copper was one of the earliest metals to be known and utilized in alloy, but copper, as a single metal, was probably little used. The remains of spears, balances, arms, vases, mirrors, statues, cooking utensils, implements of all kinds, etc., from Bible times are principally of an alloy of copper hardened with tin known today as bronze (*see* BRASS). In such passages as ^{<1889>} Deuteronomy 8:9, where reference is made to the native metal or ores, “copper” should be substituted for “brass” as in the American Standard Revised Version (compare ^{<1808>} Job 40:18). This is true also of coins as [**χ****α****λ****κ****ό****ς**, *chalkos*], in ^{<1000>} Matthew 10:9.

Our modern English word “copper” is derived from an old name pertaining to the island of Cyprus. Copper was known to the ancients as Cyprian brass, probably because that island was one of the chief sources for this metal. The Sinai peninsula and the mountains of northern Syria also contributed to the ancient world’s supply (see Tell el-Amarna Letters). No evidences of copper ore in any quantity are found in Palestine proper.

See *METAL; MINE*.

James A. Patch.

COPPERSMITH

<kop'-er-smith> ([**χ****α****λ****κ****ε****ύ****ς**, *chalkeus*): The word is found in New Testament once only, in ^{<1044>} 2 Timothy 4:14: “Alexander the coppersmith did (margin “showed”) me much evil.” As the Bible word rendered “copper” (see ^{<1987>} Ezra 8:27 the King James Version) is translated “brass” by the Revised Version (British and American), so the word here rendered “c.” should be rendered “brazier,” or “worker in brass.”

See *COPPER*.

COPTIC VERSIONS

<kop'-tik vur'-shunz>:

I. LANGUAGE AND ALPHABET.

1. *Alphabet:*

The Coptic alphabet consists of the Greek uncial letters, plus seven characters taken from the Egyptian demotic to express sounds not represented in the Greek. It can be traced back to the 4th century, as the oldest Coptic manuscripts belong to the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century. The language still prevailed in Egypt in the 9th century, but was no longer understood in Middle Egypt in the 12th. Its last speaker died in 1633.

2. *Dialects:*

There were at least five written dialects and subdialects of Coptic. Of these the most important from a literary point of view was the

(1) Buchairic, the dialect of Lower Egypt, often called Coptic paragraph excellence, and also (wrongly) Memphitic. It is used as the ecclesiastical language in the services of the Coptic church. The other four dialects are somewhat more closely allied to one another than to Buchairic, which shows greater traces of Greek influence. These dialects are,

(2) the Sahidic (Sa`idi, or dialect of upper Egypt), also called Thebaic;

(3) the Bashmuric — or rather Bushmuric — (for which Fayyumic has been suggested);

(4) the Middle Egyptian proper (known from manuscripts found in the monastery of Jeremias near the Theban *Serapeum*), differing but little from (3); and

(5) the Akhmimic (Akhmim = the ancient Chemmis). Akhmimic is more primitive and more closely related to ancient Egyptian than any other. Only a few fragments in it (of Exodus, Ecclesiastes, 2 Maccabees, the Minor Prophets, and Catholic epistles) have yet been found. The last three dialects are often classed together as “Middle Egyptian” and

(4) is then called “Lower Sahidic.”

II. VERSIONS.

In all 5 dialects more or less complete versions of the Bible once existed. They were the earliest made after the early Syriac. At latest they began in the 3rd century, though some (e.g. Hyvernat) say as early as the 2nd. It is thought that the Sahidic version was the earliest, then the Middle Egyptian and finally the Buchairic. The latter represents an early and comparatively pure Greek text, free from what are generally termed western additions, while the Sahidic, on the other hand, contains most of the peculiar western readings. It sometimes supports Codex Sinaiticus, sometimes Codex Vaticanus (B), sometimes both, but generally it closely agrees with codex D (Bezae), especially in the Acts. A Coptic (Sahidic) MS, written considerably before 350 AD, and published by the British Museum in April, 1912, contains Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts, and is older than any other Biblical manuscript (except a few fragments) yet known to exist. It proves that this Sahidic version was made about 200 AD. It in general supports the "Western" text of codex Bezae (D). Much of the New Testament especially still exists in Sahidic, though not Revelation. In Buchairic we have the Pentateuch, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, the 12 Minor Prophets, and fragments of the historical books of the Old Testament, besides the whole New Testament, though the Book of Revelation is later than the rest. In the other dialects much less had been preserved, as far as is known. In Bushmuric we have fragments of Isaiah, Lamentations, Ep. Jeremiah, and a good many fragments of the New Testament. In more than one dialect we have apocryphal gospels (see Texts and Studies, IV, number 2, 1896) and Gnostic papyri, etc. The Old Testament was translated from the Septuagint. The Psalms seem to have been translated about 303 AD.

III. CHIEF EDITIONS.

The Buchairic Psalms were first published in 1659. Wilkins published the Buchairic New Testament at London in 1716, and the Pentateuch in 1731; Schwartz the Gospels in 1846-47; de Lagarde the Acts and Epistles in 1852. He also edited the Psalms (transliterated) in 1875, 151 in number, of which the last celebrates David's victory over Goliath. He added fragments of the Sahidic Psalter and of the Buchairic Proverbs. Tattam published the Minor Prophets in 1836 and the Major in 1852 an edition of the Gospels in London in 1847, and of the rest of the New Testament in 1852 (SPCK), with a literal Arabic version. Horner's edition of the Buchairic New

Testament (4 volumes, 1898, etc., Clarendon Press) and of Sahidic Gospels (1910, 3 vols) is the standard edition Ford published part of the Sahidic New Testament in 1799. Various editions of parts of Old Testament and New Testament have since appeared: e.g. Ciasca published fragments of the Sahidic Old Testament (Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani) at Rome, 1885-89.

LITERATURE.

Realencyclopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche, III; Hyvernat, Etude sur les versions coptes; Revue biblique, 1896, 1897; Zeitschrift für agypt. Sprache; Journal of Theol. Studies, I, 3; Nestle, Text. Crit of Greek New Testament; Forbes Robinson, Texts and Studies, IV; Oesterley in Murray's New Bible Dict.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

COR

<kor> ([rK~~ok~~or]): A liquid and dry measure, same as the homer, of about 90 gals. capacity (~~2654~~ Ezekiel 45:14).

See HOMER; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

CORAL

<kor'-al> ([t/mar; ra'moth], [μynynP] peninim]): The red coral or precious coral, Corallium rubrum, is confined to the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas. It is the calcareous axis of a branching colony of polyps. It does not form reefs, but occurs in small masses from 40 to 100 fathoms below the surface. It differs totally in structure from the white corals which form coral reefs, belonging to the order of Octactinia or Eight-rayed Polyps, while the reef-building corals belong to the Hexactinia or Six-rayed Polyps.

Ra'moth, apparently from r. *ra'am*, "to be high" (compare *rum*, "to be high"), occurs in three passages. In ~~2107~~ Proverbs 24:7, EVV have "too high": "Wisdom is too high for a fool." In ~~1882~~ Job 28:12-19, where various precious things are compared with wisdom, English Versions of the Bible has "coral" (King James Version, margin "Ramoth"). It is mentioned here along with *ceghor*, "gold" (the Revised Version, margin "treasure"); *kethem*, "gold of Ophir"; *shoham*, "onyx" (the Revised Version, margin

“beryl”); *cappir*, “sapphire”; *zahabh*, “gold”; *zekhukhith*, “crystal” (the Revised Version (British and American) “glass”); *paz*, “gold”; *gabhish*, “pearls” (the Revised Version (British and American) “crystal”); *peninim*, “rubies” (the Revised Version, margin “red coral” or “pearls”); *piTedhah*, “topaz.” While the real meaning of some of these terms is doubtful (*see STONES, PRECIOUS*), they all, including *ra’moth*, appear to be precious stones or metals. In ^{<2716>}Ezekiel 27:16, *ra’moth* occurs with *nophekh*, “emeralds” (the Revised Version, margin “carbuncles”); *argaman*, “purple”; *riqmah*, “brodered work”; *buts*, “fine linen”; *kadhkodh*, “agate”(King James Version, margin “chrysoprase,” the Revised Version (British and American) “rubies”). Here the context does not require a precious stone or metal, and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has *sericum*, i.e. “Chinese material” or “silk.” Notwithstanding, therefore, the traditional rendering, “coral,” the real meaning of *ra’moth* must be admitted to be doubtful.

Peninim (from the root *panan*, “to divide up,” “to separate”; compare Arabic *fanan*, “a branch of a tree”) occurs in ^{<1838>}Job 28:18; ^{<1115>}Proverbs 3:15; 8:11; 20:15; 31:10; ^{<2107>}Lamentations 4:7. In all these passages English Versions of the Bible has “rubies” (^{<1838>}Job 28:18, the Revised Version, margin “red coral” or “pearls”; ^{<2107>}Lamentations 4:7, the Revised Version, margin “corals”). Everywhere a precious substance is indicated, but nowhere does the context give any light as to the nature of the substance, except in ^{<2107>}Lamentations 4:7, where we have the statement that the nobles of Jerusalem “were more ruddy in body” than *peninim*. This and the etymology favor a branching red substance such as precious coral. The occurrence of *peninim* and *ra’moth* together in ^{<1838>}Job 28:18 is, if we give the precedence to *peninim*, a further argument against *ra’moth* meaning “coral.”

Alfred Ely Day

COR-ASHAN

<kor-ash’-an>, *<ko-ra’-shan>* (English Revised Version, the King James Version Chor-ashan; [^{~v};^r/K, *kor`ashan*], ^{<1111>}1 Samuel 30:30): The original reading was probably Bor-ashan, “well of Ashan.”

See ASHAN.

CORBAN

<kor'-ban> ([¹Brḥ; qorban]; [δῶρον, *doron*]; translated “a gift,” “a sacrificial offering,” literally, “that which is brought near,” namely, to the altar): An expression frequently used in the original text of the Old Testament; in the English Bible it occurs in ^{<4071>}Mark 7:11; compare also ^{<4135>}Matthew 15:5. It is the most general term for a sacrifice of any kind. In the course of time it became associated with an objectionable practice. Anything dedicated to the temple by pronouncing the votive word “Corban” forthwith belonged to the temple, but only ideally; actually it might remain in the possession of him who made the vow. So a son might be justified in not supporting his old parents simply because he designated his property or a part of it as a gift to the temple, that is, as “Corban” There was no necessity of fulfilling his vow, yet he was actually prohibited from ever using his property for the support of his parents. This shows clearly why Christ singled out this queer regulation in order to demonstrate the sophistry of tradition and to bring out the fact of its possible and actual hostility to the Scripture and its spirit.

William Baur

CORBE

<kor'-be>.

See *CHORBE*.

CORD

<kord> ([¹bj , *chebhet*], [^rty, *yether*], [^rtyme^methar], [^tb[] `abhoth]; [^{σχοινίον}, *schoinion*]):

(1) The Arabic *chab'l* corresponds to the Hebrew *chebhel* and is still the common name for cord or rope throughout the East. Such ropes or cords are made of goat's or camel's hair, first spun into threads and then twisted or plaited into the larger and stronger form. *Chebhel* is translated rather inconsistently in the Revised Version (British and American) by “cord” (^{<4125>}Joshua 2:15; ^{<3318>}Job 36:8, etc.); by “line” (^{<4082>}2 Samuel 8:2; ^{<3015>}Micah 2:5; ^{<4945>}Psalms 16:6; 78:55; ^{<3177>}Amos 7:17; ^{<3811>}Zechariah 2:1); by “ropes” (^{<1128>}1 Kings 20:31), and by “tacklings” (^{<2333>}Isaiah 33:23).

(2) *Yether* corresponds to the Arabic *wittar*, which means catgut. With a kindred inconsistency it is translated the Revised Version (British and American) by “withes” (^{<0760>}Judges 16:7 the Revised Version, margin “bowstring”); by “cord” (^{<8301>}Job 30:11), where some think it may mean “bowstring,” or possibly “rein” of a bridle, and by “bowstring” (^{<9102>}Psalms 11:2), doubtless the true meaning.

(3) *Methar* is considered the equivalent of Arabic *atnab*, which means tent ropes, being constantly so used by the Bedouin. They make the thing so called of goat’s or camel’s hair. It is used of the “cords” of the tabernacle (^{<2400>}Jeremiah 10:20), of the “cords” of the “hangings” and “pillars” of the courts of the tabernacle in Exodus and Numbers, and figuratively by Isaiah (54:2), “Lengthen thy cords,” etc.

(4) *Abhoth* is thought to have its equivalent in the Arabic *rubuts*, which means a band, or fastening. *See* BAND. It is translated by “cords” in ^{<4807>}Psalms 118:27; 129:4; by “bands” in ^{<2035>}Ezekiel 3:25; ^{<8390>}Job 39:10; ^{<8104>}Hosea 11:4; by “ropes” in ^{<0753>}Judges 15:13,14, and by “cart rope” in ^{<2358>}Isaiah 5:18. *See* CART. See also ^{<0458>}Numbers 15:38 and AMULET. It seems to have the meaning of something twisted or interlaced.

(5) In the New Testament “cord” is found in ^{<825>}John 2:15, translating *schoinion*, but in ^{<4272>}Acts 27:32 the same Greek word is rendered “ropes.” Figurative:

- (1) of affliction (^{<8308>}Job 36:8);
- (2) of God’s laws (^{<9018>}Psalms 2:3);
- (3) of the artifices of the wicked (^{<4904>}Psalms 129:4; 140:5);
- (4) of sinful habits (^{<2052>}Proverbs 5:22);
- (5) of true friendship or companionship (^{<2042>}Ecclesiastes 4:12);
- (6) possibly of the spinal cord (^{<2126>}Ecclesiastes 12:6);
- (7) of falsehood (^{<2358>}Isaiah 5:18);
- (8) of the spirit of enterprise and devotion (^{<2542>}Isaiah 54:2);
- (9) of God’s gentleness.

George B. Eager

CORDS, SMALL

<kordz> ([σχοινίον, *schoinion*], the diminutive of *schoinos*, “a rush,” hence, “a rope of rushes”): Translated “small cords” (<4215> John 2:15 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) “cords”). The same word is translated “ropes” in <4273> Acts 27:32. See also <3417> Job 41:2 margin.

CORE

<ko'-re> ([ορέ, *Kore*): In the King James Version, <6111> Jude 1:11, used as a variant for Korah.

See *KORAH*, 3.

CORIANDER

<kor-i-an'-der> ([dΓαδῆ; [κόριον, *korion*]): The fruit of the *Coriandrum Sativum* (Natural Order *Umbelliferae*), a plant indigenous around the Mediterranean and extensively cultivated. The fruits are aromatic and stomatic-carminative. They are of a grayish-yellow color, ribbed, ovate-globular and in size about twice that of a hemp-seed. “The manna was like coriander seed” (<4117> Numbers 11:7; see also <1261> Exodus 16:31.

CORINTH

<kor'-inth> ([όρινθος, *Korinthos*], “ornament”): A celebrated city of the Peloponnesus, capital of Corinthia, which lay North of Argolis, and with the isthmus joined the peninsula to the mainland. Corinth had three good harbors (Lechaeum, on the Corinthian, and Cenchrea and Schoenus on the Saronic Gulf), and thus commanded the traffic of both the eastern and the western seas. The larger ships could not be hauled across the isthmus (<4276> Acts 27:6,37); smaller vessels were taken over by means of a ship tramway with wooden rails. The Phoenicians, who settled here very early, left many traces of their civilization in the industrial arts, such as dyeing and weaving, as well as in their religion and mythology. The Corinthian cult of Aphrodite, of Melikertes (Melkart) and of Athene Phoenike are of Phoenician origin. Poseidon, too, and other sea deities were held in high esteem in the commercial city. Various arts were cultivated and the Corinthians, even in the earliest times, were famous for their cleverness,

inventiveness and artistic sense, and they prided themselves on surpassing the other Greeks in the embellishment of their city and in the adornment of their temples. There were many celebrated painters in Corinth, and the city became famous for the Corinthian order of architecture: an order, which, by the way, though held in high esteem by the Romans, was very little used by the Greeks themselves. It was here, too, that the dithyramb (hymn to Dionysus) was first arranged artistically to be sung by a chorus; and the Isthmian games, held every two years, were celebrated just outside the city on the isthmus near the Saronic Gulf. But the commercial and materialistic spirit prevailed later. Not a single Corinthian distinguished himself in literature. Statesmen, however, there were in abundance: Periander, Phidon, Timoleon.

Harbors are few on the Corinthian Gulf. Hence, no other city could wrest the commerce of these waters from Corinth. According to Thucydides, the first ships of war were built here in 664 BC. In those early days Corinth held a leading position among the Greek cities; but in consequence of her great material prosperity she would not risk all as Athens did, and win eternal supremacy over men: she had too much to lose to jeopardize her material interests for principle, and she soon sank into the second class. But when Athens, Thebes, Sparta and Argos fell away, Corinth came to the front again as the wealthiest and most important city in Greece; and when it was destroyed by Mummius in 146 BC, the treasures of art carried to Rome were as great as those of Athens. Delos became the commercial center for a time; but when Julius Caesar restored Corinth a century later (46 BC), it grew so rapidly that the Roman colony soon became again one of the most prominent centers in Greece. When Paul visited Corinth, he found it the metropolis of the Peloponnesus. Jews flocked to this center of trade (~~4481~~ Acts 18:1-18; ~~5162~~ Romans 16:21 ff; ~~4492~~ 1 Corinthians 9:20), the natural site for a great mart, and flourishing under the lavish hand of the Caesars; and this is one reason why Paul remained there so long (~~4481~~ Acts 18:11) instead of sojourning in the old seats of aristocracy, such as Argos, Sparta and Athens. He found a strong Jewish nucleus to begin with; and it was in direct communication with Ephesus. But earthquake, malaria, and the harsh Turkish rule finally swept everything away except seven columns of one old Doric temple, the only object above ground left today to mark the site of the ancient city of wealth and luxury and immorality — the city of vice paragraph excellence in the Roman world. Near the temple have been excavated the ruins of the famous fount of Peirene, so celebrated in

Greek literature. Directly South of the city is the high rock (over 1,800 ft.) Acrocorinthus, which formed an impregnable fortress. Traces of the old ship-canal across the isthmus (attempted by Nero in 66-67 AD) were to be seen before excavations were begun for the present canal. At this time the city was thoroughly Roman. Hence, the many Latin names in the New Testament: Lucius, Tertius, Gaius, Erastus, Quartus (~~5162~~Romans 16:21-23), Crispus, Titus Justus (~~4187~~Acts 18:7,8), Fortunatus, Achaicus (~~4167~~1 Corinthians 16:17). According to the testimony of Dio Chrysostomus, Corinth had become in the 2nd century of our era the richest city in Greece. Its monuments and public buildings and art treasures are described in detail by Pausanias.

The church in Corinth consisted principally of non-Jews (~~4170~~1 Corinthians 12:2). Paul had no intention at first of making the city a base of operations (~~4181~~Acts 18:1; 16:9,10); for he wished to return to Thessalonica (~~5177~~1 Thessalonians 2:17,18). His plans were changed by a revelation (~~4180~~Acts 18:9,10). The Lord commanded him to speak boldly, and he did so, remaining in the city eighteen months. Finding strong opposition in the synagogue he left the Jews and went to the Gentiles (~~4186~~Acts 18:6). Nevertheless, Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue and his household were believers and baptisms were numerous (~~4188~~Acts 18:8); but no Corinthians were baptized by Paul himself except Crispus, Gaius and some of the household of Stephanas (~~4114~~1 Corinthians 1:14,16) "the firstfruits of Achaia" (~~4165~~1 Corinthians 16:15). One of these, Gaius, was Paul's host the next time he visited the city (~~4163~~Romans 16:23). Silas and Timothy, who had been left at Berea, came on to Corinth about 45 days after Paul's arrival. It was at this time that Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Thessalonians (~~5176~~1 Thessalonians 3:6). During Gallio's administration the Jews accused Paul, but the proconsul refused to allow the case to be brought to trial. This decision must have been looked upon with favor by a large majority of the Corinthians, who had a great dislike for the Jews (~~4187~~Acts 18:17). Paul became acquainted also with Priscilla and Aquila (~~4188~~Acts 18:18,26; ~~5163~~Romans 16:3; ~~5109~~2 Timothy 4:19), and later they accompanied him to Ephesus. Within a few years after Paul's first visit to Corinth the Christians had increased so rapidly that they made quite a large congregation, but it was composed mainly of the lower classes: they were neither 'learned, influential, nor of noble birth' (~~4125~~1 Corinthians 1:26). Paul probably left Corinth to attend the celebration of the feast at Jerusalem (~~4181~~Acts 18:21). Little is known of the history of the church in Corinth after his departure. Apollos came from Ephesus with a letter of

recommendation to the brethren in Achaia (~~<418Z>~~ Acts 18:27; ~~<410E>~~ 2 Corinthians 3:1); and he exercised a powerful influence (~~<418Z>~~ Acts 18:27,28; ~~<401D>~~ 1 Corinthians 1:12); and Paul came down later from Macedonia. His first letter to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus. Both Titus and Timothy were sent to Corinth from Ephesus (~~<407B>~~ 2 Corinthians 7:13,15; ~~<404T>~~ 1 Corinthians 4:17), and Timothy returned by land, meeting Paul in Macedonia (~~<400E>~~ 2 Corinthians 1:1), who visited Greece again in 56-57 or 57-58.

LITERATURE.

Leake, *Travels in the Morea*, III, 229-304; *Peloponnesiaca*, 392 ff; Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, II, 514 ff; Clark, *Peloponnesus*, 42-61; Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of Paul*, chapter xii; Ramsay, "Corinth" (in HDB); Holm, *History of Greece*, I, 286 ff; II, 142, and 306-16; III, 31-44, and 283; IV, 221, 251, 347 and 410-12.

J. E. Harry

CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO THE

~~<ko-rin'-thi-anz>~~:

I. AUTHENTICITY OF THE TWO EPISTLES.

1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans, all belong to the period of Paul's third missionary journey. They are the most remarkable of his writings, and are usually distinguished as the four great or principal epistles; a distinction which not only is a tribute to their high originality and intrinsic worth, but also indicates the extremely favorable opinion which critics of almost all schools have held regarding their authenticity. Throughout the centuries the tradition has remained practically unbroken, that they contain the very pectus Paulinum, the mind and heart of the great apostle of the Gentiles, and preserve to the church an impregnable defense of historical Christianity. What has to be said of their genuineness applies almost equally to both.

1. External Evidence:

The two epistles have a conspicuous place in the most ancient lists of Pauline writings. In the Muratorian Fragment (circa 170) they stand at the head of the nine epistles addressed to churches, and are declared to have been written to forbid heretical schism (*primum omnium Corinthiis schisma*

haeresis intredicens); and in Marcion's Apostolicon (circa 140) they stand second to Gal. They are also clearly attested in the most important writings of the subapostolic age, e.g. by Clement of Rome (circa 95), generally regarded as the friend of the apostle mentioned in ~~ROM~~ Philippians 4:3; Ignatius (Ad Ephes., chapter xviii, second decade of 2nd century); Polycarp (chapters ii, vi, xi, first half of 2nd century), a disciple of John; and Justin Martyr (born at close of 1st century); while the Gnostic Ophites (2nd century) were clearly familiar with both epistles (compare Westcott, Canon, passim, and Index II; also Charteris, Canonicity, 222-224, where most of the original passages are brought together). The witness of Clement is of the highest importance. Ere the close of the 1st century he himself wrote a letter to the Corinthians, in which (chapter xlvii, Lightfoot's edition, 144) he made a direct appeal to the authority of 1 Cor: "Take up the letter of Paul the blessed apostle; what did he write to you first in the beginning of the gospel? Verily he gave you spiritual direction regarding himself, Cephas, and Apollos, for even then you were dividing yourselves into parties." It would be impossible to desire more explicit external testimony.

2. Internal Evidence:

Within themselves both epistles are replete with marks of genuineness. They are palpitating human documents, with the ring of reality from first to last. They admirably harmonize with the independent narrative of Acts; in the words of Schleiermacher (Einltg., 148), "The whole fits together and completes itself perfectly, and yet each of the documents follows its own course, and the data contained in the one cannot be borrowed from those of the other." Complex and difficult as the subjects and circumstances sometimes are, and varying as the moods of the writer are in dealing with them, there is a naturalness that compels assent to his good faith. The very difficulty created for a modern reader by the incomplete and allusive character of some of the references is itself a mark of genuineness rather than the opposite; just what would most likely be the ease in a free and intimate correspondence between those who understood one another in the presence of immediate facts which needed no careful particularization; but what would almost as certainly have been avoided in a fictitious composition. Indeed a modicum of literary sense suffices to forbid classification among the pseudepigrapha. To take but a few instances from many, it is impossible to read such passages as those conveying the remonstrance in 1 Corinthians 9, the alternations of anxiety and relief in

connection with the meeting of Titus in 2 Corinthians 2 and 7, or the ever-memorable passage which begins at ~~47124~~ 2 Corinthians 11:24 of the same epistle: "Of the Jews five times received I," ere, without feeling that the hypothesis of fiction becomes an absurdity. No man ever wrote out of the heart if this writer did not. The truth is that theory of pseudonymity leaves far more difficulties behind it than any it is supposed to solve. The unknown and unnamable literary prodigy of the 2nd century, who in the most daring and artistic manner gloried in the fanciful creation of those minute and life-like details which have imprinted themselves indelibly on the memory and imagination of mankind, cannot be regarded as other than a chimera. No one knows where or when he lived, or in what shape or form. But if the writings are the undoubted rescripts of fact, to whose life and personality do they fit themselves more exquisitely than to those of the man whose name stands at their head, and whose compositions they claim to be? They suit beyond compare the apostle of the missionary journeys, the tender, eager, indomitable "prisoner of the Lord," and no other. No other that has even been suggested is more than the mere shadow of a name, and no two writers have as yet seriously agreed even as to the shadow. The pertinent series of questions with which Godet (Intro to New Testament; Studies on the Epistles, 305) concludes his remarks on the genuineness may well be repeated: "What use was it to explain at length in the 2nd century a change in a plan of the journey, which, supposing it was real, had interest only for those whom the promised visit of the apostle personally concerned? When the author speaks of five hundred persons who had seen the risen Christ, of whom the most part were still alive at the time when he was writing, is he telling his readers a mere story that would resemble a bad joke? What was the use of discussing at length and giving detailed rules on the exercise of the glossolalia at a time when that gift no longer existed, so to say, in the church? Why make the apostle say: 'We who shall be alive (at the moment of the Parousia)' at a time when everyone knew that he was long dead? In fine, what church would have received without opposition into its archives, as an epistle of the apostle, half a century after his death, a letter unknown till then, and filled with reproaches most severe and humiliating to it?"

3. Consent of Criticism:

One is not surprised, therefore, that even the radical criticism of the 19th century cordially accepted the Corinthian epistles and their companions in the great group. The men who founded that criticism were under no

conceivable constraint in such a conclusion, save the constraint of obvious and incontrovertible fact. The Tübingen school, which doubted or denied the authenticity of all the rest of the epistles, frankly acknowledged the genuineness of these. This also became the general verdict of the “critical” school which followed that of Tübingen, and which, in many branches, has included the names of the leading German scholars to this day. F.C. Baur’s language (Paul, I, 246) was: “There has never been the slightest suspicion of unauthenticity cast on these four epistles, and they bear so incontestably the character of Pauline originality, that there is no conceivable ground for the assertion of critical doubts in their case.” Renan (St. Paul, Introduction, V) was equally emphatic: “They are incontestable, and uncontested.”

4. Ultra-Radical Attack (Dutch School):

Reference, however, must be made to the ultra-radical attack which has gathered some adherents, especially among Dutch scholars, during the last 25 years. As early as 1792 Evanson, a retired English clergyman, rejected Rome on the ground that, according to Acts, no church existed in Rome in Paul’s day. Bruno Bauer (1850-51-52) made a more sweeping attack, relegating the whole of the four principal epistles to the close of the 2nd century. His views received little attention, until, in 1886 onward, they were taken up and extended by a series of writers in Holland, Pierson and Naber, and Loman, followed rapidly by Steck of Bern, Volter of Amsterdam, and above all by Van Manen of Leyden. According to these writers, with slight modifications of view among themselves, it is very doubtful if Paul or Christ ever really existed; if they did, legend has long since made itself master of their personalities, and in every case what borders on the supernatural is to be taken as the criterion of the legendary. The epistles were written in the 1st quarter of the 2nd century, and as Paul, so far as he was known, was believed to be a reformer of anti-Judaic sympathies, he was chosen as the patron of the movement, and the writings were published in his name. The aim of the whole series was to further the interests of a supposed circle of clever and elevated men, who, partly imbued with Hebrew ideals, and partly with the speculations of Greek and Alexandrian philosophy, desired the spread of a universalistic Christianity and true Gnosis. For this end they perceived it necessary that Jewish legalism should be neutralized, and that the narrow national element should be expelled from the Messianic idea. Hence, the epistles The principles on which the main contentions of the critics are based may be reduced to two:

(1) that there are relations in the epistles so difficult to understand that, since we cannot properly understand them, the epistles are not trustworthy; and

(2) that the religious and ecclesiastical development is so great that not merely 20 or 30 years, but 70 or 80 more, are required, if we are to be able rationally to conceive it: to accept the situation at an earlier date is simply to accept what cannot possibly have been. It is manifest that on such principles it is possible to establish what one will, and that any historical literature might be proved untrustworthy, and reshaped according to the subjective idiosyncrasies of the critic. The underlying theory of intellectual development is too rigid, and is quite oblivious of the shocks it receives from actual facts, by the advent in history from time to time of powerful, compelling, and creative personalities, who rather mould their age than are moulded by it. None have poured greater ridicule on this “pseudo-Kritik” than the representatives of the advanced school in Germany whom it rather expected to carry with it, and against whom it complains bitterly that they do not take it seriously. On the whole the vagaries of the Dutch school have rather confirmed than shaken belief in these epistles; and one may freely accept Ramsay’s view (HDB, I, 484) as expressing the modern mind regarding them, namely, that they are “the unimpeached and unassailable nucleus of admitted Pauline writings.” (Reference to the following will give a sufficiently adequate idea of the Dutch criticism and the replies that have been made to it: Van Manen, EB, article “Paul,” and Expository Times, IX, 205, 257, 314; Knowling, Witness of the Epistles; Clemen, Einheitlichkeit der p. B.; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, ICC; Godet, Julicher and Zahn, in their Introductions; Schmiedel and Lipsius in the Hand-Commentar.)

II. TEXT OF 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS:

Integrity of 1 Corinthians:

The text of both epistles comes to us in the most ancient VSS, the Syriac (Peshito), the Old Latin, and the Egyptian all of which were in very early use, undoubtedly by the 3rd century. It is complete in the great Greek uncials: Codex Sinaiticus (original scribe) and a later scribe, 4th century), Codex Vaticanus (B, 4th century), Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century, minus two verses, <401>2 Corinthians 4:13; 12:7), and very nearly complete

in Codex Ephraemi (C, 5th century), and in the Greek-Latin Claromontanus (D, 6th century); as well as in numerous cursives. In both cases the original has been well preserved, and no exegetical difficulties of high importance are presented. (Reference should be made to the Introduction in Sanday and Headlam's Romans, ICC (1896), where section 7 gives valuable information concerning the text, not only of Roman, but of the Pauline epistles generally; also to the recent edition (Oxford, 1910), New Testament Graecae, by Souter, where the various readings of the text used in the Revised Version (British and American) (1881) are conveniently exhibited.) On the whole the text of 1 Corinthians flows on consistently, only at times, in a characteristic fashion, winding back upon itself, and few serious criticisms are made on its unity, although the case is different in this respect with its companion epistle. Some writers, on insufficient grounds, believe that 1 Corinthians contains relics of a previous epistle (compare 5:9), e.g. in 7:17-24; 9:1-10:22; 15:1-55.

III. PAUL'S PREVIOUS RELATIONS WITH CORINTH.

1. Corinth in 55 AD:

When, in the course of his 2nd missionary journey, Paul left Athens (~~<481>~~ Acts 18:1), he sailed westward to Cenchrea, and entered Corinth "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling" (~~<418>~~ 1 Corinthians 2:3). He was doubtless alone, although Silas and Timothy afterward joined him (~~<481>~~ Acts 18:5; ~~<418>~~ 2 Corinthians 1:19). The ancient city of Corinth had been utterly laid in ruins when Rome subjugated Greece in the middle of the 2nd century BC. But in the year 46 BC Caesar had caused it to be rebuilt and colonized in the Roman manner, and during the century that had elapsed it had prospered and grown enormously. Its population at this time has been estimated at between 600,000 and 700,000, by far the larger portion of whom were slaves. Its magnificent harbors, Cenchrea and Lechaeum, opening to the commerce of East and West, were crowded with ships, and its streets with travelers and merchants from almost every country under heaven. Even in that old pagan world the reputation of the city was bad; it has been compared (Baring-Gould, Study of Paul, 241) to an amalgam of new-market, Chicago and Paris, and probably it contained the worst features of each. At night it was made hideous by the brawls and lewd songs of drunken revelry. In the daytime its markets and squares swarmed with Jewish peddlers, foreign traders, sailors, soldiers, athletes in training, boxers, wrestlers, charioteers, racing-men, betting-men, courtesans, slaves, idlers and parasites of every description. The corrupting

worship of Aphrodite, with its hordes of *hierodouloi*, was dominant, and all over the Greek-Roman world, “to behave as a Corinthian” was a proverbial synonym for leading a low, shameless and immoral life. Very naturally such a polluted and idolatrous environment accounts for much that has to be recorded of the semi-pagan and imperfect life of many of the early converts.

2. Founding of the Church:

Paul was himself the founder of the church in Corinth (~~<418>~~1 Corinthians 3:6,10). Entering the city with anxiety, and yet with almost audacious hopefulness, he determined to know nothing among its people save Jesus Christ and Him crucified (~~<418>~~1 Corinthians 2:2). Undoubtedly he was conscious that the mission of the Cross here approached its crisis. If it could abide here, it could abide anywhere. At first he confined himself to working quietly at his trade, and cultivating the friendship of Aquila and Priscilla (~~<418>~~Acts 18:2 f); then he opened his campaign in the synagogue where he persuaded both Jews and Greeks, and ultimately, when opposition became violent, carried it on in the house of Titus Justus, a proselyte. He made deep impressions, and gradually gathered round him a number who were received into the faith (~~<418>~~Acts 18:7,8; ~~<414>~~1 Corinthians 1:14-16). The converts were drawn largely but not entirely from the lower or servile classes (~~<412>~~1 Corinthians 1:26; 7:21); they included Crispus and Sosthenes, rulers of the synagogue, Gaius, and Stephanas with his household, “the firstfruits of Achaia” (~~<415>~~1 Corinthians 16:15). He regarded himself joyfully as the father of this community (~~<414>~~1 Corinthians 4:14,15), every member of which seemed to him like his own child.

IV. DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

After a sojourn of eighteen months (~~<418>~~Acts 18:11) in this fruitful field, Paul departed, most probably in the year 52 (compare Turner, article “Chron. New Testament,” HDB, I, 422 ff), and, having visited Jerusalem and returned to Asia Minor (third journey), established himself for a period of between two and three years (trietia, ~~<418>~~Acts 20:31) in Ephesus (~~<418>~~Acts 18:18 onward). It was during his stay there that his epistle was written, either in the spring (pre-Pentecost, ~~<418>~~1 Corinthians 16:8) of the year in which he left, 55; or, if that does not give sufficient interval for a visit and a letter to Corinth, which there is considerable ground for believing intervened between 1 Corinthians and the departure from Ephesus, then in the spring of the preceding year, 54. This would give

ample time for the conjectured events, and there is no insuperable reason against it. Pauline chronology is a subject by itself, but the suggested dates for the departure from Ephesus, and for the writing of 1 Corinthians, really fluctuate between the years 53 and 57. Harnack (*Gesch. der altchrist. Litt.*, II; *Die Chron.*, I) and McGiffert (*Apos Age*) adopt the earlier date; Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveler*), 56; Lightfoot (*Bib. Essays*) and Zahn (*Einkl.*), 57; Turner (*ut supra*), 55. Many regard 57 as too late, but Robertson (*HDB*, I, 485-86) still adheres to it.

V. OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

1. A Previous Letter:

After Paul's departure from Corinth, events moved rapidly, and far from satisfactorily. He was quite cognizant of them. The distance from Ephesus was not great — about eight days' journey by sea — and in the constant coming and going between the cities news of what was transpiring must frequently have come to his ears. Members of the household of Chloe are distinctly mentioned (~~<4011>~~ 1 Corinthians 1:11) as having brought tidings of the contentions that prevailed, and there were no doubt other informants. Paul was so concerned by what he heard that he sent Timothy on a conciliatory mission with many commendations (~~<4047>~~ 1 Corinthians 4:17; 16:10 f), although the present epistle probably reached Corinth first. He had also felt impelled, in a letter (~~<4109>~~ 1 Corinthians 5:9) which is now lost, to send earnest warning against companying with the immoral. Moreover, Apollos, after excellent work in Corinth, had come to Ephesus, and was received as a brother by the apostle (~~<4085>~~ 1 Corinthians 3:5,6; 16:12). Equally welcome was a deputation consisting of Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (~~<4067>~~ 1 Corinthians 16:17), from whom the fullest information could be gained, and who were the probable bearers of a letter from the church of Corinth itself (~~<4008>~~ 1 Corinthians 7:1), appealing for advice and direction on a number of points.

2. Letter from Corinth:

This letter has not been preserved, but it was evidently the immediate occasion of our epistle, and its tenor is clearly indicated by the nature of the apostle's reply. (The letter, professing to be this letter to Paul, and its companion, professing to be Paul's own lost letter just referred to, which deal with Gnostic heresies, and were for long accepted by the Syrian and Armenian churches, are manifestly apocryphal. (Compare Stanley's *Corinthians*, Appendix; Harnack's *Gesch. der altchrist. Litt.*, I, 37-39, and

II, 506-8; Zahn, *Einleitung.*, I, 183-249; Sanday, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, I, 906-7.) If there be any relic in existence of Paul's previous letter, it is possibly to be found in the passage ~~4:16-17~~ 2 Corinthians 6:14 through 7:1; at all events that passage may be regarded as reminiscent of its style and message.) So that 1 Corinthians is no bow drawn at a venture. It treats of a fully understood, and, on the whole, of a most unhappy situation. The church had broken into factions, and was distracted by party cries. Some of its members were living openly immoral lives, and discipline was practically in abeyance. Others had quarrels over which they dragged one another into the heathen courts. Great differences of opinion had also arisen with regard to marriage and the social relations generally; with regard to banquets and the eating of food offered to idols; with regard to the behavior of women in the assemblies, to the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts, to the use and value of spiritual gifts, and with regard to the hope of the resurrection. The apostle was filled with grief and indignation, which the too complacent tone of the Corinthians only intensified. They discussed questions in a lofty, intellectual way, without seeming to perceive their real drift, or the life and spirit which lay imperiled at their heart. Resisting the impulse to visit them "with a rod" (4:21), the apostle wrote the present epistle, and dispatched it, if not by the hands of Stephanas and his comrades, most probably by the hands of Titus.

VI. CONTENTS.

1. General Character:

In its general character the epistle is a strenuous writing, masterly in its restraint in dealing with opposition, firm in its grasp of ethical and spiritual principles, and wise and faithful in their application. It is calm, full of reasoning, clear and balanced in judgment; very varied in its lights and shadows, in its kindness, its gravity, its irony. It moves with firm tread among the commonest themes, but also rises easily into the loftiest spheres of thought and vision, breaking again and again into passages of glowing and rhythmical eloquence. It rebukes error, exposes and condemns sin, solves doubts, upholds and encourages faith, and all in a spirit of the utmost tenderness and love, full of grace and truth. It is broad in its outlook, penetrating in its insight, unending in its interest and application.

2. Order and Division:

It is also very orderly in its arrangement, so that it is not difficult to follow the writer as he advances from point to point. Weizsacker (Apos Age, I, 324-25) suggestively distinguishes the matter into

- (1) subjects introduced by the letter from Corinth, and
- (2) those on which Paul had obtained information otherwise. He includes three main topics in the first class: marriage, meat offered to idols and spiritual gifts (there is a fourth — the logia or collection, ~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 16:1); six in the second class: the factions, the case of incest, the lawsuits, the free customs of the women, the abuse connected with the Supper and the denial of the resurrection. It is useful, however, to adhere to the sequence of the epistle. In broadly outlining the subject-matter we may make a threefold division:

- (1) chapters 1 through 6;
- (2) chapters 7 through 10; and
- (3) chapter 11 through end.

3. Outline:

(1) 1 Corinthians 1 through 6:

After salutation, in which he associates Sosthenes with himself, and thanksgiving for the grace given to the Corinthians (~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 1:1-9), Paul immediately begins (~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 1:10-13) to refer to the internal divisions among them, and to the unworthy and misguided party cries that had arisen. (Many theories have been formed as to the exact significance of the so-called “Christus-party,” a party whose danger becomes more obvious in 2 Cor. Compare Meyer-Heinrici, Comm., 8th edition; Godet, Intro, 250 ff; Stanley, Cor, 29-30; Farrar, Paul, chapter xxxi; Pfleiderer, Paulinism, II, 28-31; Weiss, Intro, I, 259-65; Weizsacker, Apos Age, I, 325-33, and 354 ff. Weizsacker holds that the name indicates exclusive relation to an authority, while Baur and Pfleiderer argue that it was a party watchword (virtually Petrine) taken to bring out the apostolic inferiority of Paul. On the other hand a few scholars maintain that the name does not, strictly speaking, indicate a party at all but rather designates those who were disgusted at the display of all party spirit, and with whom Paul was in hearty sympathy. See McGiffert, Apos Age, 295-97.) After


denouncing this petty partisanship, Paul offers an elaborate defense of his own ministry, declaring the power and wisdom of God in the gospel of the Cross (1:14 through 2:16), returning in chapter 3 to the spirit of faction, showing its absurdity and narrowness in face of the fullness of the Christian heritage in “all things” that belong to them as belonging to Christ; and once more defending his ministry in chapter 4, making a touching appeal to his readers as his “beloved children,” whom he had begotten through the gospel. In chapter 5 he deals with the case of a notorious offender, guilty of incest, whom they unworthily harbor in their midst, and in the name of Christ demands that they should expel him from the church, pointing out at the same time that it is against the countenancing of immorality within the church membership that he specially warns, and had previously warned in his former epistle. Ch 6 deals with the shamefulness of Christian brethren haling one another to the heathen courts, and not rather seeking the settlement of their differences within themselves; reverting once more in the closing verses to the subject of unchastity, which irrepressibly haunts him as he thinks of them.

(2) 1 Corinthians 7 through 10:

In 1 Corinthians 7 he begins to reply to two of the matters on which the church had expressly consulted him in its ep., and which he usually induces by the phrase *peri de*, “now concerning.” The first of these bears (chapter 7) upon celibacy and marriage, including the case of “mixed” marriage. These questions he treats quite frankly, yet with delicacy and circumspection, always careful to distinguish between what he has received as the direct word of the Lord, and what he only delivers as his own opinion, the utterance of his own sanctified common-sense, yet to which the good spirit within him gives weight. The second matter on which advice was solicited, questions regarding idolothuta, meats offered to idols, he discusses in chapter 8, recurring to it again in chapter 10 to end. The scruples and casuistries involved he handles with excellent wisdom, and lays down a rule for the Christian conscience of a far-reaching kind, happily expressed: “All things are lawful; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful; but not all things edify. Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbor’s good” (10:23,14). By lifting their differences into the purer atmosphere of love and duty, he causes them to dissolve away. Chapter 9 contains another notable defense of his apostleship, in which he asserts the principle that the Christian ministry has a claim for its support on those to whom it ministers, although in his own case he deliberately

waived his right, that no challenge on such a matter should be possible among them. The earlier portion of chapter 10 contains a reference to Jewish idolatry and sacramental abuse, in order that the evils that resulted might point a moral, and act as a solemn warning to Christians in relation to their own rites.

(3) 1 Corinthians 11 through 16:

The third section deals with certain errors and defects that had crept into the inner life and observances of the church, also with further matters on which the Corinthians sought guidance, namely, spiritual gifts and the collection for the saints.  1 Corinthians 11:1-16 has regard to the deportment of women and their veiling in church, a matter which seems to have occasioned some difficulty, and which Paul deals with in a manner quite his own; passing thereafter to treat of graver and more disorderly affairs, gross abuses in the form of gluttony and drunkenness at the Lord's Supper, which leads him, after severe censure, to make his classic reference to that sacred ordinance (verse 20 to end). Chapter 12 sets forth the diversity, yet true unity, of spiritual gifts, and the confusion and jealousy to which a false conception of them inevitably leads, obscuring that "most excellent way," the love which transcends them all, which never faileth, the greatest of the Christian graces, whose praise he chants in language of surpassing beauty (chapter 13). He strives also, in the following chapter, to correct the disorder arising from the abuse of the gift of tongues, many desiring to speak at once, and many speaking only a vain babble which no one could understand, thinking themselves thereby highly gifted. It is not edifying: "I had rather," he declares, "speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (14:19). Thereafter follows the immortal chapter on the resurrection, which he had learned that some denied (15:12). He anchors the faith to the resurrection of Christ as historic fact, abundantly attested (verses 3-8), shows how all-essential it is to the Christian hope (verses 13-19), and then proceeds by reasoning and analogy to brush aside certain naturalistic objections to the great doctrine, "then they that are Christ's, at his coming" (verse 23), when this mortal shall have put on immortality, and death be swallowed up in victory (verse 54). The closing chapter gives directions as to the collection for the saints in Jerusalem, on which his heart was deeply set, and in which he hoped the Corinthians would bear a worthy share. He promises to visit them, and even to tarry the winter with

them. He then makes a series of tender personal references, and so brings the great epistle to a close.

VII. DISTINGUISHING FEATURES.

It will be seen that there are passages in the epistle of great doctrinal and historical importance, especially with reference to the Person of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Eucharist and the Resurrection; also many that illuminate the nature of the religious meetings and services of the early church (compare particularly on these, Weizsacker, *Apos Age*, II, 246 ff). A lurid light is cast on many of the errors and evils that not unnaturally still clung to those who were just emerging from paganism, and much allowance has to be made for the Corinthian environment. The thoroughness with which the apostle pursues the difficulties raised into their relations and details, and the wide scope of matters which he subjects to Christian scrutiny and criterion, are also significant. Manifestly he regarded the gospel as come to fill, not a part, but the whole, of life; to supply principles that follow the believers to their homes, to the most secluded sanctum there, out again to the world, to the market-place, the place of amusement, of temptation, of service, of trial, of worship and prayer; and all in harmony with knowing nothing "save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." For Paul regards that not as a restriction, but as a large and expansive principle. He sets the cross on an eminence so high that its shadow covers the whole activities of human life.

1. Party Spirit:

Three broad outstanding features of a practical kind may be recognized. The first is the earnest warning it conveys against a factious spirit as inimical to the Christian life. The Corinthians were imbued with the party spirit of Greek democracy, and were infected also by the sporting spirit of the great games that entered so largely into their existence. They transferred these things to the church. They listened to their teachers with itching ears, not as men who wished to learn, but as partisans who sought occasion either to applaud or to condemn. Paul recognizes that, though they are not dividing on deep things of the faith, they are giving way to "schisms" of a pettier and perhaps even more perilous kind, that appeal to the lowest elements in human nature, that cause scandal in the eyes of men and inflict grievous wounds on the Body of Christ. In combating this spirit he takes occasion to go below the surface, and to reveal the foundations of true Christian unity. That must simply be "in Christ." And this is true even

if the divergence should be on higher and graver things. Any unity in such a case, still possible to cherish, must be a unity in Christ. None can be unchurched who build on Him; none severed from the true and catholic faith, who confess with their lips and testify with their lives that He is Lord.

2. Christian Conscience:

The epistle also renders a high ethical service in the rules it lays down for the guidance of the Christian conscience. In matters where the issue is clearly one of the great imperatives, the conflict need never be protracted. An earnest man will see his way. But beyond these, or not easily reducible to them, there are many matters that cause perplexity and doubt. Questions arise regarding things that do not seem to be wrong in themselves, yet whose abuse or the offense they give to others, may well cause debate. Meat offered to idols, and then brought to table, was a stumbling-block to many Corinthian Christians. They said: "If we eat, it is consenting to idolatry; we dare not partake." But there were some who rose to a higher level. They perceived that this was a groundless scruple, for an idol is nothing at all, and the meat is not affected by the superstition. Accordingly, their higher and more rational view gave them liberty and left their conscience free. But was this really all that they had to consider? Some say: "Certainly"; and Paul acknowledges that this is undoubtedly the law of individual freedom. But it is not the final answer. There has not entered into it a consideration of the mind of Christ. Christian liberty must be willing to subject itself to the law of love. Granted that a neighbor is often short-sighted and over-scrupulous, and that it would be good neither for him nor for others to suffer him to become a moral dictator; yet we are not quite relieved. The brother may be weak, but the very claim of his weakness may be strong. We may not ride over his scruples roughshod. To do so would be to put ourselves wrong even more seriously. And if the matter is one that is manifestly fraught with peril to him, conscience may be roused to say, as the apostle says: "Wherefore, if meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore."

3. Power of the Cross:

A third notable feature of the epistle is its exaltation of the cross of Christ as the power and wisdom of God unto salvation. It was the force that began to move and unsettle, to lift and change from its base, the life of that old heathen world. It was neither Paul, nor Apollos, nor Cephas who accomplished that colossal task, but the preaching of the crucified Christ.

The Christianity of Corinth and of Europe began with the gospel of Calvary and the open tomb. It can never with impunity draw away from these central facts. The river broadens and deepens as it flows, but it is never possible for it to sever itself from the living fountain from which it springs.

LITERATURE.

The following writers will be found most important and helpful:

1. On Matters of Introduction (Both Epistles):

Holtzmann, Weiss, Hausrath, Harnack, Pfleiderer, Godet, Weizsacker, Julicher, Zahn, Salmon, Knowling, McGiffert, J. H. Kennedy, Ramsay, Sabatier, Farrar, Dobschutz, Robertson (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)), Sanday (Encyclopaedia Biblica), Plummer (DB), Ropes (Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition).

2. Commentaries and Lectures (on 1 Corinthians or Both):

Meyer-Heinrici, Godet, T. C. Edwards, Hodge, Beet, Ellicott, Schmiedel (Hand-Comm.), Evans (Speakers' Commentary), Farrar (Pulpit Commentary), Lightfoot (chapters i through vii in Biblical Ess.), Lias (Cambridge Greek Testament), McFadyen, F. W. Robertson, Findlay (Expos. Greek Test.); and on 2 Corinthians alone: Kloppen, Waite (Speakers' Comm.), Denney (Expos. Bible), Bernard (Expos. Greek Test.).

3. Ancient Writers and Special Articles:

For ancient writers and special articles, the list at close of Plummer's article in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible should be consulted.

R. Dykes Shaw

CORINTHIANS, SECOND EPISTLE TO THE

I. TEXT, AUTHENTICITY AND DATE.

1. Internal Evidence:

Compare what has already been said in the preceding article. In the two important 5th-century uncials, Codex Alexandrinus

(A) and Codex Ephraemi (C), portions of the text are lacking. As to the genuineness internal evidence very vividly attests it. The distinctive elements of Pauline theology and eschatology, expressed in familiar Pauline terms, are manifest throughout. Yet the epistle is not doctrinal or didactic, but an intensely personal document. Its absorbing interest is in events which were profoundly agitating Paul and the Corinthians at the time, straining their relations to the point of rupture, and demanding strong action on Paul's part. Our imperfect knowledge of the circumstances necessarily hinders a complete comprehension, but the references to these events and to others in the personal history of the apostle are so natural, and so manifestly made in good faith, that no doubt rises in the reader's mind but that he is in the sphere of reality, and that the voice he hears is the voice of the man whose heart and nerves were being torn by the experiences through which he was passing. However scholars may differ as to the continuity and integrity of the text, there is no serious divergence among them in the opinion that all parts of the epistle are genuine writings of the apostle.

2. External Evidence:

Externally, the testimony of the sub-apostolic age, though not so frequent or precise as in the case of 1 Corinthians, is still sufficiently clear to establish the existence and use of the epistle in the 2nd century. Clement of Rome is silent when he might rather have been expected to use the epistle (compare Kennedy, Second and Third Corinthians, 142 ff); but it is quoted by Polycarp (Ad Phil., ii.4 and vi.1), and in the Epistle to Diognetus 5 12, while it is amply attested to by Irenaeus, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria.

3. Date:

It was written from Macedonia (probably from Philippi) either in the autumn of the same year as that in which 1 Corinthians was written, 54 or 55 AD, or in the autumn of the succeeding year.

II. RESUME OF EVENTS.

Great difficulty exists as to the circumstances in which the epistle was written, and as to the whole situation between 1 and 2 Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians Paul had intimated his intention of visiting the Corinthians and wintering with them, coming to them through Macedonia (16:5-7; compare

also ~~4492~~ Acts 19:21). In ~~4015~~ 2 Corinthians 1:15,16 he refers to a somewhat different plan, Corinth — Macedonia — Corinth — Judaea; and describes this return from Macedonia to Corinth as a second or double benefit. But if this plan, on which he and his friends had counted, had not been entirely carried out, it had been for good reason (1:17), and not due to mere fickleness or light-hearted change to suit his own convenience. It was because he would “spare” them (1:23), and not come to them “again with sorrow” (2:1). That is, he had been with them, but there had been such a profound disturbance in their relations that he dared not risk a return meantime; instead, he had written a letter to probe and test them, “out of much affliction and anguish of heart with many tears” (2:4). Thank God, this severe letter had accomplished its mission. It had produced sorrow among them (2:2; 7:8,9), but it had brought their hearts back to him with the old allegiance, with great clearing of themselves, and fear and longing and zeal (7:11). There was a period, however, of waiting for knowledge of this issue, which was to him a period of intense anxiety; he had even nervously regretted that he had written as he did (7:5-8). Titus, who had gone as his representative to Corinth, was to return with a report of how this severe letter had been received, and when Titus failed to meet him at Troas ~~4013~~ 2 Corinthians 2:13, he had “no relief for his spirit,” but pushed on eagerly to Macedonia to encounter him the sooner. Then came the answer, and the lifting of the intolerable burden from his mind. “He that comforteth the lowly, even God, comforted” him (7:6). The Corinthians had been swayed by a godly sorrow and repentance (7:8), and the sky had cleared again with almost un hoped-for brightness. One who had offended (2:5 and 7:12) — but whose offense is not distinctly specified — had been disciplined by the church; indeed, in the revulsion of feeling against him, and in sympathy for the apostle, he had been punished so heavily that there was a danger of passing to an extreme, and plunging him into despair (2:7). Paul accordingly pleads for leniency and forgiveness, lest further resentment should lead only to a further and sadder wrong (2:6-11). But in addition to this offender there were others, probably following in his train, who had carried on a relentless attack against the apostle both in his person and in his doctrine. He earnestly defends himself against their contemptuous charges of fleshliness and cowardice (chapter 10), and crafty venality (12:16,17). Another Jesus is preached, a different spirit, a different gospel (11:4). They “commend themselves” (10:12), but are false apostles, deceitful workers, ministers of Satan, fashioning themselves into ministers of Christ (11:13,14). Their attacks are vehemently repelled in an eloquent

apologia (chapters 11 and 12), and he declares that when he comes the third time they will not be spared (13:2). Titus, accompanied by other well-known brethren, is again to be the representative of the apostle ~~<486>~~2 Corinthians 8:6,17 ff. At no great interval Paul himself followed, thus making his third visit (12:14; 13:1), and so far fulfilled his original purpose that he spent the winter peacefully in Corinth (compare ~~<486>~~ Acts 20:2,3; ~~<6125>~~ Romans 15:25-27 and 16:23).

III. THE NEW SITUATION.

It is manifest that we are in the presence of a new and unexpected situation, whose development is not clearly defined, and concerning which we have elsewhere no source of information. To elucidate it, the chief points requiring attention are:

- (1) The references to the offender in 2 Corinthians 2 and 7, and to the false teachers, particularly in the later chapters of the ep.;
- (2) the painful visit implicitly referred to in 2:1; and
- (3) the letter described as written in tears and for a time regretted (2:4; 7:8).

1. The Offender:

The offender in ~~<486>~~1 Corinthians 5:1-5 had been guilty of incest, and Paul was grieved that the church of Corinth did not regard with horror a crime which even the pagan world would not have tolerated. His judgment on the case was uncompromising and the severest possible — that, in solemn assembly, in the name and with the power of the Lord Jesus, the church should deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh. On the other hand, the offender in ~~<486>~~2 Corinthians 2:5 ff is one who obviously has transgressed less heinously, and in a way more personal to the apostle. The church, roused by the apostle to show whether they indeed cared for him and stood by him (2:9; 13:7), had, by a majority, brought censure to bear on this man, and Paul now urged that matters should go no farther, lest an excess of discipline should really end in a triumph of Satan. It is not possible to regard such references as applying to the crime dealt with in 1 Corinthians. Purposely veiled as the statements are, it would yet appear that a personal attack had been made on the apostle; and the “many” in Corinth (~~<486>~~2 Corinthians 2:6), having at length espoused his cause, Paul then deals with the matter in the generous spirit he might have been

expected to display. Even if the offender were the same person, which is most improbable, for he can scarcely have been retained in the membership, the language is not language that could have been applied to the earlier case. There has been a new offense in new circumstances. The apostle had been grievously wronged in the presence of the church, and the Corinthians had not spontaneously resented the wrong. That is what wounded the apostle most deeply, and it is to secure their change in this respect that is his gravest concern.

2. The False Teachers:

Esp. in the later chapters of 2 Corinthians there are, as we have seen, descriptions of an opposition by false teachers that is far beyond anything met with in 1 Corinthians. There indeed we have a spirit of faction, associated with unworthy partiality toward individual preachers, but nothing to lead us to suspect the presence of deep and radical differences undermining the gospel. The general consensus of opinion is that this opposition was of a Judaizing type, organized and fostered by implacable anti-Pauline emissaries from Palestine, who now followed the track of the apostle in Achaia as they did in Galatia. As they arrogated to themselves a peculiar relation to Christ Himself (“Christ’s men” and “ministers of Christ,” ~~4700~~2 Corinthians 10:7; 11:13), it is possible that the Christus-party of 1 Corinthians (and possibly the Cephas-party) may have persisted and formed the nucleus round which these newcomers built up their formidable opposition. One man seems to have been conspicuous as their ring-leader (~~4700~~2 Corinthians 10:7,11), and to have made himself specially obnoxious to the apostle. In all probability we may take it that he was the offender of 2 Corinthians 2 and 7. Under his influence the opposition audaciously endeavored to destroy the gospel of grace by personal attacks upon its most distinguished exponent. Paul was denounced as an upstart and self-seeker, destitute of any apostolic authority, and derided for the contemptible appearance he made in person, in contrast with the swelling words and presumptuous claims of his epistles. It is clear, therefore, that a profound religious crisis had arisen among the Corinthians, and that there was a danger of their attachment to Paul and his doctrine being destroyed.

3. The Painful Visit:

~~4724~~2 Corinthians 12:14 and 13:1,2 speak of a third visit in immediate prospect, and the latter passage also refers to a second visit that had been already accomplished; while 2:1 distinctly implies that a visit had taken

place of a character so painful that the apostle would never venture to endure a similar one. As this cannot possibly refer to the first visit when the church was founded, and cannot easily be regarded as indicating anything previous to 1 Corinthians which never alludes to such an experience, we must conclude that the reference points to the interval between 1 and 2 Corinthians. It was then beyond doubt that the visit "with sorrow," which humbled him (12:21) and left such deep wounds, had actually taken place. "Any exegesis," says Weizsacker justly, "that would avoid the conclusion that Paul had already been twice in Corinth is capricious and artificial" (Apostolic Age, I, 343). Sabatier (Apostle Paul, 172 note) records his revised opinion: "The reference here (2:1) is to a second and quite recent visit, of which he retained a very sorrowful recollection, including it among the most bitter trials of his apostolic career."

4. The Severe Letter:

Paul not only speaks of a visit which had ended grievously, but also of a letter which he had written to deal with the painful circumstances, and as a kind of ultimatum to bring the whole matter to an issue (~~1~~ 2 Corinthians 2:4; 7:8). This letter was written because he could not trust himself meantime to another visit. He was so distressed and agitated that he wrote it "with many tears"; after it was written he repented of it; and until he knew its effect he endured torture so keen that he hastened to Macedonia to meet his messenger, Titus, halfway. It is impossible by any stretch of interpretation to refer this language to 1 Corinthians, which on the whole is dominated by a spirit of didactic calm, and by a consciousness of friendly rapport with its recipients. Even though there be in it occasional indications of strong feeling, there is certainly nothing that we can conceive the apostle might have wished to recall. The alternative has generally been to regard this as another case of a lost epistle. Just as the writer of Acts appears to have been willing that the deplorable visit itself should drop into oblivion, so doubtless neither Paul nor the Corinthians would be very anxious to preserve an epistle which echoed with the gusts and storms of such a visit. On the other hand a strong tendency has set in to regard this intermediate epistle as at least in part preserved in 2 Corinthians 10 through 13, whose tone, it is universally admitted, differs from that of the preceding chapters in a remarkable way, not easily accounted for. The majority of recent writers seem inclined to favor this view, which will naturally fall to be considered under the head of "Integrity."

IV. HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION.

In view of such an interpretation, we may with considerable probability trace the course of events in the interval between 1 and 2 Corinthians as follows: After the dispatch of 1 Corinthians, news reached the apostle of a disquieting character; probably both Titus and Timothy, on returning from Corinth, reported the growing menace of the opposition fostered by the Judaizing party. Paul felt impelled to pay an immediate visit, and found only too sadly that matters had not been overstated. The opposition was strong and full of effrontery, and the whole trend of things was against him. In face of the congregation he was baffled and flouted. He returned to Ephesus, and poured out his indignation in a severe epistle, which he sent on by the hands of Titus. Before Titus could return, events took a disastrous form in Ephesus, and Paul was forced to leave that city in peril of his life. He went to Troas, but, unable to wait patiently there for tidings of the issue in Corinth, he crossed to Macedonia, and met Titus, possibly in Philippi. The report was happily reassuring; the majority of the congregation returned to their old attachment, and the heavy cloud of doubt and anxiety was dispelled from the apostle's mind. He then wrote again — the present epistle — and forwarded it by Titus and other brethren, he himself following a little later, and finally wintering in Corinth as he had originally planned. If it be felt that the interval between spring and autumn of the same year is too brief for these events, the two epistles must be separated by a period of nearly 18 months, 1 Corinthians being referred to the spring of 54 or 55, and 2 Corinthians to the autumn of 55 or 56 AD. (Reference on the reconstruction should especially be made to Weizsacker's *Apostolic Age*, English translation, I; to Sabatier's *Note to the English edition* (1893) of his *Apostle Paul*; and to Robertson's article in *Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible* (five volumes).)

V. INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

Although the genuineness of the various parts of the epistle is scarcely disputed, the homogeneity is much debated. Semler and some later writers, including Clemen (*Einheitlichkeit*), have thought that 2 Corinthians 9 should be eliminated as logically inconsistent with chapter 8, and as evidently forming part of a letter to the converts of Achaia. But the connection with chapter 8 is too close to permit of severance, and the logical objection, founded on the phraseology of 9:1, is generally regarded

as hypercritical. There are two sections, however, whose right to remain integral parts of 2 Corinthians has been more forcibly challenged.

1. ~~4064~~2 Corinthians 6:14 through 7:1:

The passage ~~4064~~2 Corinthians 6:14 to 7:1 deals with the inconsistency and peril of intimate relations with the heathen, and is felt to be incongruous with the context. No doubt it comes strangely after an appeal to the Corinthians to show the apostle the same frankness and kindness that he is showing them; whereas 7:2 follows naturally and links itself closely to such an appeal. When we remember that the particular theme of the lost letter referred to in ~~4069~~1 Corinthians 5:9 was the relation of the converts to the immoral, it is by no means unlikely that we have here preserved a stray fragment of that epistle

2. ~~4700~~2 Corinthians 10:1 through 13:10:

It is universally acknowledged that there is a remarkable change in the tone of the section ~~4700~~2 Corinthians 10:1 through 13:10, as Compared with that of the previous chapters In the earlier chapters there is relief at the change which Titus has reported as having taken place in Corinth, and the spirit is one of gladness and content; but from chapter 10 onward the hostility to the apostle is unexpectedly represented as still raging, and as demanding the most strenuous treatment. The opening phrase, "Now I Paul" (10:1), is regarded as indicating a distinctive break from the previous section with which Timothy is associated (1:1), while the concluding verse, 13:11 to end, seem fittingly to close that section, but to be abruptly out of harmony with the polemic that ends at 13:10. Accordingly it is suggested that 13:11 should immediately follow 9:15, and that 10:1 through 13:10 be regarded as a lengthy insertion from some other epistle. Those who, while acknowledging the change of tone, yet maintain the integrity of the epistle, do so on the ground that the apostle was a man of many moods, and that it is characteristic of him to make unexpected and even violent transitions; that new reports of a merely scotched antagonism may come in to ruffle and disturb his comparative contentment; and that in any case he might well deem it advisable finally to deliver his whole soul on a matter over which he had brooded and suffered deeply, so that there might be no mistake about the ground being cleared when he arrived in person. The question is still a subject of keen discussion, and is not one on which it is easy to pronounce dogmatically. On the whole, however, it must be acknowledged that the preponderance of recent opinion is in favor of theory of interpolation. Hausrath (Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus an die

Korinther, 1870) gave an immense impetus to the view that this later section really represents the painful letter referred to in 2 Corinthians 2 and 7. As that earlier letter, however, must have contained references to the personal offender, the present section, which omits all such references, can be regarded as at most only a part of it. This theory is ably and minutely expounded by Schmiedel (Hand-Kommentar); and Pfeleiderer, Lipsius, Clemen, Krenkel, von Soden, McGiffert, Cone, Plummer, Rendall, Moffatt, Adeney, Peake, and Massie are prominent among its adherents. J. H. Kennedy (Second and Third Cor) presents perhaps the ablest and fullest argument for it that has yet appeared in English. On the other hand Sanday (Encyclopaedia Biblica) declares against it, and Robertson (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)) regards it as decidedly not proven; while critics of such weight as Holtzmann, Beyschlag, Klopfer, Weizsacker, Sabatier, Godet, Bernard, Denney, Weiss, and Zahn are all to be reckoned as advocates of the integrity of the epistle.

VI. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The order of matter in 2 Corinthians is quite clearly defined. There are three main divisions:

- (1) chapters 1 through 7;
- (2) chapters 8 through 9; and
- (3) chapters 10 through 13.

1. 2 Corinthians 1 through 7:

The first seven chapters in 2 Corinthians as a whole are taken up with a retrospect of the events that have recently transpired, joyful references to the fact that the clouds of grief in connection with them have been dispelled, and that the evangelical ministry as a Divine trust and power is clearly manifested. After a cordial salutation, in which Timothy is associated, Paul starts at once to express his profound gratitude to God for the great comfort that had come to him by the good news from Corinth, rejoicing in it as a spiritual enrichment that will make his ministry still more fruitful to the church (1:3-11). He professes his sincerity in all his relations with the Corinthians, and particularly vindicates it in connection with a change in the plan which had originally promised a return ("a second benefit") to Corinth; his sole reason for refraining, and for writing a painful letter instead, being his desire to spare them and to prove them (1:12;

2:4,9). Far from harboring any resentment against the man who had caused so much trouble, he sincerely pleads that his punishment by the majority should go no farther, but that forgiveness should now reign, lest the Adversary should gain an advantage over them (2:5-11). It was indeed an agonizing experience until the moment he met Titus, but the relief was all the sweeter and more triumphant when God at length gave it, as he might have been sure He would give it to a faithful and soul-winning servant of Christ (2:12-17). He does not indeed wish to enter upon any further apologies or self-commendation. Some believe greatly in letters of commendation, but his living testimonial is in his converts. This he has, not of himself, but entirely through God, who alone has made him an efficient minister of the new and abiding covenant of the Spirit, whose glory naturally excels that of the old dispensation which fadeth because it really cannot bring life. Regarding this glorious ministry he must be bold and frank. It needs no veil as if to conceal its evanescence. Christ presents it unveiled to all who turn to Him, and they themselves, reflecting His glory, are spiritually transformed (3:1-18). As for those who by God's mercy have received such a gospel ministry, it is impossible for them to be faint-hearted in its exercise, although the eyes of some may be blinded to it, because the god of this world enslaves them (4:4). It is indeed wonderful that ministers of this grace should be creatures so frail, so subject to pressure and affliction, but it is not inexplicable. So much the more obvious is it that all the power and glory of salvation are from God alone (4:7,15). Yea, even if one be called to die in this ministry, that is but another light and momentary affliction. It is but passing from a frail earthly tent to abide forever in a heavenly home (5:1). Who would not long for it, that this mortal may be swallowed up in immortality? Courage, therefore, is ours to the end, for that end only means the cessation of our separation from Christ, whom it is a joy to serve absent or present. And present we shall all ultimately be before Him on the judgment throne (5:10). That itself unspeakably deepens the earnestness with which preachers of the gospel seek to persuade men. It is the love of Christ constraining them (5:14) in the ministry of reconciliation, that they should entreat men as ambassadors on Christ's behalf (5:20). So sacred and responsible a trust has subdued the apostle's own life, and is indeed the key to its manifold endurance, and to the earnestness with which he has striven to cultivate every grace, and to submit himself to every discipline (6:1-10). Would God the Corinthians might open their hearts to him as he does to them! (Let them have no fellowship with iniquity, but perfect holiness in the fear of God, 6:14

through 7:1.) He has never wronged them; they are enshrined in his heart, living or dying; he glories in them, and is filled with comfort in all his affliction (6:11-13; 7:2-4). For what blessed comfort that was that Titus brought him in Macedonia to dispel his fears, and to show that the things he regretted and grieved to have written had done no harm after all, but had rather wrought in them the joyful change for which he longed! Now both they and he knew how dear he was to them. Titus, too, was overjoyed by the magnanimity of their reception of him. The apostle's cup is full, and "in everything he is of good courage concerning them" (2 Corinthians 7:16).

2. 2 Corinthians 8 through 9:

In the second section, 2 Corinthians 8 through 9, the apostle, now abundantly confident of their good-will, exhorts the Corinthians on the subject of the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. He tells them of the extraordinary liberality of the Macedonian churches, and invites them to emulate it, and by the display of this additional grace to make full proof of their love (8:1-8). Nay, they have a higher incentive than the liberality of Macedonia, even the self-sacrifice of Christ Himself (8:9). Wherefore let them go on with the good work they were so ready to initiate a year ago, giving out of a willing mind, as God hath enabled them (8:10-15). Further to encourage them he sends on Titus and other well-known and accredited brethren, whose interest in them is as great as his own, and he is hopeful that by their aid the matter will be completed, and all will rejoice when he comes, bringing with him probably some of those of Macedonia, to whom he has already been boasting of their zeal (8:16-9:5). Above all, let them remember that important issues are bound up with this grace of Christian liberality. It is impossible to reap bountifully, if we sow sparingly. Grudging and compulsory benevolence is a contradiction, but God loveth and rewardeth a cheerful giver. This grace blesseth him that gives and him that takes. Many great ends are served by it. The wants of the needy are supplied, men's hearts are drawn affectionately to one another, thanksgivings abound, and God himself is glorified (9:6-15).

3. 2 Corinthians 10 through 13:

The third section, 2 Corinthians 10 through 13, as has been pointed out, is a spirited and even passionate polemic, in the course of which the Judaizing party in Corinth is vigorously assailed. The enemies of the apostle have charged him with being very bold and courageous when he is absent, but

humble enough when he is present. He hopes the Corinthians will not compel him to show his courage (10:2). It is true, being human, he walks in the flesh, but not in the selfish and cowardly way his opponents suggest. The weapons of his warfare are not carnal, yet are they mighty before God to cast down such strongholds as theirs, such vain imaginations and disobedience. Some boast of being “Christ’s,” but that is no monopoly; he also is Christ’s. They think his letters are mere “sound and fury, signifying nothing”; by and by they will discover their mistake. If he should glory in his authority, he is justified, for Corinth was verily part of his God-appointed province, and he at least did not there enter on other men’s labors. But it would be well if men who gloried confined themselves to glorying “in the Lord.” For after all it is His commendation alone that is of any permanent value (10:3-18). Will the Corinthians bear with him in a little of this foolish boasting? Truly he ventures on it out of concern for them (11:2). And as they are manifest adepts in toleration, abounding in patience toward those who have come with a different gospel, they may perhaps extend some of their indulgence to him, for though he cannot lay claim to a polished oratory comparable to that of these “super-eminent” apostles, yet at least he is not behind them in knowledge (11:4-6). Can it be that he really sinned in preaching the gospel to them without fee or reward? Was it a mark of fleshly cunning when he resolved not to be burdensome to them, while he accepted supplies from Macedonia? Ah! it was not because he did not love them, but because he decided to give no occasion to those who were too ready to blame him — those false apostles, who, like Satan himself, masqueraded as angels of light and ministers of righteousness (11:7-15). Come, then, let him to this glorying, this poor folly, which they in their superlative wisdom bear with so gladly in the case of those insolent creatures who now bully and degrade them (11:16-21). Hebrews! Israelites! So is he. Ministers of Christ! There he excels them — in labors, in perils, in persecutions; in burdens, anxieties, sympathies; in visions and revelations of the Lord; in infirmities and weaknesses that have made more manifest in him the strength of Christ

~~47122~~ 2 Corinthians 11:22-12:10. Certainly all this is folly, but they are most to blame for it who, through lack of loyalty, have forced him to it. Did he injure them by declining to be burdensome? Is it so sore a point? Let it be forgiven! Yet when he comes again he will take no other course (12:11-18). They must not imagine that in all this he is excusing himself to them. He is sincerely and affectionately concerning himself for their edifying. He trembles lest when they meet again they should be disappointed in each

other; lest they should be found in unworthy strife and tumults, and lest he should be humbled of God before them, having cause to mourn over some who are hardened and impenitent in their sins (12:19-21). For they must meet again — he is coming for the third time — and this time he will not spare. Let them prove themselves whether they be in the faith; for surely they must know whether Christ be in them. He earnestly prays for their goodness and honor; not to the end that no display of his power may be called for, but simply that he will be glad to appear weak if they should appear strong. Could they but believe it, their perfecting is the aim of all his labors (13:1-10). And so, with words of grace and tenderness, exhorting them to unity and peace, and pronouncing over them the threefold benediction, he bids them farewell (13:11-4).

VII. VALUE OF THE EPISTLE.

The chief element of value in this epistle is the revelation it gives of the apostle himself. Through all its changing moods, Paul, in perfect abandon, shows us his very soul, suffering, rejoicing, enduring, overcoming. It has been truly said that “it enables us, as it were, to lay our hands upon his breast, and feel the very throbbings of his heart.”

(1) In relation to his converts, it shows us how sensitive he was, how easy it was to touch him on the quick, and to wound his feelings. The apostle was very human, and nowhere are his kindred limitations more obvious than in these present incidents. He would probably be the first to acquiesce, if it were said that even with him the creed was greater than the life. In the hastily written and nervously repented passages of that severe epistle; in the restless wandering, like a perturbed spirit, from Troas to Macedonia, to meet the news and know the issue of his acts, we see a man most lovable indeed, most like ourselves when issues hang in the balance, but a man not already perfect, not yet risen to the measure of the stature of Christ. Yet we see also the intensity with which Paul labored in his ministry — the tenacity with which he held to his mission, and the invincible courage with which he returned to the fight for his imperiled church. He loved those converts as only a great soul in Christ could love them. His keenest sorrow came in the disaster that threatened them, and he flew to their defense. He had not only won them for Christ, he was willing to die that he might keep them for Christ.

(2) The epistle is charged with a magnificent consciousness on the apostle's part of his high calling in Christ Jesus. He has been called with a Divine calling to the most glorious work in which a man can engage, to be to this estranged earth an ambassador of heaven. Received as Divine, this vocation is accepted with supreme devotion. It has been a ministry of sorrow, of strain and suffering, of hairbreadth escapes with the bare life; with its thorn in the flesh, its buffering of Satan. Yet through it all there rings the note of abounding consolation in Christ Jesus, and never was the "power of Christ," resting on frail humanity, more signally manifested.

LITERATURE.

See the references to both epistles, and to 2 Corinthians alone, under this heading in the preceding article. To the list there given should be added Moffatt's Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 1911; valuable for its critical presentation of recent views, and for its references to the literature.

R. Dykes Shaw

CORINTHUS

<ko-rin'-thus>: Latin form for Greek *Korinthos* in the subscription to Romans (the King James Version).

See CORINTH.

CORMORANT

<kor'-mo-rant> ([עִל נ; *shalakh*]; [καταράκτης, *kataraktes*]; Latin *Corvus marinus*): A large sea-fowl belonging to the genus *Phalacrocorax* and well described by the Hebrew word used to designate it — which means a "plunging bird." The bird appears as large as a goose when in full feather, but plucked, the body is much smaller. The adult birds are glossy black with bronze tints, touched with white on the cheeks and sides as a festal dress at mating season, and adorned with filamentary feathers on the head, and bright yellow gape. These birds if taken young and carefully trained can be sent into the water from boats and bring to their masters large quantities of good-sized fish: commonly so used in China. The flesh is dark, tough and quite unfit to eat in the elders on account of their diet of fish. The nest is built mostly of seaweed. The eggs are small for the size of

the birds, having a rough, thick, but rather soft shell of a bluish white which soon becomes soiled, as well as the nest and its immediate surroundings, from the habits of the birds. The young are leathery black, then covered with soft down of brownish black above and white beneath and taking on the full black of the grown bird at about three years. If taken in the squab state the young are said to be delicious food, resembling baked hare in flavor. The old birds are mentioned among the abominations for food (^{<B113>}Leviticus 11:13-19; ^{<B142>}Deuteronomy 14:12-18).

Gene Stratton-Porter

CORN

^{<korn>} ([^{gD}; *daghan*]; [^{σίτος}, *sitos*]): A word used for cereals generally (^{<0278>}Genesis 27:28,37, etc., the King James Version) much as our English word “corn.” the American Standard Revised Version almost invariably substitutes “grain” for “corn.” The latter may be taken to include

- (1) barley,
- (2) wheat,
- (3) fitches (vetches),
- (4) lentils,
- (5) beans,
- (6) millet,
- (7) rye — the wrong translation for vetches,
- (8) pulse — for all these see separate articles. Rye and oats are not cultivated in Palestine For many references to corn *see AGRICULTURE; FOOD*. “A corn [^{κόκκος}, *kokkos*], the Revised Version (British and American) “grain”] of wheat” is mentioned (^{<B124>}John 12:24).

CORNELIUS

^{<kor-ne'-li-us>} ([^{ορνήλιος}, *Kornelios*], “of a horn”): The story of Cornelius is given in ^{<400>}Acts 10:1 through 11:18.

1. HIS FAMILY AND STATION:

The name is Roman and belonged to distinguished families in the imperial

city, such as the Scipios and Sulla. Thus he was probably an Italian of Roman blood. Julian the Apostate reckons him as one of the few persons of distinction who became a Christian. He was evidently a man of importance in Caesarea and well known to the Jews (~~<4102>~~Acts 10:22). He was a centurion in the Italian cohort. To understand this we must note that the Roman army was divided into two broad divisions, the legions and the auxiliary forces.

See ARMY, ROMAN.

Legions were never permanently quartered in Palestine until the great war which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD. From the year 6 AD, when Palestine was made into province of the second rank, until 66 AD, it was garrisoned by auxiliary troops recruited amongst the Samaritans and Syrian Greeks. The headquarters were naturally at Caesarea, the residence of the procurator. But it would not have been prudent for a garrison in Palestine to be composed wholly of troops locally recruited. Therefore the Roman government mingled with the garrison 600 soldiers, free Italian volunteers. With this cohort Cornelius was connected as centurion.

2. HIS CHARACTER:

He is described as devout and God-fearing, i.e. at least, one of those men so numerous in that effete age of decadent heathenism who, discontented with polytheism, yearned for a better faith, embraced, therefore, the monotheism of the Jews, read the Scriptures, and practiced more or less of the Jewish rites. He was well reported of by the Jews, and his religion showed itself in prayer at the regular hours, and in alms to the people (of Israel). Even Jewish bigotry was dumb in presence of so noble a man. Moreover, he seems to have made his house a sort of church, for his kinsfolk and friends were in sympathy with him, and among the soldiers who closely attended him were some devout ones (~~<4101>~~Acts 10:1,27).

3. HIS ADMISSION INTO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH:

The story of his conversion and admission into the Christian church is told with some minuteness in Acts 10. Nothing further is known of Cornelius, though one tradition asserts that he founded the church in Caesarea, and another legend that he became the bishop of Scamandros.

4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INCIDENT:

The exact importance of the incident depends upon the position of Cornelius before it occurred. Certainly he was not a proselyte of the sanctuary, circumcised, under the law, a member of the Jewish communion. This is abundantly evident from ~~4418~~ Acts 10:28,34,45; 11:3,18; 15:7,14. But was he not an inferior form of proselyte, later called “proselytes of the gate”? This question has been much debated and is still under discussion. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 43) says that the expression, “God-fearing,” applied to him, is always used in Acts with reference to this kind of proselytes. Such were bound to observe certain regulations of purity, probably those, this author thinks, mentioned in ~~4459~~ Acts 15:29, and which stand in close relation to the principles laid down in Leviticus 17 through 18 for the conduct of strangers dwelling among Israel. Renan, on the other hand, denies that Cornelius was a proselyte at all, but simply a devout Gentile who adopted some of the Jewish ideas and religious customs which did not involve a special profession. The importance of the whole transaction to the development of the church seems to depend on the circumstance that Cornelius was probably not a proselyte at all. Thus we regard Cornelius as literally the first-fruits of the Gentiles. The step here taken by Peter was therefore one of tremendous importance to the whole development of the church. The significance of the incident consists exactly in this, that under Divine direction, the first Gentile, not at all belonging to the old theocracy, becomes a Spirit-filled Christian, entering through the front door of the Christian church without first going through the narrow gate of Judaism. The incident settled forever the great, fundamental question as to the relations of Jew and Gentile in the church. The difficulties in the way of the complete triumph of Peter’s view of the equality of Jews and Gentiles in the Kingdom of Christ were enormous. It would have been indeed little short of miraculous if the multitude of Christian Pharisees had not raised the question again and again. Did they not dog Paul’s steps after the Council? Certainly Ramsay is wrong in saying that the case of Cornelius was passed over or condoned as exceptional, for it was used as a precedent by both Peter and James (~~4459~~ Acts 15:7,14).

As for Peter’s subsequent conduct at Antioch, no one who knows Peter need be surprised at it. The very accusation that Paul hurled at him was that for the moment he was carried into inconsistency with his principles (*hypokrisis*). Of course, this incident of Cornelius was only the first step in

a long development; but the principle was forever settled. The rest in due time and proper order was sure to follow. By this tremendous innovation it was settled that Christianity was to be freed from the swaddling bands of Judaism and that the Christian church was not to be an appendix to the synagogue. The noble character of Cornelius was just fitted to abate, as far as possible, the prejudices of the Jewish Christians against what must have seemed to them a dangerous, if not awful, innovation.

G. H. Trever

CORNER

<kor'-ner> ([[אֶקְרִי, miqtsoa`], [haPepe'ah], [hNPi pinnah]; [ἀρχή, arche], [γωνία, gonia], [ἀκρογωνιαίος, akrogoniaios]): In ^{<1234>}Exodus 26:24; ^{<3412>}Ezekiel 41:22; 46:21,22, miqtsoa`, “angle” is translated “corner”; pe'ah, “side,” “quarter” and pinnah “corner,” “front,” “chief,” are more frequently so translated, e.g. ^{<2535>}Exodus 25:26; ^{<1810>}Leviticus 19:9; ^{<2406>}Jeremiah 9:26; 25:23; and ^{<1270>}Exodus 27:2; ^{<1073>}1 Kings 7:34; ^{<1832>}Psalms 118:22; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 28:16 (“corner-stone”); ^{<2513>}Jeremiah 51:26. Other words are kanaph, “wing” (^{<2112>}Isaiah 11:12; ^{<3070>}Ezekiel 7:2); katheph, “shoulder” (^{<2111>}2 Kings 11:11 the King James Version, twice); pa'am, “foot” (^{<1252>}Exodus 25:12 the King James Version); zawiyoth, “corner-stones” (^{<1842>}Psalms 144:12; ^{<3015>}Zechariah 9:15, translated “corners”).

For “corner” the Revised Version (British and American) has “side” (~~(235)~~ Exodus 36:25), “corner-stone” (~~(3004)~~ Zechariah 10:4), also for “stay” (~~(23913)~~ Isaiah 19:13); instead of “teacher removed into a corner” (~~(2370)~~ Isaiah 30:20), “be hidden,” “hide themselves”; for “corners” we have “feet” (~~(252)~~ Exodus 25:12; ~~(1073)~~ 1 Kings 7:30); “ribs” (~~(23004)~~ Exodus 30:4; 37:27); for “divide into corners” (~~(4002)~~ Nehemiah 9:22), “allot after their portions”; for “into corners” (~~(1525)~~ Deuteronomy 32:26), “afar”; the words to Israel (~~(23409)~~ Isaiah 41:9) “called thee from the chief men ‘*atsilim* thereof” are rendered by the Revised Version (British and American) “called thee from the corners thereof” (of the earth).

In the New Testament we have *gonia* (“angle,” “corner”), “in the corners of the streets” (⁴⁰⁶⁵Matthew 6:5), “the head of the corner” (⁴⁰⁴⁰Matthew 21:42), “the four corners of the earth” (⁴⁰⁰⁵Revelation 7:1; 20:8); *arche* (“a beginning”) (⁴⁰⁰¹Acts 10:11; 11:5); “chief corner stone” (⁴⁰²⁰Ephesians 2:20; ⁴⁰²⁶1 Peter 2:6), is a translation of *akrogoniaios* (“at the extreme angle”).

CORNER GATE

<kor'-ner gat>.

See *JERUSALEM*.

CORNERS OF THE EARTH

See *EARTH, CORNERS OF*.

CORNER-STONE

<kor'-ner ston> ([^hⁿ^p_i *pinnah*], [^t^y^w_z *zawith*]; [^ἀ^κ^ρ^ο^γ^ω^ν^ι^α^ι^ο^ς *akrogoniaios*]): Part of the public or imposing buildings, to which importance has been attached in all ages and in many nations, both on account of its actual service and its figurative meaning. Ordinarily its use in the Bible is figurative, or symbolical. No doubt the original meaning was some important stone, which was laid at the foundation of a building.

(1) With the Canaanites, who preceded Israel in the possession of Palestine, corner-stone laying seems to have been a most sacred and impressive ceremonial. Under this important stone of temples, or other great structures, bodies of children or older persons would be laid, consecrating the building by such human sacrifice (see *FORTIFICATION*, II, 1). This was one of many hideous rites and practices which Israel was to extirpate. It may throw light on the curse pronounced upon the rebuilding of Jericho (⁶⁶⁶Joshua 6:26; see PEFS, January, 1904, July, 1908).

See *CANAAN*.

(2) Old Testament references. — The Hebrew word *pinnah*, “corner,” is found or implied in every occurrence of this idea. Derived from a root signifying “to turn,” it means “turning,” and therefore “edge” or “corner.” Ordinarily it is used with ‘*ebhen*, “stone” (⁹⁸²Psalm 118:22); or it may occur alone, having acquired for itself through frequent use the whole technical phrase-idea (³⁰⁰⁴Zechariah 10:4 the King James Version).

FIGURATIVE USES:

While all the passages indicate the stone at the corner, there appear to be two conceptions:

(a) the foundation-stone upon which the structure rested (^{<1886>}Job 38:6; ^{<2386>}Isaiah 28:16; ^{<2626>}Jeremiah 51:26); or

(b) the topmost or cap-stone, which linked the last tier together (^{<1982>}Psalm 118:22; ^{<3007>}Zechariah 4:7); in both cases it is an important or key-stone, and figurative of the Messiah, who is “the First and the Last.” In ^{<1886>}Job 38:6 it beautifully expresses in figures the stability of the earth, which Yahweh created. In ^{<3004>}Zechariah 10:4 the leader or ruler in the Messianic age is represented by the corner-stone. The ancient tradition of the one missing stone, when the temple was in building, is reflected in or has been suggested by ^{<1982>}Psalm 118:22 (Midrash quoted by Pusey under ^{<3007>}Zechariah 4:7). It is probable that we should read in ^{<1942>}Psalm 144:12 not “corner-stones,” but “corner-pillars,” or supports (compare Greek Caryatides) from a different Hebrew word, *zawith*, Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, under the word

(3) New Testament passages. — ^{<1982>}Psalm 118:22 is quoted and interpreted as fulfilled in Jesus Christ in a number of passages: ^{<1142>}Matthew 21:42; ^{<1120>}Mark 12:10; ^{<2007>}Luke 20:17; ^{<4041>}Acts 4:11 and ^{<1017>}1 Peter 2:7; it is also the evident basis for ^{<4021>}Ephesians 2:20. ^{<2386>}Isaiah 28:16 is quoted twice in the New Testament: ^{<5023>}Romans 9:33, from Septuagint combined with the words of ^{<2384>}Isaiah 8:14, and in ^{<1016>}1 Peter 2:6, which is quoted with some variation from Septuagint. The Old Testament passages were understood by the rabbis to be Messianic, and were properly so applied by the New Testament writers.

See also **HOUSE**.

Edward Mack

CORNET

<kor'-net>.

See **MUSIC**.

CORNFLOOR

<korn'-flor> ([^gD; ^rḡogoren daghan]): “Thou hast loved a reward upon every cornfloor” (^{<3001>}Hosea 9:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “hire upon every grainfloor”). Israel had deserted Yahweh for supposed material benefits and regarded bounteous

crops as the gift of the heathen gods which they worshipped. Yahweh would therefore cause the corn (grain) and wine to fail (^{<300>}Hosea 9:2).

See also THRESHING-FLOOR.

CORONATION

^{<kor-o-na'-shun>} ([^{πρωτοκλισία}, *protoklisia*]): Occurs in 2 Macc 4:21 (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “enthronement”) where Apollonius was sent into Egypt for the coronation of Ptolemy Philometor as king. The Greek word *protoklisia* occurs nowhere else, and its meaning is uncertain. The reading in Swete is *protoklesia*, and this means “the first call.”

CORPSE

^{<korps>}: This word in the King James Version is the translations of two Hebrew words, [^{rgP}, *pegher*], and [^{hpWG}, *gewiyah*], while [^{hl bæ} *nebhelah*], and [^{hpWG} *guphah*], which mean the same, are translated “body,” with which the English word “corpse” (Latin, *corpus*) was originally synonymical. Therefore we find the now apparently unnecessary addition of the adjective “dead” in ^{<1298>}2 Kings 19:35 and ^{<2376>}Isaiah 37:36. The Greek equivalent is [^{πτῶμα}, *ptoma*], literally, “a fallen body,” “a ruin” (from [^{πίπτω}, *pipto*], “to fall”), in ^{<1069>}Mark 6:29; ^{<6108>}Revelation 11:8,9.

Corpses were considered as unclean and defiling in the Old Testament, so that priests were not to touch dead bodies except those of near kinsfolk (^{<9208>}Leviticus 21:1-3), the high priest and a Nazirite not even such (^{<9211>}Leviticus 21:11; ^{<0165>}Numbers 6:6-8). Numbers 19 presents to us the ceremonial of purification from such defilement by the sprinkling with the ashes of a red heifer, cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet.

It was considered a great calamity and disgrace to have one's body left unburied, a “food unto all birds of the heavens, and unto the beasts of the earth” (^{<5335>}Deuteronomy 28:26; ^{<1210>}2 Samuel 21:10; ^{<9712>}Psalms 79:2; ^{<2348>}Isaiah 34:3; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:33, etc.). Thence is explained the merit of Rizpah (^{<1210>}2 Samuel 21:10), and of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, who protected or recovered and buried the mutilated bodies of Saul and his sons (^{<0811>}1 Samuel 31:11-13; ^{<1004>}2 Samuel 2:4-7; compare ^{<1301>}1 Chronicles 10:11,12).

See BURIAL.

Even the corpses of persons executed by hanging were not to remain on the tree “all night,” “for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land which Yahweh thy God giveth thee for an inheritance” (^{<1923>}Deuteronomy 21:23).

H. L. E. Luering

CORRECTION

<ko-rek'-shun> ([^r^s^w^m, *mucar*], usually rendered “instruction,” is translated “correction” in several passages): The verb from which the noun is derived signifies “to instruct” or “chastise.” The idea of chastisement was very closely connected in the Hebrew mind with that of pedagogy. *See CHASTISEMENT.* the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have changed “correction” of the King James Version to “instruction” in ^{<3478>}Jeremiah 7:28, reversing the order in the margins. [^f^b^y^e^s^h^e^b^h^e^T], rendered “rod” in ^{<8209>}Job 21:9, is unnecessarily changed to “correction” in 37:13. In ^{<5816>}2 Timothy 3:16, [^ἐ^π^α^ν^ό^ρ^θ^ω^σ^ι^ς, *epanorthosis*], is translated “correction.” The difference between correction, discipline and instruction Was not clearly drawn in the Hebrew mind.

W. W. Davies

CORRUPTION

<ko-rup'-shun>: The Hebrew words [^t^j ^v^hⁱ, *mishchath*], [^t^j ^v^h” , *mashchath*], [^t^y^j ^v^h” , *mashchith*], and their Greek equivalents, [^φ^θ^ο^ρ^ά, *phthora*], and [^δ^ι^α^φ^θ^ο^ρ^ά, *diaphthora*], with numerous derivatives and cognate verbs, imply primarily physical degeneration and decay (^{<1874>}Job 17:14; ^{<4427>}Acts 2:27, etc.). The term [^t^j ” ^v” , *shachath*], which the King James Version translates with “corruption” in Jon 2:6, ought to be rendered “pit,” as in ^{<8109>}Psalms 30:9; 35:7 *et passim*, while *shachath beli* in ^{<2387>}Isaiah 38:17 means the “pit of nothingness,” i.e. of destruction. Figurative: At an early time we find the above-given words in a non-literal sense denoting moral depravity and corruption (^{<1061>}Genesis 6:11; ^{<12317>}Exodus 32:7; ^{<3019>}Hosea 9:9; ^{<4168>}Galatians 6:8, etc.), which ends in utter moral ruin and hopelessness, the second death. The question has been raised whether the meaning of these words might be extended so as to

include the idea of final destruction and annihilation of the spirit. Upon careful examination, however, this question must be denied both from the standpoint of the Old Testament and of the New Testament. Apart from other considerations we see this from the metaphors used in the Scriptures to illustrate the condition of “corruption,” such as the “unquenchable fire,” the “worm” which “dieth not” (~~4096~~ Mark 9:43,18; compare ~~2764~~ Isaiah 66:24), and “sleep” (~~2713~~ Daniel 12:2), where a careful distinction is made between the blissful state after death of the righteous and the everlasting disgrace of the godless. The later Jewish theology is also fully agreed on this point. The meaning of the words cannot therefore extend beyond the idea of utter moral degradation and depravity.

H. L. E. Luering

CORRUPTION, MOUNT OF

([*tyj iM" h" Arh" , har ha-mashchith*]; [*τὸ ὄρος τοῦ Μοσοάθ, to oros tou Mosoath*]): The hill on the right hand of which Solomon built high places for Ashtoreth, Chemosh and Milcom (~~12313~~ 2 Kings 23:13). The mountain referred to is no doubt the Mount of Olives. The high places would, therefore, be on the southern height called in later Christian writings the “Mount of Offence,” and now, by the Arabs, *Baten el-Hawa*. *Har ha-mashchith* is probably only a perversion of *har ha-mishchah*, “Mount of Anointing,” a later name of the Mount of Olives.

W. Ewing

COS

~~<kos>~~ ([*ῶς, Kos*], “summit”; the King James Version Coos): An island off the coast of Caria, Asia Minor, one of the Sporades, mountainous in the southern half, with ridges extending to a height of 2,500 ft.; identified with the modern Stanchio. It was famous in antiquity for excellent wine, amphorae, wheat, ointments, silk and other clothing (*Coae vestes*). The capital was also called Cos. It possessed a famous hospital and medical school, and was the birthplace of Hippocrates (the father of medicine), of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and of the celebrated painter Apelles. The large plane tree in the center of the town (over 2,000 years old) is called “the tree of Hippocrates” to this day. The older capital, Astypalaea, was in the western part of the island, the later (since 366 BC) in the eastern part. From almost every point can be seen beautiful landscapes and picturesque views of sea and land and mountain.

Cos was one of the six Dorian colonies. It soon became a flourishing place of commerce and industry; later, like Corinth, it was one of the Jewish centers of the Aegean, as well as one of the financial centers of the commercial world in the eastern Mediterranean. Among the benefactors of the people of Cos was Herod the Great. It is mentioned in connection with Paul's third missionary journey in ~~<ΠΙ>~~ Acts 21:1, and in its relations with the Jews in 1 Macc 15:23; Ant, XIV, vii, 2; x, 15; BJ, I, xxi. 11. For a list of works on the island see Paton-Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, ix.

J. E. Harry

COSAM

~~<ko'-sam>~~ ([~~ωσάμ~~, *Kosam*]): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy in the 5th generation before Zerubbabel (~~<ΠΙ>~~ Luke 3:28).

COSMOGONY

~~<koz-mog'-o-ni>~~.

See ANTHROPOLOGY; CREATION; EARTH; EVOLUTION; WORLD.

COSMOLOGY

~~<koz-mol'-o-ji>~~.

See WORLD; PROVIDENCE.

COSTLINESS

~~<kost'-li-nes>~~ ([~~τιμιότης~~, *timiotes*], "preciousness," "an abundance of costly things"): Found only in ~~<ΠΙ>~~ Revelation 18:19, "made rich by reason of her costliness."

COTES

~~<kots>~~.

See SHEEPCOTE.

COTTAGE

~~<kot'-aj>~~.

See *HOUSE*.

COTTON

<*kot'-'-n*> ([*SP" rK"* , *karpac*] is the better translation, as in the Revised Version, margin, where the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have “green” in Est 1:6): The Hebrew *karpac* is from the Persian *kirpas* and the Sanskrit *karpasa*, “the cotton plant.” The derived words originally meant “muslin” or “calico,” but in classical times the use of words allied to *karpac* — in Greek and Latin — was extended to include linen. The probability is in favor of “cotton” in Est 1:6. This is the product of *Gossypium herbaceum*, a plant originally from India but now cultivated in many other lands.

COUCH

<*kouch*> (substantive.).

See *BED*.

Couch (verb): [*6b" r*; *rabhats*], “to crouch,” “lurk,” as a beast in readiness to spring on its prey. “If thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door” (~~Q047~~Genesis 4:7, the King James Version “lieth”), waiting for it to open. Cain is warned to beware of the first temptations to evil, in his case especially a sullen and jealous disposition (compare Dante, *Inferno*, I, 30). See *ABEL*; *CAIN*. The tribe of Judah is compared for its bravery to a recumbent lion or lioness (~~Q049~~Genesis 49:9; compare ~~Q049~~Numbers 24:9 f); and Issachar to “a strong ass, couching down between the sheepfolds” (~~Q044~~Genesis 49:14, the King James Version “between two burdens”; compare ~~Q0516~~Judges 5:16). “The deep that coucheth beneath” (~~Q5313~~Deuteronomy 33:13), probably the springs of water, or possibly, as Driver suggests, “the subterranean deep, pictured as a gigantic monster.”

See *ABYSS*.

M. O. Evans

COUCHING-PLACE

<*kouch'-ing-plas*> ([*6Beḥ"* , *marbets*]; once in English Versions of the Bible, ~~Q335~~Ezekiel 25:5): The same Hebrew word, however, which means simply “place of lying down” of animals in repose, is used also in

<4025> Zephaniah 2:15 where the translation is “a place to lie down in.” The figure, a common one in Scripture (see besides, <3170> Isaiah 17:2; 27:10), suggests desolation.

COULTER

<kol'-ter>.

See *PLOW*.

COUNCIL; COUNCILLOR

<koun'-sil>, <koun'-siler> ([συμβούλιον, *sumboulion*): An assembly of advisers (<4052> Acts 25:12); a body of those taking counsel (see Schurer's *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, I (1), 60). Distinguished from [συνέδριον, *sunedrion*], the supreme court of the Jews, by being of a less formal character, i.e. less of an institution. For “council” in the latter sense, its most frequent use, see *SANHEDRIN*. A councilor (Greek *bouleutes*) was a member of the Sanhedrin. Applied to Joseph of Arimathea (<4153> Mark 15:43; <4270> Luke 23:50). In the King James Version “counsellor.”

COUNSEL; COUNSELLOR

<koun'-sel>, <koun'-seler> ([συμβούλιον, *sumboulion*): Ordinarily found as object of verb “to take” or “to give,” expressing, beside the idea of a practical end to be reached, that of consultation and deliberation among those united in a common cause (<4024> Matthew 12:14; <4006> Mark 3:6). A counselor (*sumboulos*) is a confidential adviser (<5134> Romans 11:34); often in the Old Testament (<3106> Isaiah 9:6; <3146> Proverbs 24:6, etc.). Confounded in the King James Version with “councillor” (see above), the latter being an official adviser, which the former does not necessarily mean.

COUNT

<kount> ([rp" s; *caphar*], [hnm; *manah*]; [ηφίζω, *psephizo*): Used of arithmetical computation “to number” (<3908> Psalm 139:18; <4230> Numbers 23:10); also for [bt" K; *kathabh*], “to reckon,” to indicate classification among or identification with, “count for a stranger” (<3895> Job 19:15); “count for his enemy” (<3330> Job 33:10). In the New Testament the arithmetical computation is less prominent, except in the sense of “calculate,” *psephizo*, *sumpsephizo*, “to reckon with pebbles,” each pebble representing a unit (<4143> Luke 14:28; <4499> Acts 19:19); of moral estimate, *hegeomai* and

logizomai (^{<1017>}Philippians 3:7,13). The noun, from Hebrew [kacath], “a count of” (^{<1014>}Exodus 12:4), namely, in the arithmetical sense.

H. E. Jacobs

COUNTENANCE

<koun'-te-nans>:

(1) The noun (see also under the word FACE) is the translation of a variety of Hebrew and Greek expressions, [μῦνP; *panim*]; [πρόσωπον, *prosopon*], being the most frequent. Besides these there are found [harḥ" , *mar'eh*], “appearance,” “shape,” “comeliness,” “visage,” [ʾyī" , *'ayin*], “the eye,” [ra" T, to'ar], “appearance,” “figure,” etc., and Aramaic [wyzi *ziw*]. To the Oriental the countenance mirrors, even more than to us, the character and feelings of the heart. The countenance (*mar'eh*) is “fair” (^{<1017>}1 Samuel 17:42; ^{<1047>}2 Samuel 14:27; ^{<2015>}Daniel 1:15); in ^{<1012>}1 Samuel 16:12, literally, “fair of eyes”; “comely” (Song 2:14); “beautiful” (*to'ar*, ^{<1028>}1 Samuel 25:3); “cheerful” (*panim*, ^{<1053>}Proverbs 15:13); “angry” (^{<1053>}Proverbs 15:23); “fierce” (^{<2083>}Daniel 8:23); “troubled” (^{<1075>}Ezekiel 27:35); “sad” (^{<1018>}1 Samuel 1:18; ^{<1012>}Nehemiah 2:2,3; ^{<2008>}Ecclesiastes 7:3). The countenance is “sharpened” i.e. made keen (^{<1077>}Proverbs 27:17); it “falls,” i.e. looks despondent, disappointed (^{<1045>}Genesis 4:5,6); is “cast down” (^{<1024>}Job 29:24); “changed” (^{<1041>}Job 14:20; compare “altered” into glory, ^{<1012>}Luke 9:29; ^{<2086>}Daniel 5:6,9,10; 7:28, Aramaic *ziw*). To settle one’s countenance stedfastly upon a person (^{<1081>}2 Kings 8:11) is synonymous with staring or gazing at a person. Not infrequently we find compound expressions such as “light of countenance,” i.e. favor (^{<1024>}Job 29:24; ^{<1046>}Psalms 4:6; 44:3; 89:15; 90:8); health of countenance” (^{<1041>}Psalms 41:11; 43:5); “help of countenance” (^{<1046>}Psalms 42:5); “rebuke of countenance” (^{<1046>}Psalms 80:16); “pride of countenance” (Hebrew *'aph*, literally, “haughty,” “lofty nose,” ^{<1008>}Psalms 10:4).

(2) As verb (Hebrew [rd" h; *hadhar*], “to countenance”) we find the word in the King James Version of ^{<1023>}Exodus 23:3, where the Revisers translate “Neither shalt thou favor (the King James Version “countenance”) a poor man in his cause.” Here the meaning seems to be that no distinction of persons shall be made by the judge. See ^{<1045>}Leviticus 19:15, where, however, a different word is used. There is therefore no need of the emendation proposed by Knobel and accepted by Kautzsch, who would

read [l dḡ gadhol], “great,” for [l dḡ wedhal], “and the poor” of the text. The Septuagint has [πένης, *penes*], “poor.”

H. L. E. Luering

COUNTER-CHARM

<koun'-ter-charm>.

See *AMULET*; *CHARM*.

COUNTERFEIT

<koun'-ter-fit> ([κίβδηλος, *kibdelos*], [ἀνατυπόω, *anatupoo*], [ὁμοίωω, *homoioo*]): “Counterfeit” occurs as the translation of *kibdelos*, “mixed with dross,” “not genuine” (The Wisdom of Solomon 15:9, “to make counterfeit things,” the Revised Version (British and American) “mouldeth counterfeits,” spurious things, imitations”); 2:16 the Revised Version (British and American) “base metal” (compare Septuagint ^{<619>}Leviticus 19:19; ^{<621>}Deuteronomy 22:11, “mingled garment,” and ^{<715>}2 Corinthians 13:5,6, *adokimos*, “reprobate” (silver)). “Counterfeit” in the older sense of a representation occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 14:17 (*anatupoo*, “to make a likeness”), “counterfeit of his visage,” the Revised Version (British and American) “imagining the likeness from afar,” and Ecclesiasticus 38:27 (*homoioo*, “to make like”), “to counterfeit imagery,” the Revised Version (British and American) “to preserve likeness in his portraiture.”

W. L. Walker

COUNTERVAIL

<koun-ter-val> ([hwy; *shawah*], “equalize”): To thwart or overcome by acting against with equal force; thus, “The enemy could not countervail the king’s damage” or loss (Est 7:4 the American Standard Revised Version reads “The adversary could not have compensated for the king’s damage”). “Nothing doth countervail (the Revised Version (British and American) “can be taken in exchange for”) a faithful friend” (Ecclesiasticus 6:15).

COUNTRY

<kun'-tri> ([ῥα, *erets*], “land,” [hdḡ; *sadheh*], “field”; [ἀγρός, *agros*], “field,” [χώρα, *chora*], “region”): The foregoing are the principal words

rendered “country” in English Versions of the Bible, though we find also ‘*adhamah*, “earth” (Jon 4:2); ‘*i*, “island” (^{<2470>}Jeremiah 47:4 the King James Version); *gelilah*, “circuit” (^{<2608>}Ezekiel 47:8 the King James Version); *chebbhel*, “rope” (^{<1814>}Deuteronomy 3:14); *maqom*, “place” (^{<1226>}Genesis 29:26 the King James Version); *nepheth*, “hill” or “height” (^{<1671>}Joshua 17:11 the King James Version); *genos*, “race” (^{<4086>}Acts 4:36 the King James Version); [γῆ, *ge*], “earth” (^{<4081>}Matthew 9:31 the King James Version; ^{<4078>}Acts 7:3 the King James Version); [πατρίς, *patris*], “native land” (^{<1023>}Luke 4:23; ^{<1044>}John 4:44; ^{<8114>}Hebrews 11:14); [περίχωρος, *perichoros*], “country (the American Standard Revised Version “region”) round about” (^{<4435>}Matthew 14:35; ^{<4037>}Luke 3:3; 4:37; 8:37). In ^{<8114>}Hebrews 11:14 ff, “heaven” is referred to as a country. Egypt and Assyria were “far countries” (^{<2489>}Jeremiah 8:19 the King James Version; ^{<3009>}Zechariah 10:9). The hill country (compare the numerous Gibeahs (*gibh`ah*, “a hill”)) was the mountainous region to the North or to the South of Jerusalem. The low country, *shephelah* (see **SHEPHELAH**), consisted of the foothills to the west of the hill country. The south country or NEGEB (*neghebh*), which see, was the dry, extreme southern part of Palestine, approximately between Beersheba and Kadesh-barnea.

Alfred Ely Day

COUNTRYMAN

<*kun'-tri-man*> ([συμφυλέτης, *sumphuletes*): “Of the same tribe” (^{<5724>}1 Thessalonians 2:14); also in idiomatic rendering ([γένος, *genos*]) for those of one’s own race or kin (^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 11:26; ^{<1014>}Galatians 1:14 the King James Version, “one’s own nation”). Compare ^{<4004>}Mark 6:4; ^{<1003>}Romans 9:3; and see COUSIN; KINSMAN, etc.

COUPLE

<*kup'-l*>:

- (1) Used as a noun, indicates two objects of the same kind that are considered together. Thus we read of a couple of cakes (^{<1036>}2 Samuel 13:6, used loosely), and a couple of asses (^{<1060>}2 Samuel 16:1, Hebrew *tsemedh*).
- (2) Used as a verb, it means to join or fasten one thing to another. This term occurs most frequently in the description of the tabernacle (see ^{<1226>}Exodus 26:6,9,11; 36:10,13,16). Couple is used in ^{<4012>}1 Peter 3:2 to describe the joining of fear to chaste behavior (Hebrew *chabhar*).

COUPLING

<*kup'ling*>: Is the FV rendering of [trBj ם" , *machbereth*]. This Hebrew word means joining, or the place where one thing is joined to another, as of the curtains of the tabernacle (^{<1234>}Exodus 26:4,5), and of the different parts of the ephod (^{<1237>}Exodus 28:27; 39:20).

It is also the English Versions of the Bible rendering of [t/rBj " m] *mechabberoth*], and this refers more to the thing that joins the two objects, as beams of wood (^{<4341>}2 Chronicles 34:11), or hooks of iron (^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 22:3).

COURAGE

<*kur'-aj*>: Hebrew *chazaq*, “to show oneself strong” (^{<1433>}Numbers 13:20; ^{<1002>}2 Samuel 10:12; ^{<3593>}1 Chronicles 19:13; ^{<4458>}2 Chronicles 15:8; ^{<5104>}Ezra 10:4; ^{<1974>}Psalms 27:14; 31:24; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 41:6); *ruach*, “spirit,” “animus” (^{<1021>}Joshua 2:11 the King James Version); *amats*, “to be alert” (physically and mentally), “to be agile,” “quick,” “energetic” (^{<1506>}Deuteronomy 31:6,7,23; ^{<1006>}Joshua 1:6,9,18; 10:25; ^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 22:13; 28:20); *lebhabh*, “the heart,” and figuratively, “person,” “spirit” (^{<2125>}Daniel 11:25); Greek *tharsos*, “cheer” (^{<4085>}Acts 28:15). A virtue highly esteemed among all nations, one of the four chief “natural” (cardinal) virtues (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:7), while cowardice ranks as one of the mortal sins (Ecclesiasticus 2:12,13; ^{<6208>}Revelation 21:8).

COURSE

<*kors*> (from Latin *cursus*, “a running,” “race,” “voyage,” “way”):

(1) [εὐθυδρομέω, *euthudromeo*], “forward or onward movement,” as of a ship: “We made a straight course” (^{<4461>}Acts 16:11; compare ^{<420>}Acts 21:1); “We had finished our course.” (the Revised Version (British and American) “voyage,” ^{<4207>}Acts 21:7).

(2) A (prescribed or self-appointed) path, as of the sun: “Swift is the sun in his course” (1 Esdras 4:34); of the stars: “The stars in their courses fought against Sisera” (^{<1031>}Judges 5:20 the King James Version) (*see* ASTRONOMY; ASTROLOGY); of a river (or irrigating canal?): “as willows by the watercourses” (^{<2344>}Isaiah 44:4); of a race ([τρέχω, *trecho*] “that the word of the Lord may have free course.” (the Revised Version (British and American) “may run”) (^{<5000>}2 Thessalonians 3:1).

(3) A career in such a course ([~~<δρόμος>~~, *dromos*): “I have finished my (the Revised Version (British and American) “the”) course” (~~<2 Timothy 4:7>~~); “as John fulfilled (the Revised Version (British and American) “was fulfilling”) his course” (~~<4135>~~ Acts 13:25); “that I might finish (the Revised Version (British and American) “may accomplish”) my course” (~~<414>~~ Acts 20:24).

(4) A way or manner, as of life: “Every one turned to his course” (~~<2486>~~ Jeremiah 8:6); “their course is evil” (~~<2230>~~ Jeremiah 23:10); “walked according to the course [~~<αἰών>~~, *aion*], the Revised Version, margin “age”] of this world” (~~<4012>~~ Ephesians 2:2).

(5) Orderly succession: “sang together by course” (the American Standard Revised Version “sang one to another”) (~~<15815>~~ Ezra 3:11); “by course” (the Revised Version (British and American) “in turn”) (~~<6427>~~ 1 Corinthians 14:27); the courses of the priests and Levites (~~<1370>~~ 1 Chronicles 27:1-15; ~~<1380>~~ 1 Chronicles 28:1; ~~<4451>~~ 2 Chronicles 5:11; ~~<4006>~~ Luke 1:5,8).

See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

(6) A row or layer, as of masonry: “All the foundations of the earth are out of count” (the Revised Version (British and American) “are moved”; the American Standard Revised Version “are shaken”) (~~<1835>~~ Psalm 82:5).

(7) (The tongue) “setteth on fire the course (the Revised Version (British and American) “wheel”) of nature” (~~<5006>~~ James 3:6). The cycle of generation ([*ton trochon tes geneseos*]) here means the physical world as constituted by the round of origin and decay, and typified by the Orphic (legendary) cycle of births and deaths through which the soul passes in metempsychosis.

See also GAMES.

William Arthur Heidel

COURSE OF PRIESTS AND LEVITES

See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

COURT

~~<kort>~~.

See HOUSE.

COURT OF THE GENTILES

See TEMPLE (HEROD'S).

COURT OF THE SABBATH

See COVERED WAY.

COURT, OF THE SANCTUARY; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE

<kort>, *<sank'2, -tu-a-ri>*: By “court” ([*rx̣ɛ̃*; *chatser*]) is meant a clear space enclosed by curtains or walls, or surrounded by buildings. It was always an uncovered enclosure, but might have within its area one or more edifices.

1. THE TABERNACLE:

The first occurrence of the word is in ^{<1279>}Exodus 27:9, where it is commanded to “make the court of the tabernacle.” The dimensions for this follow in the directions for the length of the linen curtains which were to enclose it. From these we learn that the perimeter of the court was 300 cubits, and that it consisted of two squares, each 75 ft., lying East and West of one another. In the westerly square stood the tabernacle, while in that to the East was the altar of burnt offering. This was the worshipper’s square, and every Hebrew who passed through the entrance gate had immediate access to the altar (compare W. Robertson Smith, note on ^{<1276>}Exodus 20:26, Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 435). The admission to this scene of the national solemnities was by the great east gate described in ^{<12713>}Exodus 27:13-16 (*see EAST GATE*).

2. SOLOMON’S TEMPLE:

The fundamental conception out of which grew the resolve to build a temple for the worship of Yahweh was that the new structure was to be an enlarged duplicate in stone of the tent of meeting (*see TEMPLE*). The doubling in size of the holy chambers was accompanied by a doubling of the enclosed area upon which the holy house was to stand. Hitherto a rectangular oblong figure of 150 ft. in length and 75 ft. in breadth had sufficed for the needs of the people in their worship. Now an area of 300 ft. in length and 150 ft. in breadth was enclosed within heavy stone walls,

making, as before, two squares, each of 150 ft. This was that “court of the priests” spoken of in ~~<4049>~~2 Chronicles 4:9, known to its builders as “the inner court” (~~<1065>~~1 Kings 6:36; compare ~~<2830>~~Jeremiah 36:10). Its walls consisted of “three courses of hewn stone, and a course of cedar beams” (~~<1065>~~1 Kings 6:36), into which some read the meaning of colonnades. Its two divisions may have been marked by some fence. The innermost division, accessible only to the priests, was the site of the new temple. In the easterly division stood the altar of sacrifice; into this the Hebrew laity had access for worship at the altar. Later incidental allusions imply the existence of “chambers” in the court, and also the accessibility of the laity (compare ~~<2834>~~Jeremiah 35:4; 36:10; ~~<3086>~~Ezekiel 8:16).

3. THE GREAT COURT:

In distinction from this “inner” court a second or “outer” court was built by Solomon, spoken of by the Chronicler as “the great court” (~~<4049>~~2 Chronicles 4:9). Its doors were overlaid with brass (bronze). Wide difference of opinion obtains as to the relation of this outer court to the inner court just described, and to the rest of the Solomonic buildings — particularly to “the great court” of “the house of the forest of Lebanon” of ~~<1009>~~1 Kings 7:9,10. Some identify the two, others separate them. Did this court, with its brass-covered gates, extend still farther to the East than the temple “inner” court, with, however, the same breadth as the latter? Or was it, as Keil thinks, a much larger enclosure, surrounding the whole temple area, extending perhaps 150 cubits eastward in front of the priests’ court (compare Keil, Biblical Archaeology, I, 171, English translation)? Yet more radical is the view, adopted by many modern authorities, which regards “the great court” as a vast enclosure surrounding the temple and the whole complex of buildings described in ~~<1070>~~1 Kings 7:1-12 (see the plan, after Stade, in G. A. Smith’s Jerusalem, II, 59). In the absence of conclusive data the question must be left undetermined.

4. EZEKIEL’S TEMPLE:

In Ezekiel’s plan of the temple yet to be built, the lines of the temple courts as he had known them in Jerusalem are followed. Two squares enclosed in stone walling, each of 150 ft., lie North and South of one another, and bear the distinctive names, “the inner court” and “the outer court” (~~<3086>~~Ezekiel 8:16; 10:5).

5. TEMPLE OF HEROD:

In the Herodian temple the old nomenclature gives place to a new set of terms. The extensive enclosure known later as “the court of the Gentiles” does not appear under that name in the New Testament or in Josephus. What we have in the tract *Middoth* of the Mishna and in Josephus is the mention of two courts, the “court of the priests” and “the court of Israel” (*Middoth*, ii.6; v. 1; Josephus, BJ, V, v, 6). The data in regard to both are difficult and conflicting. In *Middoth* they appear as long narrow strips of 11 cubits in breadth extending at right angles to the temple and the altar across the enclosure — the “court of Israel” being railed off from the “court of the priests” on the East; the latter extending backward as far as the altar, which has a distinct measurement. The design was to prevent the too near approach of the lay Israelite to the altar. Josephus makes the 11 cubits of the “court of Israel” extend round the whole “court of the priests,” inclusive of altar and temple (*see* TEMPLE; and compare G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 506-9, with the reconstruction of Waterhouse in Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 111 ff). For the “women’s court,” *see* TREASURY.

Many expressions in the Psalms show how great was the attachment of the devout-minded Hebrew in all ages to those courts of the Lord’s house where he was accustomed to worship (e.g. ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 65:4; 84:2; 92:13; 96:8; 100:4; 116:19). The courts were the scene of many historical events in the Old Testament and New Testament, and of much of the earthly ministry of Jesus. There was enacted the scene described in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican (~~Luke~~ Luke 18:10-14).

W. Shaw Caldecott

COURTS, JUDICIAL

<joo-dish’-al>, <ju-dish’-al>.

1. THEIR ORGANIZATION:

At the advice of Jethro, Moses appointed judges ([*pyfɪv*], *shopheTim*], Exodus 18). In Egypt it appears that the Hebrews did not have their own judges, which, of course, was a source of many wrongs. Leaving Egypt, Moses took the judicial functions upon himself, but it was impossible that he should be equal to the task of administering justice to two and one-half million people; hence, he proceeded to organize a system of jurisprudence. He appointed judges over tens, fifties, hundreds, thousands — in all 78,600

judges. This system was adequate for the occasion, and these courts respectively corresponded practically to our Justices of the Peace, Mayor's Court, District Court, Circuit Court. Finally, there was a Supreme Court under Moses and his successors. These courts, though graded, did not afford an opportunity of appeal. The lower courts turned their difficult cases over to the next higher. If the case was simple, the judge over tens would take it, but if the question was too intricate for him, he would refer it to the next higher court, and so on until it finally reached Moses. There were certain kinds of questions which the tens, fifties, and hundreds would not take at all, and the people understood it and would bring them to the higher courts for original jurisdiction. When any court decided it, that was the end of that case, for it could not be appealed (^{<0285>}Exodus 18:25,26). On taking possession in Palestine, the judges were to be appointed for every city and vicinity (^{<0668>}Deuteronomy 16:18), thus giving to all Israel a speedy and cheap method of adjudication. Though not so prescribed by the constitution, the judges at length were generally chosen from among the Levites, as the learned class. The office was elective. Josephus states this plainly, and various passages of the Scriptures express it positively by inference (see ^{<0813>}Deuteronomy 1:13). Jephthah's election by vote of the people is clearly set forth (^{<0716>}Judges 11:5-11).

2. CHARACTER OF THE JUDGES:

Among the Hebrews, the law was held very sacred; for God Himself had given it. Hence, those who administered the law were God's special representatives, and their person was held correspondingly sacred. These circumstances placed upon them the duty of administering justice without respect to persons (^{<0817>}Deuteronomy 1:17; 16:18). They were to be guided by the inalienable rights granted to every citizen by the Hebrew constitution:

- (1) No man was to be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law (^{<0819>}Numbers 35:9-34).
- (2) Two or three witnesses were required to convict anyone of crime (^{<0676>}Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:2-13).
- (3) Punishment for crime was not to be transferred or entailed (^{<0246>}Deuteronomy 24:16).
- (4) A man's home was inviolate (^{<0240>}Deuteronomy 24:10,11).

(5) One held to bondage but having acquired liberty through his own effort should be protected (^{<R235>}Deuteronomy 23:15,16).

(6) One's homestead was inalienable (^{<R233>}Leviticus 25:23-28,34).

(7) Slavery could not be made perpetual without the person's own consent (^{<D20>}Exodus 21:2-6).

3. THEIR WORK:

Gradually a legal profession developed among the Hebrews, the members of which were designated as "Lawyers" or "Scribes" also known as "Doctors of the Law" (^{<D24>}Luke 2:46). Their business was threefold:

(1) to study and interpret the law;

(2) to instruct the Hebrew youth in the law; and

(3) to decide questions of the law. The first two they did as scholars and teachers; the last either as judges or as advisers in some court, as, for instance, the Senate of Jerusalem or some inferior tribunal. No code can go into such details as to eliminate the necessity of subsequent legislation, and this usually, to a great extent, takes the form of judicial decisions founded on the code, rather than of separate enactment; and so it was among the Hebrews. The provisions of their code were for the most part quite general, thus affording large scope for casuistic interpretation. Regarding the points not explicitly covered by the written law, a substitute must be found either in the form of established custom or in the form of an inference drawn from the statute.

As a result of the industry with which this line of legal development was pursued during the centuries immediately preceding our era, Hebrew law became a most complicated science. For the disputed points, the judgments of the individual lawyers could not be taken as the standard; hence, the several disciples of the law must frequently meet for a discussion, and the opinion of the majority then prevailed. These were the meetings of the "Doctors." Whenever a case arose concerning which there had been no clear legal decision, the question was referred to the nearest lawyer; by him, to the nearest company of lawyers, perhaps the Sanhedrin, and the resultant decision was henceforth authority.

Before the destruction of Jerusalem technical knowledge of the law was not a condition of eligibility to the office of judge. Anyone who could

command the confidence of his fellow-citizens might be elected, and many of the rural courts undoubtedly were conducted, as among us, by men of sterling quality, but limited knowledge. Such men would avail themselves of the legal advice of any “doctor” who might be within reach; and in the more dignified courts of a large municipality it was a standing custom to have a company of lawyers present to discuss and decide any new law points that might arise. Of course, frequently these men were themselves elected to the office of judge, so that practically the entire system of jurisprudence was in their hands.

4. LIMITATIONS UNDER ROMAN RULE:

Though Judea at this time was a subject commonwealth, yet the Sanhedrin, which was the body of supreme legislative and judicial authority, exercised autonomous authority to such an extent that it not only administered civil cases in accordance with Jewish law — for without such a right a Jewish court would be impossible — but it also took part to a great extent in the punishment of crime. It exercised an independent police power, hence, could send out its own officers to make arrests (~~1357~~ Matthew 26:47; ~~4148~~ Mark 14:43; ~~4018~~ Acts 4:3; 5:17,18). In cases that did not involve capital punishment, its judgments were final and untrammelled (~~4002~~ Acts 4:2-23; 5:21-40). Only in capital punishment cases must the consent of the procurator be secured, which is not only clearly stated in ~~6181~~ John 18:31, but is also evident in the entire course of Christ’s trial, as reported by the Synoptic Gospels. In granting or withholding his consent in such cases, the procurator could follow his pleasure absolutely, applying either the Jewish or Roman law, as his guide. In one class of cases the right to inflict capital punishment even on Roman citizens was granted the Sanhedrin, namely, when a non-Jewish person overstepped the bounds and entered the interior holy place of the temple. Even in this case the consent of the procurator must be secured, but it appears that the Roman rulers were inclined to let the law take its course against such wanton outrage of the Jews’ feelings. Criminal cases not involving capital punishment need not be referred to the procurator.

5. TIME AND PLACE OF SESSIONS:

The city in which the Sanhedrin met was Jerusalem. To determine the particular building, and the spot on which the building stood, is interesting to the archaeologist, not to the student of law. The local courts usually held their sessions on the second and fifth day (Monday and Thursday) of

the week, but we do not know whether the same custom was observed by the Great Sanhedrin. On feast days no court was held, much less on the Sabbath. Since the death penalty was not to be pronounced until the day after the trial, such cases were avoided also on the day preceding a Sabbath or other sacred day. The emphasis placed on this observance may be seen from the edicts issued by Augustus, absolving the Jews from the duty of attending court on the Sabbath.

See DOCTOR; LAWYER; SANHEDRIN; SCRIBE.

Frank E. Hirsch

COUSIN

<kuz'-n> ([**ἀνε** **ιός**, *anepsios*): Only in ^{<SIOH>}Colossians 4:10, where Mark is said to be “cousin” (Revised Version) to Barnabas, and not as in the King James Version, “sister’s son.” The renderings “cousin” of the King James Version for [**συγγενής**, *suggenes*], in ^{<DOCS>}Luke 1:36,58 were probably understood at the time of the translation, in the wider, and not in the more restricted, sense of the term, now almost universally prevalent. In view of this the renderings “kinswoman,” “kinsfolk” in the Revised Version (British and American) are preferable. As a title of honor and dignity, it occurs in 1 Esdras 4:42, etc.

See KINSMAN.

COUTHA

<kou'-tha>, <koo'-tha>.

See CUTHAH.

COVENANT, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

<kuv'-e-nant> ([**tyrB**] *berith*):

I. GENERAL MEANING.

The etymological force of the Hebrew *berith* is not entirely certain. It is probable that the word is the same as the Assyrian *biritu*, which has the common meaning “fetter,” but also means “covenant.” The significance of the root from which this Assyrian word is derived is uncertain. It is probable that it is “to bind,” but that is not definitely established. The

meaning of *biritu* as covenant seems to come directly from the root, rather than as a derived meaning from *fetter*. If this root idea is to bind, the covenant is that which binds together the parties. This, at any rate, is in harmony with the general meaning of the word.

In the Old Testament the word has an ordinary use, when both parties are men, and a distinctly religious use, between God and men. There can be no doubt that the religious use has come from the ordinary, in harmony with the general custom in such cases, and not the reverse. There are also two shades of meaning, somewhat distinct, of the Hebrew word: one in which it is properly a covenant, i.e. a solemn mutual agreement, the other in which it is more a command, i.e. instead of an obligation voluntarily assumed, it is an obligation imposed by a superior upon an inferior. This latter meaning, however, has clearly been derived from the other. It is easy to see that an agreement, including as the contracting parties those of unequal position, might readily include those agreements which tended to partake of the nature of a command; but the process could not readily be reversed.

II. AMONG MEN.

1. *Early Idea:*

We consider first a covenant in which both contracting parties are men. In essence a covenant is an agreement, but an agreement of a solemn and binding force. The early Semitic idea of a covenant was doubtless that which prevailed among the Arabs (see especially W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 2nd edition, *passim*). This was primarily blood-brotherhood, in which two men became brothers by drinking each other's blood. Ordinarily this meant that one was adopted into the clan of the other. Hence, this act involved the clan of one of the contracting parties, and also brought the other party into relation with the god of this clan, by bringing him into the community life of the clan, which included its god. In this early idea, then, "primarily the covenant is not a special engagement to this or that particular effect, but bond of troth and life-fellowship to all the effects for which kinsmen are permanently bound together" (W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, 315 f). In this early ceremonial the religious idea was necessarily present, because the god was kindred to the clan; and the god had a special interest in the covenant because he especially protects the kindred blood, of which the stranger thus becomes a part. This religious side always persisted, although the original idea was much modified. In

later usage there were various substitutes for the drinking of each other's blood, namely, drinking together the sacrificial blood, sprinkling it upon the parties, eating together the sacrificial meal, etc.; but the same idea found expression in all, the community of life resulting from the covenant.

2. Principal Elements:

The covenant in the Old Testament shows considerable modification from the early idea. Yet it will doubtless help in understanding the Old Testament covenant to keep in mind the early idea and form. Combining statements made in different accounts, the following seem to be the principal elements in a covenant between men. Some of the details, it is to be noted, are not explicitly stated in reference to these covenants, but may be inferred from those between God and men.

- (1) A statement of the terms agreed upon (^{<0259>}Genesis 26:29; 31:50,52). This was a modification of the earlier idea, which has been noted, in which a covenant was all-inclusive.
- (2) An oath by each party to observe the terms, God being witness of the oath (^{<0258>}Genesis 26:31; 31:48-53). The oath was such a characteristic feature that sometimes the term "oath" is used as the equivalent of covenant (see ^{<0273>}Ezekiel 17:13).
- (3) A curse invoked by each one upon himself in case disregard of the agreement. In a sense this may be considered a part of the oath, adding emphasis to it. This curse is not explicitly stated in the case of human covenants, but may be inferred from the covenant with God (^{<0275>}Deuteronomy 27:15-26).
- (4) The formal ratification of the covenant by some solemn external act. The different ceremonies for this purpose, such as have already been mentioned, are to be regarded as the later equivalents of the early act of drinking each other's blood. In the Old Testament accounts it is not certain that such formal act is expressly mentioned in relation to covenants between men. It seems probable, however, that the sacrificial meal of ^{<0354>}Genesis 31:54 included Laban, in which case it was a covenant sacrifice. In any case, both sacrificial meal and sprinkling of blood upon the two parties, the altar representing Yahweh, are mentioned in ^{<0248>}Exodus 24:4-8, with allusions elsewhere, in ratification of the covenant at Sinai between Yahweh and Israel. In the covenant of God with Abraham is another ceremony, quite certainly

with the same purpose. This is a peculiar observance, namely, the cutting of animals into two parts and passing between the severed portions (^{<0159>}Genesis 15:9-18), a custom also referred to in ^{<0418>}Jeremiah 34:18. Here it is to be noted that it is a smoking furnace and a flaming torch, representing God, not Abraham, which passed between the pieces. Such an act, it would seem, should be shared by both parties, but in this case it is doubtless to be explained by the fact that the covenant is principally a promise by Yahweh. He is the one who binds Himself. Concerning the significance of this act there is difference of opinion. A common view is that it is in effect a formal expression of the curse, imprecating upon oneself the same, i.e. cutting in pieces, if one breaks the terms of the covenant. But, as W. R. Smith has pointed out (op. cit., 481), this does not explain the passing between the pieces, which is the characteristic feature of the ceremony. It seems rather to be a symbol that the two parties “were taken within the mystical life of the victim.” (Compare the interpretation of ^{<0345>}Hebrews 9:15-17 in *COVENANT, THE NEW TESTAMENT*.) It would then be an inheritance from the early times, in which the victim was regarded as kindred with the tribe, and hence, also an equivalent of the drinking of each other’s blood.

The immutability of a covenant is everywhere assumed, at least theoretically.

Other features beyond those mentioned cannot be considered as fundamental. This is the case with the setting up of a stone, or raising a heap of stones (^{<0154>}Genesis 31:45,46). This is doubtless simply an ancient custom, which has no direct connection with the covenant, but comes from the ancient Semitic idea of the sacredness of single stones or heaps of stones. Striking hands is a general expression of an agreement made (^{<0509>}Ezra 10:19; ^{<0718>}Ezekiel 17:18, etc.).

3. Different Varieties:

In observing different varieties of agreements among men, we note that they may be either between individuals or between larger units, such as tribes and nations. In a great majority of cases, however, they are between the larger units. In some cases, also, when an individual acts it is in a representative capacity, as the head of a clan, or as a king. When the covenant is between tribes it is thus a treaty or alliance. The following passages have this use of covenant: ^{<0143>}Genesis 14:13; 21:27,32; 26:28;

31:44; <0232> Exodus 23:32; 34:12,15; <0802> Deuteronomy 7:2; <0906> Joshua 9:6,7,11,15,16; <0902> Judges 2:2; <0910> 1 Samuel 11:1; <1052> 1 Kings 3:12; 15:19 parallel <1468> 2 Chronicles 16:3; <1284> 1 Kings 20:34; <0805> Psalm 83:5; <0308> Isaiah 33:8; <0366> Ezekiel 16:61; 17:13-19; 30:5; <0712> Daniel 11:22; Amos 1:9. In other cases it is between a king and his subjects, when it is more a command or ordinance, as <1082> 2 Samuel 3:12,13,11; 5:3 parallel <1308> 1 Chronicles 11:3; <0808> Jeremiah 34:8-18; <0927> Daniel 9:27. In other cases it is between individuals, or between small groups, where it is an agreement or pledge (<1204> 2 Kings 11:4 parallel <0201> 2 Chronicles 23:1; <0805> Job 31:1; 41:4; <0304> Hosea 10:4). Between David and Jonathan it is more specifically an alliance of friendship (<0988> 1 Samuel 18:3; 20:8; 23:18), as also apparently in <0950> Psalm 55:20. It means an alliance of marriage in <0024> Malachi 2:14, but probably not in <0127> Proverbs 2:17, where it is better to understand the meaning as being “her covenant with God.”

4. Phraseology Used:

In all cases of covenants between men, except <0840> Jeremiah 34:10 and <0927> Daniel 9:27, the technical phrase for making a covenant is *karath berith*, in which *karath* meant originally “to cut.” Everything indicates that this verb is used with reference to the formal ceremony of ratification above mentioned, of cutting animals in pieces.

III. BETWEEN GOD AND MEN.

1. Essential Idea:

As already noted, the idea of covenants between God and men doubtless arose from the idea of covenants between men. Hence, the general thought is similar. It cannot in this case, however, be an agreement between contracting parties who stand on an equality, but God, the superior, always takes the initiative. To some extent, however, varying in different cases, is regarded as a mutual agreement; God with His commands makes certain promises, and men agree to keep the commands, or, at any rate, the promises are conditioned on human obedience. In general, the covenant of God with men is a Divine ordinance, with signs and pledges on God’s part, and with promises for human obedience and penalties for disobedience, which ordinance is accepted by men. In one passage (<0254> Psalm 25:14), it is used in a more general way of an alliance of friendship between God and man.

2. Covenants Recorded in the Old Testament:

A covenant of this general kind is said in the Old Testament to have been made by God with Noah (^{<0009>}Genesis 9:9-17 and elsewhere). In this the promise is that there shall be no more deluge. A covenant is made with Abraham, the thought of which includes his descendants. In this the promise of God is to multiply the descendants of Abraham, to give them the land of Canaan, and to make them a blessing to the nations. This is narrated in ^{<0158>}Genesis 15:18; 17:2-21, etc. A covenant is made with the nation Israel at Sinai (Horeb) (^{<0205>}Exodus 19:5; 24:7,8; 34:10,27,28, etc.), ratified by a covenant sacrifice and sprinkling of blood (^{<0244>}Exodus 24:4-8). This constituted the nation the peculiar people of God, and was accompanied by promises for obedience and penalties for disobedience. This covenant was renewed on the plains of Moab (^{<0305>}Deuteronomy 29:1). In these national covenants the individual had a place, but only as a member of the nation. The individual might forfeit his rights under the covenant, however, by deliberate rebellion against Yahweh, sinning “with a high hand” (^{<0450>}Numbers 15:30 f), and then he was regarded as no longer a member of the nation, he was “cut off from among his people,” i.e. put to death. This is the teaching of the Priestly Code (P), and is also implied elsewhere; in the mercy of God, however, the punishment was not always inflicted. A covenant with the tribe of Levi, by which that became the priestly tribe, is alluded to in ^{<0500>}Deuteronomy 33:9; ^{<0520>}Jeremiah 33:21; ^{<0540>}Malachi 2:4 ff. The covenant with Phinehas (^{<0552>}Numbers 25:12,13) established an everlasting priesthood in his line. The covenant with Joshua and Israel (Joshua 24) was an agreement on their part to serve Yahweh only. The covenant with David (2 Samuel 7 parallel 1 Chronicles 17; see also ^{<0580>}Psalms 89:3,18,34,39; 132:12; ^{<0620>}Jeremiah 33:21) contained a promise that his descendants should have an everlasting kingdom, and should stand to God in the relation of sonship. The covenant with Jehoiada and the people (^{<0717>}2 Kings 11:17 parallel ^{<0723>}2 Chronicles 23:3) was an agreement on their part to be the people of Yahweh. The covenant with Hezekiah and the people (^{<0790>}2 Chronicles 29:10) consisted essentially of an agreement on their part to reform the worship; the covenant with Josiah and the people (^{<0813>}2 Kings 23:3), of an agreement on their part to obey the Book of the Law. The covenant with Ezra and the people (^{<0810>}Ezra 10:3) was an agreement on their part to put away foreign wives and obey the law. The prophets also speak of a new covenant, most explicitly in Jeremiah, but with references elsewhere, which is connected with the

Messianic time (see ^{<306>}Isaiah 42:6; 49:8; 55:3; 59:21; 61:8; ^{<303>}Jeremiah 31:31,33; 32:40; 50:5; ^{<300>}Ezekiel 16:60,62; 20:37; 34:25; 37:26; ^{<308>}Hosea 2:18).

3. Phraseology Used:

Various phrases are used of the making of a covenant between God and men. The verb ordinarily used of making covenants between men, *karath*, is often used here as well. The following verbs are also used: *heqim*, "to establish" or "confirm"; *nathan*, "to give"; *sim*, "to place"; *tsiwwah*, "to command"; *`abhar*, "to pass over," followed by *be*, "into"; *bo*, "to enter," followed by *be*; and the phrase *nasa' berith `al pi*, "to take up a covenant upon the mouth of someone."

4. History of Covenant Idea:

The history of the covenant idea in Israel, as between God and man, is not altogether easy to trace. This applies especially to the great covenants between God and Israel, namely, the one with Abraham, and the one made at Sinai. The earliest references to this relation of Israel to Yahweh under the term "covenant" are in ^{<307>}Hosea 6:7; 8:1. The interpretation of the former passage is doubtful in details, but the reference to such a covenant seems clear. The latter is considered by many a

later addition, but largely because of this mention of the covenant. No other references to such a covenant are made in the prophets before Jeremiah. Jeremiah and Ezekiel speak of it, and it is implied in Second-Isaiah. It is a curious fact, however, that most of the later prophets do not use the term, which suggests that the omission in the earlier prophets is not very significant concerning a knowledge of the idea in early times.

In this connection it should be noted that there is some variation among the Hexateuchal codes in their treatment of the covenants. Only one point, however, needs special mention. The Priestly Code (P) gives no explicit account of the covenant at Sinai, and puts large emphasis upon the covenant with Abraham. There are, however, apparent allusions to the Sinaitic covenant (^{<302>}Leviticus 2:13; 24:8; 26:9,15,25,44,45). The facts indicate, therefore, principally a difference of emphasis.

In the light partly of the facts already noted, however, it is held by many that the covenant idea between God and man is comparatively late. This view is that there were no covenants with Abraham and at Sinai, but that in

Israel's early conceptions of the relation to Yahweh He was their tribal God, bound by natural ties, not ethical as the covenant implies. This is a larger question than at first appears. Really the whole problem of the relation of Israel to Yahweh throughout Old Testament history is involved, in particular the question at what time a comprehensive conception of the ethical character of God was developed. The subject will therefore naturally receive a fuller treatment in other articles. It is perhaps sufficient here to express the conviction that there was a very considerable conception of the ethical character of Yahweh in the early history of Israel, and that consequently there is no sufficient reason for doubting the fact of the covenants with Abraham and at Sinai. The statement of W. Robertson Smith expresses the essence of the matter (op. cit., 319): "That Yahweh's relation is not natural but ethical is the doctrine of the prophets, and is emphasized, in dependence on their teaching, in the Book of Deuteronomy. But the passages cited show that the idea had its foundation in pre prophetic times; and indeed the prophets, though they give it fresh and powerful application, plainly do not regard the conception as an innovation."

A little further consideration should be given to the new covenant of the prophets. The general teaching is that the covenant was broken by the sins of the people which led to the exile. Hence, during the exile the people had been cast off, the covenant was no longer in force. This is stated, using other terminology, in ~~30RB~~ Hosea 3:3 f; 1:9; 2:2. The prophets speak, however, in anticipation, of the making of a covenant again after the return from the exile. For the most part, in the passages already cited, this covenant is spoken of as if it were the old one renewed. Special emphasis is put, however, upon its being an everlasting covenant, as the old one did not prove to be, implying that it will not be broken as was that one. Jeremiah's teaching, however, has a little different emphasis. He speaks of the old covenant as passed away (31:32). Accordingly he speaks of a new covenant (31:31,33). This new covenant in its provisions, however, is much like the old. But there is a new emphasis upon individuality in approach to God. In the old covenant, as already noted, it was the nation as a whole that entered into the relation; here it is the individual, and the law is to be written upon the individual heart.

In the later usage the specific covenant idea is sometimes less prominent, so that the term is used practically of the religion as a whole; see ~~250H~~ Isaiah 56:4; ~~19A3B~~ Psalm 103:18.

LITERATURE.

Valeton, ZATW, XII, XIII (1892-93); Candlish, The Expositor Times, 1892, Oct., Nov.; Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Altes Testament, Marburg, 1896; articles "Covenant" in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) and Encyclopedia Biblica.

George Ricker Berry

COVENANT, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

[Διαθήκη, *Diatheke*], was the word chosen by the Septuagint translators to render the Hebrew *berith*, and it appears thus nearly 300 times in the Greek Old Testament in the sense of covenant, while *suntheke* and *entolai* are each used once only. The choice of this word seems to have been occasioned by a recognition that the covenant which God makes with men is not fully mutual as would be implied in *suntheke*, the Greek word commonly used for covenant (although not a New Testament word), while at the same time the rarity of wills among the Jews made the common sense of *diatheke* relatively unfamiliar. The Apocryphal writers also frequently use the same word in the same sense and no other.

In the New Testament *diatheke* is used some thirty times in a way which makes it plain that its translation must be "covenant." In ~~<ABES>~~ Galatians 3:15 and ~~<SDIS>~~ Hebrews 9:15-17 it is held by many that the sense of covenant must be set aside in favor of will or testament. But in the former passage it can be taken in the sense of a disposition of affairs or arrangement made by God, a conception in substantial harmony with its regular New Testament use and with the sense of *berith*. In the passage in Hebrews the interpretation is more difficult, but as it is acknowledged on all hands that the passage loses all argumentative force if the meaning testament is accepted, it seems best to retain the meaning covenant if possible. To do this it is only necessary to hold that the death spoken of is the death of the animal sometimes, if not, indeed, commonly slain in connection with the making of a covenant, and that in the mind of the author this death symbolized the death of the contracting parties so far at least as to pledge them that thereafter in the matter involved they would no more change their minds than can the dead. If this view is taken, this passage falls in line with the otherwise invariable use of the word *diatheke* by Jewish Hellenists.

See TESTAMENT.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, *Commentary on Gal*; Ramsay, *Commentary on Gal*; Westcott, *Commentary on Hebrews*; article on ^{<8095>}Hebrews 9:15-17, *Baptist Review and The Expositor.*, July, 1904.

David Foster Estes

COVENANT, ARK OF THE

^{<kuv'-e-nant>}, ^{<kuv'-e-nant>}.

See **ARK OF THE COVENANT**.

COVENANT OF SALT

^{<solt>} ([j l " m, tyrB] *berith melach*); [αλας, *halas*], classical Greek [αλς, *hals*): As salt was regarded as a necessary ingredient of the daily food, and so of all sacrifices offered to Yahweh (^{<8023>}Leviticus 2:13), it became an easy step to the very close connection between salt and covenant-making. When men ate together they became friends. Compare the Arabic expression, "There is salt between us"; "He has eaten of my salt," which means partaking of hospitality which cemented friendship; compare "eat the salt of the palace" (^{<19044>}Ezra 4:14). Covenants were generally confirmed by sacrificial meals and salt was always present. Since, too, salt is a preservative, it would easily become symbolic of an enduring covenant. So offerings to Yahweh were to be by a statute forever, "a covenant of salt for ever before Yahweh" (^{<0489>}Numbers 18:19). David received his kingdom forever from Yahweh by a "covenant of salt" (^{<4035>}2 Chronicles 13:5). In the light of these conceptions the remark of our Lord becomes the more significant: "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another" (^{<0020>}Mark 9:50).

Edward Bagby Pollard

COVENANT, THE BOOK OF THE

([tyrBh" rpsēceph *ha-berith*):

The name given in ^{<0247>}Exodus 24:7 to a code or collection of laws found in the preceding chapters, 20 through 23, as the terms of the covenant made with Yahweh, and given for Israel's guidance until a more complete legislation should be provided. In this covenant between Yahweh and

Israel, Moses served as mediator; animals were sacrificed, the blood thus shed being also called “the blood of the covenant” (*dam haberith*, ^{<0248>}Exodus 24:8).

1. HISTORICAL CONNECTION:

This brief book of laws occupies a fitting and dearly marked place in the Pentateuchal collection. Examination of the historical context shows that it is put where it belongs and belongs where it is put. A few months after the Exodus (^{<0290>}Exodus 19:1) Israel arrived at Sinai. Immediately at the command which Moses had received from Yahweh in the Mount, they prepared themselves by a ceremonial of sanctification for entrance into covenant relation with Yahweh. When the great day arrived for making this covenant, Moses in the midst of impressive natural phenomena went again to meet Yahweh in the top of the mountain. On his return (^{<0225>}Exodus 19:25), the words of the law, or the terms of the covenant, were declared to the people, and accepted by them. The first part of these covenant-terms, namely, the Decalogue (^{<0210>}Exodus 20:2-17), was spoken by the Divine voice, or its declaration was accompanied by awe-inspiring natural convulsions (^{<0208>}Exodus 20:18). Therefore in response to the pleadings of the terrified people Moses went up again into the mountain and received from Yahweh for them the rest of the “words” and “ordinances” (^{<0243>}Exodus 24:3); and these constitute the so-called Book of the Covenant (^{<0212>}Exodus 20:22 through 23). In this direct and unequivocal manner the narrator connected the book with the nation’s consecration at Sinai. The prophets regarded the making of the Sinaitic covenant as the marriage of Israel and Yahweh, and these laws were the terms mutually agreed upon in the marriage contract.

2. ANALYSIS:

While it is not possible to arrange the materials of this document into hard-and-fast divisions, the following analysis may be suggestive and serviceable:

- (1) directions concerning worship, specifying prohibition of images and the form of altar for animal sacrifices (^{<0213>}Exodus 20:23-26);
- (2) ordinances for protection of Hebrew slaves, including betrothal, for a price, of daughter (^{<0209>}Exodus 21:2-11);

(3) laws concerning injuries,

(a) to man by man (^{<1212>}Exodus 21:12-27),

(b) to man by beast (^{<1218>}Exodus 21:28-32),

(c) to beast by man (^{<1213>}Exodus 21:33,14),

(d) to beast by beast (^{<1215>}Exodus 21:35,36);

(4) concerning theft (^{<1216>}Exodus 22:1-4);

(5) concerning damage to a neighbor's property, including violence to his daughter (^{<1215>}Exodus 22:5-17);

(6) sundry laws against profaning Yahweh's name, under which are included proper worship, avoidance of oppression and dutiful offering of first-fruits (^{<1218>}Exodus 22:18-31);

(7) against various forms of injustice and unbrotherliness (^{<1216>}Exodus 23:1-9);

(8) festal occasions, including the Sabbatical year and the three annual feasts: unleavened bread, first-fruits and ingathering (^{<1210>}Exodus 23:10-17);

(9) warning against certain wrong practices in their sacrifices (^{<1218>}Exodus 23:18,19);

(10) in conclusion, a promise of God's continual presence with them in the person of His Angel, and the consequent triumph over enemies (^{<1230>}Exodus 23:20-33).

3. CRITICAL THEORIES:

In this legislation are found two forms of laws or deliverances:

(1) the ordinances (*mishpaTim*), which deal principally with civil and moral matters, are like court decisions, and are introduced by the hypothetical "if";

(2) words, or commands (*debharim*), which relate chiefly to religious duties, being introduced by the imperative "thou shalt." The critical analysis and dismemberment of the books of Moses, if accepted,

renders the simple historical explanation of the introduction to this body of laws untrue and impossible. The four chapters are assigned to JE, the Decalogue to E, and the Book of the Covenant to the Jahwist (Jahwist) or Elohim (E), the repetition of the Decalogue in Exodus 32 through 34 being the Jahwist's account. Ordinarily the Book of the Covenant is held to be earlier than the Decalogue, and is indeed the oldest body of Hebrew legislation. However, it could not have been given at one time, nor in the wilderness, since the laws are given for those in agricultural life, and seem to be decisions made at various times and finally gathered together. Furthermore, this more primitive code either contradicts the later legislation of the Deuteronomist (D) and the Priestly Code (P) or reveals an entirely different point of view. The chief contradictions or divergences are: nature and number of altars, absence of an official priestly class, and simpler conception of the annual feasts as agricultural celebrations. Jahwist-Elohim (JE) came into united form in the 9th or 8th century, but this body of laws existed much earlier, embodying the earliest legal developments of Hebrew life in Canaan. It is suggested by some, as Driver, LOT, although he does not attempt the analysis, that this code is itself a composite of various layers and ages.

See CRITICISM (GRAF-WELLHAUSEN HYPOTHESIS).

4. TRUE, OR BIBLICAL CONCEPTION:

But in favor of the simpler interpretation of these laws as the ethical obligations of the new bond between Yahweh and Israel some statements deserve to be made. If a solemn league and covenant was made at Sinai — and to this all the history, all the prophets and the Psalms give testimony — there must have been some statement of the germinal and fundamental elements of the nation's moral relation to Yahweh. Such statement need not be final nor exhaustive, but rather intended to instruct and guide until later and more detailed directions might be given. This is exactly the position and claim of the Book of the Covenant; and that this was the thought of the editor of the Pentateuch, and that this is the first and reasonable impression made by the unsuspecting and connected reading of the record, can hardly be questioned by candid minds. In answer to the criticism that the agricultural flavor of the laws presupposes settlement in Canaan — a criticism rather remarkable for its bland ignorance — it may be suggested:

(1) Israel had occupied in Egypt an agricultural section, and must have been able either to form or to receive a body of laws dealing with agricultural pursuits.

(2) They were on the march toward a land in which they should have permanent settlement in agricultural life; and not the presence of allusions to such life, but rather their absence, should cause surprise.

(3) However, references to settled farm life are not so obtrusively frequent as those seeking signs would have us think. References to the animal life of the flock and herd of a shepherd people, such as the Israelites were at Sinai, are far more frequent (¹²¹⁸Exodus 21:28,33,15; 22:1,10; 23:4, etc.). The laws are quite generic in form and conception, enforcing such duties as would devolve upon both temporary nomad and prospective tillers of the soil. R. B. Taylor therefore (article in one-volume Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)) accepts this code as originating in the desert wanderings.

In answer to the view, best presented by Wellhausen in Proleg. and W. R. Smith in OTJC, that this code is in conflict with later legislation, it may be said that the Book of the Covenant, as an ethical and civil summary, is in its proper place in the narrative of the sojourn at Sinai, and does not preclude the expectancy of more elaborate organization of both ceremonial and civil order. But the whole question relates more properly to discussion of the later legislation or of the particular topics in dispute (which see). For a thorough treatment of them consult W. H. Green, Hebrew Feasts.

5. NATURE OF THE LAWS:

In the Book of the Covenant the moral elements strongly emphasized are: simplicity, directness and spirituality of worship; a high and equitable standard of right; highest consideration for the weak and the poor; humane treatment of dumb animals; purity in the relations of life; the spirit of brotherhood; and the simple and joyful life. Whatever development in details came with later legislation did not nullify the simple but lofty standards of the earlier laws.

LITERATURE.

Driver, Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, under "Exodus"; Wellhausen, Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel;

Comp. d. Hexateuch; W. R. Smith, Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church; W. H. Green, Hebrew Feasts; Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch; Dillmann, Commentary on Exodus-Leviticus.

Edward Mack

COVENANT, THE NEW

([hvdj }tyrB] *berith chadhashah*), ^{<2613>}Jeremiah 31:31; [ἡ διαθήκη καινή, *he diatheke kaine*], ^{<808>}Hebrews 8:8,13, etc., or [νέα, *nea*], ^{<8024>}Hebrews 12:24: the former Greek adjective has the sense of the “new” primarily in reference to quality, the latter the sense of “young,” the “new,” primarily in reference to time):

1. CONTRAST OF “NEW” AND “OLD” THE TERM “COVENANT”:

The term “New” Covenant necessarily implies an “Old” Covenant, and we are reminded that God’s dealings with His people in the various dispensations of the world’s history have been in terms of covenant. The Holy Scriptures by their most familiar title keep this thought before us, the Old Testament and the New Testament or Covenant; the writings produced within the Jewish “church” being the writings or Scriptures of the Old Covenant, those within the Christian church, the Scriptures of the New Covenant. The alternative name “Testament” — adopted into our English description through the Latin, as the equivalent of the Hebrew *berith*, and the Greek *diatheke*, which both mean a solemn disposition, compact or contract — suggests the disposition of property in a last will or testament, but although the word *diatheke* may bear that meaning, the Hebrew *berith* does not, and as the Greek usage in the New Testament seems especially governed by the Old Testament usage and the thought moves in a similar plane, it is better to keep to the term “covenant.” The one passage which seems to favor the “testament” idea is ^{<8016>}Hebrews 9:16,17 (the Revisers who have changed the King James Version “testament” into “covenant” in every other place have left it in these two verses), but it is questionable whether even here the better rendering would not be “covenant” (see below). Certainly in the immediate context “covenant” is the correct translation and, confessedly, “testament,” if allowed to stand, is an application by transition from the original thought of a solemn compact to the secondary one of testamentary disposition. The theological terms “Covenant of Works” and “Covenant of Grace” do not occur in Scripture,

though the ideas covered by the terms, especially the latter, may easily be found there. The “New Covenant” here spoken of is practically equivalent to the Covenant of Grace established between God and His redeemed people, that again resting upon the eternal Covenant of Redemption made between the Father and the Son, which, though not so expressly designated, is not obscurely indicated by many passages of Scripture.

2. CHRIST’S USE AT LAST SUPPER:

Looking at the matter more particularly, we have to note the words of Christ at the institution of the Supper. In all the three Synoptists, as also in Paul’s account (^{<1068>}Matthew 26:28; ^{<1142>}Mark 14:24; ^{<1022>}Luke 22:20; ^{<1125>}1 Corinthians 11:25) “covenant” occurs. Matthew and Mark, “my blood of the (new) covenant”; Luke and Paul, “the new covenant in my blood.” The Revisers following the critical text, have omitted “new” in Matthew and Mark, but even if it does not belong to the original MS, it is implied, and there need be little doubt that Jesus used it. The old covenant was so well known to these Jewish disciples, that to speak of the covenant in this emphatic way, referring manifestly to something other than the old Mosaic covenant, was in effect to call it a “new” covenant. The expression, in any case, looks back to the old and points the contrast; but in the contrast there are points of resemblance.

3. RELATION TO EXODUS 24:

It is most significant that Christ here connects the “new” covenant with His “blood.” We at once think, as doubtless the disciples would think, of the transaction described in ^{<10247>}Exodus 24:7, when Moses “took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people” those “words,” indicating God’s undertaking on behalf of His people and what He required of them; “and they said, All that Yahweh hath spoken will we do, and be obedient,” thus taking up their part of the contract. Then comes the ratification. “Moses took the blood (half of which had already been sprinkled on the altar), and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which Yahweh hath made with you concerning all these words” (verse 8). The blood was sacrificial blood, the blood of the animals sacrificed as burnt offerings and peace offerings (^{<10246>}Exodus 24:5,6). The one half of the blood sprinkled on the altar tells of the sacrifice offered to God, the other half sprinkled on the people, of the virtue of the same sacrifice applied to the people, and so the covenant relation is fully brought about. Christ, by speaking of His blood in this

connection, plainly indicates that His death was a sacrifice, and that through that sacrifice His people would be brought into a new covenant relationship with God. His sacrifice is acceptable to God and the virtue of it is to be applied to believers — so all the blessings of the new covenant are secured to them; the blood “is poured out for you” (~~(⁴²²¹)~~ Luke 22:20). He specifically mentions one great blessing of the new covenant, the forgiveness of sins — “which is poured out for many unto remission of sins” (~~(⁴¹³³)~~ Matthew 26:28).

4. USE IN EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:

This great thought is taken up in Hebrews and fully expounded. The writer draws out fully the contrast between the new covenant and the old by laying stress upon the perfection of Christ’s atonement in contrast to the material and typical sacrifices (~~(³⁹¹¹)~~ Hebrews 9:11-23). He was “a high priest of the good things to come,” connected with “the greater and more perfect tabernacle.” He entered the heavenly holy place “through his own blood,” not that of “goats and calves,” and by that perfect offering He has secured “eternal redemption” in contrast to the temporal deliverance of the old dispensation. The blood of those typical offerings procured ceremonial cleansing; much more, therefore, shall the blood of Christ avail to cleanse the conscience “from dead works to serve the living God” — that blood which is so superior in value to the blood of the temporal sacrifices, yet resembles it in being sacrificial blood. It is the blood of Him “who, through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God.” It is the fashion in certain quarters nowadays to say that it is not the blood of Christ, but His spirit of self-sacrifice for others, that invests the cross with its saving power, and this verse is sometimes cited to show that the virtue lies in the surrender of the perfect will, the shedding of the blood being a mere accident. But this is not the view of the New Testament writers. The blood-shedding is to them a necessity. Of course, it is not the natural, material blood, or the mere act of shedding it, that saves. The blood is the life. The blood is the symbol of life; the blood shed is the symbol of life outpoured — of the penalty borne; and while great emphasis must be laid, as in this verse it is laid, upon Christ’s perfect surrender of His holy will to God, yet the essence of the matter is found in the fact that He willingly endured the dread consequences of sin, and as a veritable expiatory sacrifice shed His precious blood for the remission of sins.

5. THE MEDIATOR OF THE NEW COVENANT:

On the ground of that shed blood, as the writer goes on to assert, “He is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance” (⁸⁹¹⁵ Hebrews 9:15). Thus Christ fulfils the type in a twofold way: He is the sacrifice upon which the covenant is based, whose blood ratifies it, and He is also, like Moses, the Mediator of the covenant. The death of Christ not only secures the forgiveness of those who are brought under the new covenant, but it was also for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, implying that all the sacrifices gained their value by being types of Christ, and the forgiveness enjoyed by the people of God in former days was bestowed in virtue of the great Sacrifice to be offered in the fullness of time.

6. “INHERITANCE” AND “TESTAMENT”:

Not only does the blessing of perfect forgiveness come through the new covenant, but also the promise of the “eternal inheritance” in contrast to the earthly inheritance which, under the old covenant, Israel obtained. The mention of the inheritance is held to justify the taking of the word in the next verse as “testament,” the writer passing to the thought of a testamentary disposition, which is only of force after the death of the testator. Undoubtedly there is good ground for the analogy, and all the blessings of salvation which come to the believer may be considered as bequeathed by the Saviour in His death, and accruing to us because He has died. It has, in that sense, tacitly to be assumed that the testator lives again to be His own executor and to put us in possession of the blessings. Still, we think there is much to be said in favor of keeping to the sense of “covenant” even here, and taking the clause, which, rendered literally, is: “a covenant is of force (or firm) over the dead,” as meaning that the covenant is established on the ground of sacrifice, that sacrifice representing the death of the maker of the covenant. The allusion may be further explained by a reference to ⁸⁹¹⁹ Genesis 15:9,10,17, which has generally been considered as illustrating the ancient Semitic method of making a covenant: the sacrificial animals being divided, and the parties passing between the pieces, implying that they deserved death if they broke the engagement. The technical Hebrew phrase for making a covenant is “to cut a covenant.”

There is an interesting passage in Herodotus iii. 8, concerning an Arabian custom which seems akin to the old Hebrew practice. “The Arabians observe pledges as religiously as any people; and they make them in the following manner; when any wish to pledge their faith, a third person standing between the two parties makes an incision with a sharp stone in the palm of the hand, nearest the longest fingers of both the contractors; then taking some of the nap from the garments of each, he smears seven stones placed between him and the blood; and as he does this he invokes Bacchus and Urania. When this ceremony is completed, the person who pledges his faith binds his friends as sureties to the stranger, or the citizen, if the contract is made with a citizen; and the friends also hold themselves obliged to observe the engagement” — Cary’s translation.

Whatever the particular application of the word in ~~1157~~Genesis 15:17, the central idea in the passage is that death, blood-shedding, is necessary to the establishment of the covenant, and so he affirms that the first covenant was not dedicated without blood, and in proof quotes the passage already cited from Exodus 24, and concludes that “apart from shedding of blood there is no remission” (24:22).

See COVENANT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

7. RELATION TO ~~2633~~JEREMIAH 31:31-34:

This new covenant established by Christ was foretold by the prophet Jeremiah, who uses the very word “new covenant” in describing it, and very likely Christ had that description in mind when He used the term, and meant His disciples to understand that the prophetic interpretation would in Him be realized. There is no doubt that the author of He had the passage in mind, for he has led up to the previous statement by definitely quoting the whole statement of ~~2633~~Jeremiah 31:31-34. He had in Jeremiah 7 spoken of the contrast between Christ’s priesthood “after the order of Melchizedek” (verse 11) and the imperfect Aaronic priesthood, and he designates Jesus as “the surety of a better covenant” (verse 22). Then in Jeremiah 8, emphasizing the thought of the superiority of Christ’s heavenly high-priesthood, he declares that Christ is the “mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises” (verse 6). The first covenant, he says, was not faultless, otherwise there would have been no need for a second; but the fault was not in the covenant but in the people who failed to keep it, though perhaps there is also the suggestion that the

external imposition of laws could not suffice to secure true obedience. “For finding fault with them he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah.” The whole passage (Jeremiah 8 through 12) would repay careful study, but we need only note that not only is there prominence given to the great blessings of the covenant, perfect forgiveness and fullness of knowledge, but, as the very essence of the covenant — that which serves to distinguish it from the old covenant and at once to show its superiority and guarantee its permanence — there is this wonderful provision: “I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.” This at once shows the spirituality of the new covenant. Its requirements are not simply given in the form of external rules, but the living Spirit possesses the heart; the law becomes an internal dominating principle, and so true obedience is secured.

8. TO EZEKIEL:

Ezekiel had spoken to the same effect, though the word “new covenant” is not used in the passage, chapter 36:27: “I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep mine ordinances, and do them.” In chapter 37 Ezekiel again speaks of the great blessings to be enjoyed by the people of God, including cleansing, walking in God’s statutes, recognition as God’s people, etc., and he distinctly says of this era of blessing: “I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them” (verse 26). Other important foreshadowings of the new covenant are found in ^{<2540>}Isaiah 54:10; 55:3; 59:21; 61:8; ^{<8018>}Hosea 2:18-23; ^{<3008>}Malachi 3:1-4. We may well marvel at the spiritual insight of these prophets, and it is impossible to attribute their forecasts to natural genius; they can only be accounted for by Divine inspiration.

The writer to the Hebrews recurs again and again to this theme of the “New Covenant”; in 10:16,17 he cites the words of Jeremiah already quoted about writing the law on their minds, and remembering their sins no more. In ^{<8124>}Hebrews 12:24, he speaks of “Jesus the mediator of a new covenant,” and “the blood of sprinkling,” again connecting the “blood” with the “covenant,” and finally, in ^{<8130>}Hebrews 13:20, he prays for the perfection of the saints through the “blood of an eternal covenant.”

9. CONTRAST OF OLD AND NEW IN 2 CORINTHIANS 3:

In 2 Corinthians 3 Paul has an interesting and instructive contrast between the old covenant and the new. He begins it by saying that “our sufficiency is from God; who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life” (3:5,6). The “letter” is the letter of the law, of the old covenant which could only bring condemnation, but the spirit which characterizes the new covenant gives life, writes the law upon the heart. He goes on to speak of the old as that “ministration of death” which nevertheless “came with glory” (3:7), and he refers especially to the law, but the new covenant is “the ministration of the spirit,” the “ministration of righteousness” (3:8,9), and has a far greater glory than the old. The message of this “new covenant” is “the gospel of Christ.” The glory of the new covenant is focused in Christ; rays forth from Him. The glory of the old dispensation was reflected upon the face of Moses, but that glory was transitory and so was the physical manifestation (3:13). The sight of the shining face of Moses awed the people of Israel and they revered him as leader specially favored of God (3:7-13). When he had delivered his message he veiled his face and thus the people could not see that the glow did not last; every time that he went into the Divine presence he took off the veil and afresh his face was lit up with the glory, and coming out with the traces of that glory lingering on his countenance he delivered his message to the people and again veiled his face (compare ^{<1234>}Exodus 34:29-35), and thus the transitoriness and obscurity of the old dispensation were symbolized. In glorious contrast to that symbolical obscurity, the ministers of the gospel, of the new covenant, use great boldness of speech; the veil is done away in Christ (3:12 ff). The glory which comes through Him is perpetual, and fears no vanishing away.

Archibald McCaig

COVER; COVERING

^{<kuv'-er>}, ^{<kuv'-er-ing>}: The translation of several Hebrew words. The covering of the ark ([^{hsk}^hⁿⁱ *mikhceh*], ^{<00813>}Genesis 8:13) was possibly the lid of a hatchway (compare Mitchell, *World before Abraham*, 215).

To the sons of Kohath was assigned the task of caring for the furniture of the Tabernacle whenever the camp was moved, a suitable covering ([^{hsk};

kacah]) of sealskin being designated for each of the specially sacred objects, the temple curtains also being used (^{<0408>}Numbers 4:8,9,11,12 ff).

^{<0495>}Numbers 19:15 (*tsamidh*) may refer to anything used as a lid or covering; ^{<1347>}Job 24:7; 31:19 (*kecuth*) refer to clothing or bed-covering.

Figurative: “Abaddon hath no covering”; (*kecuth*) from God (^{<1346>}Job 26:6); “He will destroy the face of the covering (*ha-loT*) that covereth all peoples” (^{<2307>}Isaiah 25:7). The removal of the veil, often worn as a token of mourning (compare ^{<0104>}2 Samuel 19:4), signified the destruction of death.

W. N. Stearns

COVERED WAY

^{<kuv'-erd wa>} (^{<E>}^{<sym>}^{<mecakh>}], “a covered walk”): Mentioned in ^{<1268>}2 Kings 16:18 (the King James Version “covert”) as a gallery belonging to the temple, concerning the purpose of which opinions differ. Some consider it to have been the place where the king stood or sat during the Sabbath services; others, a public place for teaching; others, the way by which the priest entered the sanctuary on the Sabbath.

COVERING, FOR THE HEAD

^{<kuv'-er-ing>}, ([^{<peribolaion>}, *peribolaion*]): Mentioned in the New Testament only in ^{<4115>}1 Corinthians 11:15: “For her hair is given her for a covering,” literally, “something cast round,” probably equivalent to “veil” (which see). Read in the light of the context: “Every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head” (verse 5). The meaning would seem to be that Nature itself, in providing women with a natural veil, has taught the lesson underlying the prevailing custom, that woman should not be unveiled in the public assemblies.

George B. Eager

COVERT

^{<kuv'-ert>}: Now seldom used, except for game, and then generally spelt “cover.” “A covered way” (^{<1268>}2 Kings 16:18 the King James Version); also a shelter of any kind (^{<2046>}Isaiah 4:6); “a hiding place,” “a lair,” “a hut” (^{<1340>}Job 38:40); “a place of secrecy,” “a secret way” (^{<0250>}1 Samuel 25:20;

<802> Job 40:21; <8604> Psalm 61:4; <5104> Isaiah 16:4; 32:2); “a den,” “a lair” (<2538> Jeremiah 25:38).

COVET

<kuv'-et> ([**hwa**; 'awah]; [**ζηλόω**, *zeloo*], “to desire earnestly,” “to set the heart and mind upon anything”): Used in two senses: good, simply to desire earnestly but legitimately. e.g. the King James Version <6121> 1 Corinthians 12:31; 14:39; bad, to desire unlawfully, or to secure illegitimately ([**x" B**; *batsa`*]; [**ἐπιθυμέω**, *epithumeo*], <6007> Romans 7:7; 13:9, etc.); hence, called “lust” (<4158> Matthew 5:28; <6106> 1 Corinthians 10:6), “concupiscence” (the King James Version <6008> Romans 7:8; <5105> Colossians 3:5).

COVETOUSNESS

<kuv'-et-us-nēs>: Has a variety of shades of meaning determined largely by the nature of the particular word used, or the context, or both. Following are some of the uses:

- (1) To gain dishonestly ([**x" B**; *batsa`*]), e.g. the King James Version <21821> Exodus 18:21; <6335> Ezekiel 33:31.
- (2) The wish to have more than one possesses, inordinately, of course ([**πλεονεξία**, *pleonexia*]), e.g. <21215> Luke 12:15; <5115> 1 Thessalonians 2:5.
- (3) An inordinate love of money [**φιλάργυρος**, *philarguros*], the King James Version <21644> Luke 16:14; <51212> 2 Timothy 3:2; *philarguria*, <51010> 1 Timothy 6:10; negative in <51315> Hebrews 13:5, the King James Version. Covetousness is a very grave sin; indeed, so heinous is it that the Scriptures class it among the very gravest and grossest crimes (<4188> Ephesians 5:3). In <51015> Colossians 3:5 it is “idolatry,” while in <61010> 1 Corinthians 6:10 it is set forth as excluding a man from heaven. Its heinousness, doubtless, is accounted for by its being in a very real sense the *root* of so many other forms of sin, e.g. departure from the faith (<51010> 1 Timothy 6:9,10); lying (<1152> 2 Kings 5:22-25); theft (<41721> Joshua 7:21); domestic trouble (<21527> Proverbs 15:27); murder (<5222> Ezekiel 22:12); indeed, it leads to “many foolish and hurtful lusts” (<51010> 1 Timothy 6:9). Covetousness has always been a very serious menace to mankind, whether in the Old Testament or New Testament period. It was one of the first sins that broke out after Israel had entered into the promised land (Achan, Joshua 7); and also in the early Christian church immediately after its founding (Ananias and

Sapphira, Acts 5); hence, so many warnings against it. A careful reading of the Old Testament will reveal the fact that a very great part of the Jewish law — such as its enactments and regulations regarding duties toward the poor, toward servants; concerning gleanings, usury, pledges, gold and silver taken during war — was introduced and intended to counteract the spirit of covetousness.

Eerdmans maintains (*Expos*, July, 1909) that the commandment, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house” (^{<0207>}Exodus 20:17), meant to the Israelite that he should not take anything of his neighbor’s possessions that were momentarily unprotected by their owner. Compare ^{<0203>}Exodus 34:23 ff. Thus, it refers to a category of acts that is not covered by the commandment, “Thou shalt not steal.” It is an oriental habit of mind from of old that when anyone sees abandoned goods which he thinks desirable, there is not the least objection to taking them, and ^{<0207>}Exodus 20:17b is probably an explanation of what is to be understood by “house” in 20:17a.

Examples of covetousness: Achan (Joshua 7); Saul (^{<0919>}1 Samuel 15:9,19); Judas (^{<0144>}Matthew 26:14,15); Ananias and Sapphira (^{<0401>}Acts 5:1-11); Balaam (^{<0025>}2 Peter 2:15 with ^{<0011>}Jude 1:11).

William Evans

COW; KINE

^{<kou>}, ^{<kin>} ([^{<rqB>}; *baqar*] (compare Arabic *baqar*, “cow”); [^{<rqB>}; ^{<tI " gI>}, *`eghlath baqar*] (^{<0372>}Isaiah 7:21); [^{<hrP>}; *parah*] (compare Arabic *furar*, “young of a sheep, goat, or cow”); [^{<t/I [; t/rP>}; *paroth `aloth*] (^{<0007>}1 Samuel 6:7,10), “milch kine,” from [^{<I W[, `uI>}, “to suckle”; [^{<tI a>}, ‘*eleph*]): In ^{<0401>}Amos 4:1, the term, “kine of Bashan,” is applied to the voluptuous women of Samaria. In ^{<0401>}Genesis 41:1-36 is the narration of Pharaoh’s dream of the seven fat and seven lean kine. In Isaiah’s vision (^{<0307>}Isaiah 11:7) we have: “And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together.” Cows do not seem to have been sacrificed. The sacrifice of the kine that brought the ark back from the Philistines (^{<0064>}1 Samuel 6:14) was due to the exceptional circumstances.

See CALF; CATTLE.

Alfred Ely Day

COZ

<koz> ([6/q, kots], “thorn”): A man of Judah (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 4:8). the American Standard Revised Version has added the article, making the name Hakkoz without sufficient reason. The name occurs with the article (*Ha-qots*) in ^{<1306>}Ezra 2:61; ^{<1308>}Nehemiah 3:4,21; 7:63, and ^{<1340>}1 Chronicles 24:10, but not with reference to the same person. Coz was of the tribe of Judah, while Hakkoz belonged to the family of Aaron.

COZBI

<koz’-bi> ([yBz̥k; kozbi], “deceitful”): A Midianite woman, distinguished as the daughter of Zur, “head of the people of a fathers’ house in Midian.” She was slain by Phinehas at Shittim in company with “Zimri, the son of Salu, a prince of a fathers’ house among the Simeonites” (^{<1376>}Numbers 25:6-18).

COZEBA

<ko-ze’-ba> (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:22).

See *ACHIZB*.

CRACKNEL

<krak’nel>: Occurs in ^{<1148>}1 Kings 14:3, where Jeroboam bids his wife go to Abijah to inquire concerning their son: “And take with thee ten loaves and cracknels” (King James Version margins “cakes,” the English Revised Version “cracknels,” the American Standard Revised Version “cakes”). The Hebrew word is [μyDQ̄i̇ nīquddim], from *naqadh*, “to prick” or “mark”; most probably cakes with holes pricked in them like our biscuits.

CRAFT; CRAFTINESS; CRAFTY

<kraft>, <kraf’-ti-nes>, <kraf’-ti>, ([πανουργία, *panourgia*]), ([πανουργος, *panourgos*]): The original meaning is that of “ability to do anything,” universally applied in a bad sense to unscrupulous wickedness, that stops short of no measure, however reprehensible, in order to attain its purposes; then, in a modified form, to resourcefulness in wrong, cunning (^{<2085>}Daniel 8:25; 2 Macc 12:24; the Revised Version, margin “jugglery”). In ^{<1213>}Luke 20:23, Jesus perceives “the craftiness” of His adversaries, i.e.

the complicated network which they have laid to ensnare Him. The art with which a plot is concealed, and its direction to the ruin of others, are elements that enter into the meaning. Heinrici on ~~<4189>~~1 Corinthians 3:19 illustrates from Plato the distinction between craftiness and wisdom. There is a touch of humor in ~~<47216>~~2 Corinthians 12:16, when Paul speaks of his conduct toward the Corinthians as having been “crafty.”

H. E. Jacobs

CRAFTS

I. SOURCES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE CRAFTS OF THE BIBLE.

1. Written Records and Discoveries of Craftsmanship:

Our knowledge of the arts and crafts of Bible times has come to us through two principal ways. First, from Biblical, Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian written records. Of these the Egyptian are the most illuminating. Second, from examples of ancient handicraft which have been buried and preserved through many centuries and brought to light again by modern discoveries.

(1) Jewish.

The chief written documents from which we may learn about Hebrew handicraft are the Bible records. A study of what few references there are leads us to believe that before the Israelites came in contact with the people of Canaan and Phoenicia they had not developed any considerable technical skill (~~<1086>~~1 Kings 5:6; ~~<1340>~~1 Chronicles 14:1; ~~<4007>~~2 Chronicles 2:7,14; ~~<4807>~~Ezra 3:7). Some of the simpler operations, such as the spinning and weaving of the common fabrics and the shaping of domestic utensils, were performed in the household (~~<1285>~~Exodus 35:25,26) but the weaving and dyeing of fine fabrics, carving, inlaying, metal-working, etc., was the work of foreigners, or was learned by the Jews after the Exodus, from the dwellers in Palestine

The Jews, however, gradually developed skill in many of these crafts. It is believed that as early as Nehemiah's time, Jewish craftsmen had organized into guilds (~~<4088>~~Nehemiah 3:8,31,32). In post-Biblical times the Jews obtained monopolies in some of the industries, as for example, glass-making and dyeing. These trades remained the secrets of certain families for generations. It is because of this secrecy and the mystery that surrounded these trades, and is still maintained in many places, that we

know so little as to how they were conducted. Until recently the principal indigo dyers in Damascus were Jews, and the Jews shared with Moslem craftsmen the right to make glass. In some of the Syrian cities Jewish craftsmen are now outnumbering other native workmen in certain trades.

Few examples of Hebrew handicraft have been discovered by the archaeologists which shed much light upon early Hebrew work. Aside from the pottery of the Israelite period, and a few seals and coins, no traces of Hebrew workmanship remain. It is even doubtful how many of the above objects are really the work of this people.

(2) Canaanitish and Phoenician.

It is generally conceded that what technical skill the Hebrews acquired resulted from their contact with the Canaanites and Phoenicians. Frequent mention of the workmanship of these peoples is made in the Bible, but their own records are silent. Ezekiel's account of the glories of Tyre (Ezekiel 27) gives some idea of the reputation of that city for craftsmanship: "Thy builders have perfected thy beauty" (^{27:4}Ezekiel 27:4); "Syria was thy merchant Damascus was thy merchant for the multitude of thy handiworks" (^{27:16}Ezekiel 27:16,18). Adad-nirari III (812-783 BC), the Assyrian king, enumerates the tribute which he exacted from the king of Damascus.

"Variegated cloth, linen, an ivory bed, a seat of inlaid ivory, a table" were among the captured articles. These were probably Phoenician work.

Many examples of Phoenician craftsmanship have been discovered. These are characterized, from the standpoint of art, by a crudeness which distinguishes them from the more delicately and artistically wrought work of their teachers, the Babylonians and Egyptians. The credit remains, however, to the Phoenicians of introducing skilled workmanship into Palestine. The Phoenicians, too, furnished the means of intercourse between the Babylonians and Egyptians. From the very earliest times there was an interchange of commodities and ideas between the people of the Nile and those of the Tigris and Euphrates.

(3) Assyrian and Babylonian.

The Babylonians and Assyrians made few references to their own handicraft in their records, but the explorers of recent years have revealed many examples of the remarkable workmanship of the early inhabitants of

Mesopotamia. In referring to a silver vase found in that country (Telloh), dating from the 4th millennium BC, Clay (see “Literature”) says “the whole is exceedingly well rendered and indicates remarkable skill, which in no respect is less striking than that of Egyptian contemporaries in this handicraft.” Jewelry, weapons, votive images, various utensils, tools of many kinds, statues in the hardest stones, delicately wrought, gems, dating from the times of Abraham and earlier, lead us to ask when these people acquired their skill.

2. and 3. Egyptian and Post-Biblical Craftsmanship:

(4) Egyptian.

The written records of Egypt are doubly important, because they not only refer to the various crafts, but also illustrate the processes by drawings which can leave no doubt as to how the workmen accomplished their ends. The extensive explorations in Egypt have given to the world many priceless relics of craftsmanship, some of them dating from the very dawn of civilization. Among the ruins of early Syrian and Palestinian cities are found numerous objects witnessing to the skill of the Egyptians. These objects and the evidences of the influence of their work on the Phoenician arts show the part that the Egyptians played in moulding the ideas of the workmen who were chosen to build the temple at Jerusalem. In the following brief summary of the crafts mentioned in the Bible, it will be noticeable how well they may be illustrated by the monuments of the Nile country. To confirm the knowledge derived from the above sources, post-Biblical writings and some of the present-day customs in Bible lands are valuable. These will be mentioned in discussing the various crafts.

II. CRAFTS MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE.

(For a more detailed treatment of the crafts see under separate articles.)

1. Brickmaking:

This industry probably originated in Babylonia, but the knowledge of the process was early carried to Egypt, where later the Hebrews, along with other captives, were driven to making the bricks of the Egyptian kings. The making of sun-dried bricks called for little skill, but the firing and glazing of bricks required trained workmen.

See BRICK.

2. *Carpentering (Wood-Working):*

Wood was extensively used by ancient builders. With the exception of the Egyptian antiquities, little remains but the records to indicate this fact. Numerous references are made to the carpenter work in building the temple and subsequent repairing of this structure (^{<1086>}1 Kings 5:6; ^{<1418>}2 Chronicles 2:3; ^{<1211>}2 Kings 12:11; ^{<1412>}2 Chronicles 24:12; ^{<1271>}2 Kings 22:6; ^{<1387>}Ezra 3:7; 4:1). David's house and that of Solomon and his favorite wife were made partly of wood. In the story of the building of the tabernacle, wood-working is mentioned (Exodus 25). The people of Tyre built ships of cypress, with masts of cedar wood and oars of oak (^{<3276>}Ezekiel 27:5,6). Idols were carved from wood (^{<1597>}Deuteronomy 29:17; ^{<1298>}2 Kings 19:18; ^{<2379>}Isaiah 37:19; 45:20). The Philistines built a wooden cart to carry the ark (^{<9117>}1 Samuel 6:7). Threshing instruments and yokes were made of wood (^{<1112>}2 Samuel 24:22). Ezra read the law from a pulpit of wood (^{<1104>}Nehemiah 8:4). Solomon's chariots were made of wood (Song 3:9). Inlaid work, still a favorite form of decoration in Syria, was used by the Phoenicians (^{<3276>}Ezekiel 27:6). How the ancient carpenters did their work can assumed from the Egyptian monuments. Some of the operations there pictured are still performed in the same ways.

See TOOLS; CARPENTER.

3. *Carving (Engraving):*

The terms "carving" and "engraving" are used interchangeably in translating Old Testament passages. The first mention made of engraved objects is the signet of Judah (^{<1188>}Genesis 38:18). The art of engraving on various hard objects, such as clay, bone, ivory, metals and precious stones, probably came from Mesopotamia. The Hebrews learned engraving from the Canaanites. The nature of this engraving is shown by the Assyrian cylinders and Egyptian scarabs. It is doubtful how many of the signets found in Palestine are Hebrew work, as the engraved devices are mostly Phoenician or Egyptian. From the earliest times it has been the custom in the Orient for men of affairs to carry constantly with them their signets. The seal was set in a ring, or, as was the case with Judah, and as the Arabs do today, it was worn on a cord suspended about the neck. One of the present-day sights in a Syrian city street is the engraver of signets, seated at his low bench ready to cut on one of his blank seals the buyer's name or sign.

The second form of carving is suggested by the Decalogue (^{<1010>}Exodus 20:4). The commandment explains why sculpturing remained undeveloped among the Jews, as it has to this day among the Moslems. In spite of the commandment, however, cherubim were carved on the wooden fittings of the temple interior (^{<1023>}1 Kings 6:23).

Among the peoples with whom the Jews came in contact, stone-cutting had reached a high degree of perfection. No stone proved too hard for their tools. In Egyptian and Phoenician tombs the carving was often done on plastered surfaces.

See CARVING.

4. Ceramics:

Both the Egyptians and Babylonians were skilled in molding and baking objects of clay. The early Babylonian records consist of burnt clay tablets. Glazed bricks formed an important decorative feature. In Egypt, idols, scarabs and amulets were often made of fired clay, glazed or unglazed. By far the most important branch of ceramic art was the making of jars for holding water or other liquids. These jars have been used throughout the East from earliest times. The Jews learned what they knew about this art from the Phoenicians.

See POTTERY.

5. Dyeing and Cleansing:

Dyeing is one of the oldest of the crafts. The only references to the act of dyeing in the Bible are

(a) in connection with the dyed skins of animals (^{<1025>}Exodus 25:5; 26:14), and

(b) ^{<1051>}Judges 5:30. That it was a highly developed trade is implied in the many other references to dyed stuffs both in the Bible and in profane literature. Cleansing was done by the fuller, who was probably a dyer also.

See COLOR; DYE; FULLER.

6. *Embroidering (Needlework):*

Very little is known of the work of embroidering, further than that it was the working-in of color designs on cloth. In ^{<1571>}Ezekiel 27:7 we learn that it was one of the exports of Egypt.

See EMBROIDERING.

7. *Glass-Making:*

In ^{<1559>}Deuteronomy 33:19 “hidden treasures of the sand” is interpreted by some to mean the making of glass objects from the sand. There can be no question about the Hebrews being acquainted with glass-making, as its history extends back to very early times. The Egyptians and Phoenicians made bottles, glass beads, idols, etc. These objects are among those usually found in the tombs. Glass beads of very early manufacture were found in the mound at Gezer. Some of the pigments used for painting were made of powdered colored glass. In the New Testament we read of the “sea of glass like unto crystal” (^{<1646>}Revelation 4:6).

See GLASS.

8. *Grinding:*

Grinding was a domestic task and can hardly be classed as one of the crafts. When flour was needed, the housewife, or more likely the servant, rubbed the wheat or barley between two millstones (*see* ^{<1241>}MILLSTONE) or, with a rounded river stone, crushed the wheat on a large flat stone. It is still a common custom in Syria and Palestine for two women to work together as indicated in ^{<1241>}Matthew 24:41 and ^{<1275>}Luke 17:35. Grinding of meal was a menial task, considered the employment of a concubine; hence, setting Samson to grinding at the mill was intended as a disgrace.

9. *Mason Work:*

The rhythmic sound of the stone cutter at his work never ceases in the prosperous oriental city. It is more common today, however, than in the earlier centuries when only high officials could afford stone houses. Frequently only the temple or shrines or tombs of a city were made of stone. As such buildings were very common, and much attention was paid to every detail of their construction, there was developed an efficient corps of masons, especially in Egypt and Syria. When the Israelites abandoned their nomadic life, among the first things that they planned were permanent

places of worship. As these developed into structures more pretentious than mere piles of stones, the builders naturally resorted to the skill of the master builders of the country. A visitor to Jerusalem may still see the work of the ancient masons. The so-called Solomon's quarries under the city, the great drafted stones of the temple area, belong to an early date. The very shape of the masons' tools may be determined from the marks on the stones.

See MASON.

10. Metal-Working (Mining):

Among the oldest objects that have been preserved are those of silver, gold and bronze. These are proof that the ancients understood the various processes of mining, smelting, refining and working of metals.

See MINING; METAL-WORKING.

11. Oil-Making:

The oil referred to in the Bible is olive oil. Pliny mentions many other oils which were extracted in Egypt. The oils were usually extracted by first crushing the fruit and then pressing the crushed mass. At Gezer, Tell es Cafî and other ancient ruins old oil presses have been discovered.

See OIL.

12. Painting:

One who has visited the tombs and temples of Egypt will never forget the use which the ancient Egyptian painters made of colors. The otherwise somber effect produced by expansive plain walls was overcome by sculpturing, either in relief or intaglio, on a coating of stucco, and then coloring these engravings in reds, yellows, greens and blues. Architectural details were also painted. The capitals of columns and the columns themselves received special attention from the painter. Colors were similarly used by the Greeks and Phoenicians. In the Sidon tombs, at Palmyra and similar ruins, traces of painting are still evident.

See PAINTING.

13. Paper-Making:

The word “paper” occurs twice, once in the Old Testament (²³⁹⁷Isaiah 19:7 the King James Version) and once in New Testament (⁶⁰¹²2 John 1:12). In ²³⁹⁷Isaiah 19:7 the Revised Version (British and American) renders “paper reeds,” “meadows.” PAPYRUS (which see) occurs in ²³⁹²Isaiah 18:2 and the Revised Version, margin of ¹⁰⁰⁸Exodus 2:3. The nearest approach to our paper which the ancients possessed was that made from a species of papyrus. The process consisted in spreading out, side by side, long strips of the inner lining of the papyrus reed, then over these other strips at right angles to the first, afterward soaking with some adhesive material and finally pressing and drying. Sheets made in this way were fastened together with glue into a long scroll. The Greek for papyrus plant is “*biblos*,” from which the English word “Bible” is derived. Parchment, leather and leaves were also used as paper. The natives of Syria and Palestine still call a sheet of paper a “leaf” (Arabic *waraqet*).

14. Perfume-Making:

The art of perfume-making dates back to the ancient Egyptians. In ¹²³⁵Exodus 30:35 we have the first mention of scented anointing oils. The perfumers’ (the King James Version “confectioner” or “apothecary”) products were used

- (a) for religious rites as offerings and to anoint the idols and
- (b) for personal use on the body or clothes. Some perfumes were powders (incense); others were scented oils or fats (ointments).

See PERFUME.

15. Plastering:

(The King James Version “Plaistering.”) The trade of plastering dates back to the beginning of the history of building. There were two reasons for using plastering or stucco:

- (a) to render the buildings more resisting to the weather and
- (b) to make the surfaces more suitable for decoration by engraving or painting.

See PLASTER.

16. *Spinning and Weaving:*

The arts of spinning and weaving were early practiced in the household (~~<1255>~~ Exodus 35:25). Many different fibers were spun and woven into cloth. Fabrics of wool, cotton, flax, silk, wood fiber have been preserved from Bible times. In the more progressive communities, the weaving of the fabrics was taken over by the weavers who made it their profession. In ~~<1302>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:21 it is stated that many of the families of the house of Asbea were workers in fine linen. The modern invasion of European manufacturers has not yet driven out the weavers who toil at looms much like those described by the ancient Egyptian drawings.

See SPINNING; WEAVING.

17. *Tanning:*

Although it is known that tanning was practiced, the only reference to this trade mentioned in the Bible is to Simon the tanner (~~<4193>~~ Acts 9:43; 10:6,32). Leather girdles are mentioned in ~~<12008>~~ 2 Kings 1:8; ~~<41103>~~ Matthew 3:4. Relics taken from the tombs show that the ancients understood the various methods for preserving skins which are used in present-day practice.

See TANNER.

18. *Tent-Making:*

We think of Paul as the tent-maker. The tents which he made however were probably not like those so frequently referred to in the Old Testament. Tents in Paul's time were made from Cilician cloth. Paul's work was probably the sewing together of the proper lengths of cloth and the attaching of ropes and loops. In Old Testament times the tents were made of strips of coarse goat's hair cloth or of the skins of animals.

See TENT.

19. *Wine-Making:*

This article is being written within sound of festivities about the winepresses of Mt. Lebanon where men and women are gathered for the annual production of wine and molasses (Arabic, *dibs*). Their process is so like that of Bible times that one is transported in thought to similar festivities that must have attended the wine-making even so far back as the early Egyptian kings. That these workers understood the precautions

necessary for procuring a desirable product is evidenced by early writings. The choice of proper soil for the vineyards, the adding of preservatives to keep the wine, boiling the juice to kill undesirable ferments, guarding against putting new wine into old bottles, are examples of their knowledge of wine-making.

See WINE PRESS.

III. CRAFTSMEN.

Craftsmen were early segregated into groups. A trade usually remained in a family. This is true to some extent in the East today. In such cities as Beirut, Damascus, or Aleppo the shops of the craftsmen of a given trade will be found grouped together. There is a silver and goldsmiths' market (Arabic *suq*), an iron market, a dyeing quarter, etc. Jewish craftsmen in early times sat separately in the synagogues. Some crafts were looked upon with disfavor, especially those which brought men in contact with women, as for example, the trade of goldsmith, carder, weaver, fuller or tanner. There was a fellow-feeling among craftsmen referred to by Isaiah (^{<23406>}Isaiah 41:6,7). This same feeling is observed among Syrian workmen today. The Arab has many phrases of encouragement for a man at his work, such as, "Peace to your hands," "May God give you strength." A crowd of men pulling at a pulley rope, for example, shout or sing together as they pull.

LITERATURE.

Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in Sardinia, Judea, etc.; History of Art in Ancient Egypt; History of Art in Phoenicia and Cyprus; Wilkinson, The Ancient Egyptians; Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer; Standard Dict. of the Bible; Bliss, Macalister and Wunsch, Excavations in Palestine; Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century; Harper, The Bible and Modern Discoveries; Delitzsch, Jewish Artisan Life, etc.; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel; Jewish Encyclopedia.

James A. Patch

CRAḠ

<*krag*> ([^{<0772>}*ṣe*shen] (^{<0772>}1 Samuel 7:12; 14:4; ^{<18928>}Job 39:28 the King James Version and the English Revised Version)): In a mountainous country

composed of sedimentary rocks, like the cretaceous rocks of Palestine, cliffs are formed on a slope where hard strata are underlaid by softer strata. The soft strata wear away more rapidly, undermining the hard strata above them, which for a time project, but finally break off by vertical joint planes, the fragments rolling down to form the talus slope at the foot of the cliff. As the breaking off of the undermined hard strata proceeds irregularly, there are left projecting crags, sometimes at the top of the cliff, and sometimes lower down. Two such crags (*shen ha-cela`*, “sharp rock,” the Revised Version (British and American) “rocky crag”), which were given particular names, Bozez and Seneh, marked the scene of the exploit of Jonathan described in 1 Samuel 14. Conder failed to identify the crags, and it has been proposed to alter the text rather extensively to make it read: “wall of rock” instead of “crag” (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word “Michmash”). Such rocks form safe resting-places for birds of prey, as it is said of the eagle in ~~<K128>~~ Job 39:28 English Revised Version:

*“She dwelleth on the rock and hath her lodging there,
Upon the crag of the rock, and the stronghold.”*

Alfred Ely Day

CRANE

~~<kran>~~ ([rWg[; `aghur]; [γέρανος, *geranos*]; Latin *Grus cinerea*): A bird of the family *gruidae*. The crane is mentioned twice in the Bible: once on account of its voice (~~<2814>~~ Isaiah 38:14: “Like a swallow or a crane, so did I chatter”); again because of the unforgettable picture these birds made in migration (~~<2087>~~ Jeremiah 8:7): “Yea, the stork in the heavens knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle-dove and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the law of Yahweh.” Some commentators have adduced reasons for dropping the crane from the ornithology of the Bible, but this never should be permitted. They were close relatives of stork, heron and ibis; almost as numerous as any of these, and residents of Palestine, except in migration. The two quotations concerning them fit with their history, and point out the two features that made them as noticeable as any birds of Palestine. Next to the ostrich and pelican they were the largest birds, having a wing sweep of 8 ft. from tip to tip and standing 4 ft. in height. In migration such immense flocks passed over Palestine as to darken the sky, and when they crossed the Red Sea they appeared to sweep from shore to shore, and so became the most noticeable migratory bird, for which reason, no doubt, they were included

in Isaiah's reference to spring migration with the beloved doves, used in sacrifice and for caged pets, and with the swallows that were held almost sacred because they homed in temples. Not so many of them settled in Palestine as of the storks, but large flocks lived in the wilderness South of Jerusalem, and a few pairs homed near water as far north as Merom. The grayish-brown cranes were the largest, and there were also a crested, and a white crane. They nested on the ground or in trees and laid two large eggs, differing with species. The eggs of the brown bird were a light drab with brown speckles, and those of the white, rough, pale-blue with brown splotches. They were not so affectionate in pairs or to their young as storks, but were average parents. It is altogether probable that they were the birds intended by Isaiah, because they best suited his purpose, the crane and the swallow being almost incessant talkers among birds. The word "chatter," used in the Bible, exactly suits the notes of a swallow, but is much too feeble to be used in describing the vocalizing of the crane. They migrated in large wedge-shaped companies and cried constantly on wing. They talked incessantly while at the business of living, and even during the watches of the night they scarcely ceased passing along word that all was well, or sending abroad danger signals. The Arabs called the cry of the cranes "bellowing." We usually express it by whooping or trumpeting. Any of these words is sufficiently expressive to denote an unusual voice, used in an unusual manner, so that it appealed to the prophet as suitable for use in a strong comparison.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CRASHING

<krash'-ing> ([*rbv*, *shebher*]): This word, meaning "a breach," figuratively "destruction," is translated "crashing" in ~~300~~ Zephaniah 1:10: "a great crashing from the hills," representing the doom to fall on evil-doers in Jerusalem, as the enemy advanced against the city from the north.

CRATES

<kra'-tez> ([*πάτης*, *Krates*]), governor of the Cyprians, left as deputy of Sostratus when the latter, who was governor of Jerusalem, was summoned to Antioch by Antiochus Epiphanes, in consequence of a dispute with Menelaus (2 Macc 4:29). As Cyprus was not at the time in the possession of Antiochus, the words have been generally taken to mean Krates "who had formerly been, or afterward was, governor of the Cyprians." The

Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates the Greek into "Sostratus autem praelatus est Cypriis."

CREATION

<kre-a'-shun> ([arB; bara'] "to create"; [κτίσις, ktisis], "that which is created," "creature"):

1. CREATION AS ABIDING:

Much negative ground has been cleared away for any modern discussion of the doctrine of creation. No idea of creation can now be taken as complete which does not include, besides the world as at first constituted, all that to this day is in and of creation. For God creates not being that can exist independently of Him, His preserving agency being inseparably connected with His creative power. We have long ceased to think of God's creation as a machine left, completely made, to its own automatic working. With such a doctrine of creation, a theistic evolution would be quite incompatible.

2. MISTAKEN IDEAS:

Just as little do we think of God's creative agency, as merely that of a First Cause, linked to the universe from the outside by innumerable sequences of causes and effects. Nature in her entirety is as much His creation today as she ever was. The dynamic ubiquity of God, as efficient energy, is to be affirmed. God is still All and in All, but this in a way sharply distinguished from pantheistic views, whether of the universe as God, or of God as the universe. Of His own freedom He creates, so that Gnostic theories of natural and necessary emanation are left far behind. Not only have the "carpenter" and the "gardener" theories — with, of course, the architect or world-builder theory of Plato — been dismissed; not only has the conception of evolution been proved harmonious with creative end, plan, purpose, ordering, guidance; but evolutionary science may itself be said to have given the thought of theistic evolution its best base or grounding. The theistic conception is, that the world — that all cosmic existences, substances, events — depend upon God.

3. TRUE CONCEPTION:

The doctrine of creation — of the origin and persistence, of all finite existences — as the work of God, is a necessary postulation of the religious consciousness. Such consciousness is marked by deeper insight than belongs to science. The underlying truth is the anti-patheistic one, that the energy and wisdom — by which that, which was not, became — were, in kind, other than its own. For science can but trace the continuity of sequences in all Nature, while in creation, in its primary sense, this law of continuity must be transcended, and the world viewed solely as product of Divine Intelligence, immanent in its evolution. For God is the Absolute Reason, always immanent in the developing universe. Apart from the cosmogonic attempts at the beginning of Genesis, which are clearly religious and ethical in scope and character, the Old Testament furnishes no theoretic account of the manner and order in which creative process is carried on.

4. THE GENESIS COSMOGONY:

The early chapters of Genesis were, of course, not given to reveal the truths of physical science, but they recognize creation as marked by order, continuity, law, plastic power of productiveness in the different kingdoms, unity of the world and progressive advance. The Genesis cosmogony teaches a process of becoming, as well as a creation (*see EVOLUTION*). That cosmogony has been recognized by Haeckel as meritoriously marked by the two great ideas of separation or differentiation, and of progressive development or perfecting of the originally simple matter. The Old Testament presents the conception of time-worlds or successive ages, but its real emphasis is on the energy of the Divine Word, bringing into being things that did not exist.

5. MATTER NOT ETERNAL:

The Old Testament and the New Testament, in their doctrine of creation, recognize no eternal matter before creation. We cannot say that the origin of matter is excluded from the Genesis account of creation, and this quite apart from the use of *bard'*, as admitting of material and means in creation. But it seems unwise to build upon Genesis passages that afford no more than a basis which has proved exegetically insecure. The New Testament seems to favor the derivation of matter from the non-existent — that is to say, the time-worlds were due to the effluent Divine Word or originative

Will, rather than to being built out of God's own invisible essence. So the best exegesis interprets ~~scrib~~ Hebrews 11:3.

6. "WISDOM" IN CREATION:

In Old Testament books, as the Psalms, Proverbs, and Jeremiah, the creation is expressly declared to be the work of Wisdom — a Wisdom not disjoined from Goodness, as is yet more fully brought out in the Book of Job. The heavens declare the glory of God, the world manifests or reveals Him to our experience, as taken up and interpreted by the religious consciousness. The primary fact of the beginning of the time-worlds — the basal fact that the worlds came into being by the Word of God — is something apprehensible only by the power of religious faith, as the only principle applicable to the case (~~scrib~~ Hebrews 11:3). Such intuitive faith is really an application of first principles in the highest — and a truly rational one (*see* LOGOS). In creation, God is but expressing or acting out the conscious Godhood that is in Him. In it the thought of His absolute Wisdom is realized by the action of His perfect Love. It is philosophically necessary to maintain that God, as the Absolute Being, must find the end of creation in Himself. If the end were external to, and independent of, Him, then would He be conditioned thereby.

7. A FREE, PERSONAL ACT:

What the religious consciousness is concerned to maintain is, the absolute freedom of God in the production of the universe, and the fact that He is so much greater than the universe that existence has been by Him bestowed on all things that do exist. The Scriptures are, from first to last, shot through with this truth. Neither Kant nor Spencer, from data of self-consciousness or sense-perception, can rise to the conception of creation, for they both fail to reach the idea of Divine Personality. The inconceivability of creation has been pressed by Spencer, the idea of a self-existent Creator, through whose agency it has been made, being to him unthinkable. As if it were not a transparent sophism, which Spencer's own scientific practice refuted, that a hypothesis may not have philosophical or scientific value, because it is what we call unthinkable or inconceivable. As if a true and sufficient cause were not enough, or a Divine act of will were not a *vera causa*. Dependent existence inevitably leads thought to demand existence that is not dependent.

8. CREATION AND EVOLUTION:

Creation is certainly not disproved by evolution, which does not explain the origin of the homogeneous stuff itself, and does not account for the beginning of motion within it. Of the original creative action, lying beyond mortal ken or human observation, science — as concerned only with the manner of the process — is obviously in no position to speak. Creation may, in an important sense, be said not to have taken place in time, since time cannot be posited prior to the existence of the world. The difficulties of the ordinary hypothesis of a creation in time can never be surmounted, so long as we continue to make eternity mean simply indefinitely prolonged time. Augustine was, no doubt, right when, from the human standpoint, he declared that the world was not made in time, but with time. Time is itself a creation simultaneous with, and conditioned by, world-creation and movement. To say, in the ordinary fashion, that God created in time, is apt to make time appear independent of God, or God dependent upon time. Yet the time-forms enter into all our psychological experience, and a concrete beginning is unthinkable to us.

9. IS CREATION ETERNAL?:

The time-conditions can be transcended only by some deeper intuition than mere logical insight can supply — by such intuitive endeavor, in fact, as is realized in the necessary belief in the self-existent God. If such an eternal Being acts or creates, He may be said to act or create in eternity; and it is legitimate enough, in such wise, to speak of His creative act as eternal. This seems preferable to the position of Origen, who speculatively assumed an eternal or unbeginning activity for God as Creator, because the Divine Nature must be eternally self-determined to create in order to the manifestation of its perfections. Clearly did Aquinas perceive that we cannot affirm an eternal creation impossible, the creative act not falling within our categories of time and space. The question is purely one of God's free volition, in which — and not in “nothing” — the Source of the world is found.

10. CREATION EX NIHILO:

This brings us to notice the frequently pressed objection that creation cannot be out of nothing, since out of nothing comes nothing. This would mean that matter is eternal. But the eternity of matter, as something other than God, means its independence of God, and its power to limit or

condition Him. We have, of course, no direct knowledge of the origin of matter, and the conception of its necessary self-existence is fraught with hopeless difficulties and absurdities. The axiom, that out of nothing nothing comes, is not contradicted in the case of creation. The universe comes from God; it does not come from nothing. But the axiom does not really apply to the world's creation, but only to the succession of its phenomena. Entity does not spring from non-entity. But there is an opposite and positive truth, that something presupposes something, in this case rather some One — aliquis rather than aliquid.

11. FROM GOD'S WILL:

It is enough to know that God has in Himself the powers and resources adequate for creating, without being able to define the ways in which creation is effected by Him. It is a sheer necessity of rational faith or spiritual reason that the something which conditions the world is neither [υλη, *hule*], nor elemental matter, but personal Spirit or originaive Will. We have no right to suppose the world made out of nothing, and then to identify, as Erigena did, this "nothing" with God's own essence. What we have a right to maintain is, that what God creates or calls into being owes its existence to nothing save His will alone, Ground of all actualities. Preexistent Personality is the ground and the condition of the world's beginning.

12. ERROR OF PANTHEISM:

In this sense, its beginning may be said to be relative rather than absolute. God is always antecedent to the universe — its prius, Cause and Creator. It remains an effect, and sustains a relation of causal dependence upon Him. If we say, like Cousin, that God of necessity creates eternally, we run risk of falling into Spinozistic pantheism, identifying God, in excluding from Him absolute freedom in creation, with the impersonal and unconscious substance of the universe. Or if, with Schelling, we posit in God something which is not God — a dark, irrational background, which original ground is also the ground of the Divine Existence — we may try to find a basis for the matter of the universe, but we are in danger of being merged — by conceptions tinged with corporeity — in that form of pantheism to which God is but the soul of the universe.

The universe, we feel sure, has been caused; its existence must have some ground; even if we held a philosophy so idealistic as to make the scheme of

created things one grand illusion, an illusion so vast would still call for some explanatory Cause. Even if we are not content with the conception of a First Cause, acting on the world from without and antecedently in time, we are not yet freed from the necessity of asserting a Cause. An underlying and determining Cause of the universe would still need to be postulated as its Ground.

13. FIRST CAUSE A NECESSARY PRESUPPOSITION:

Even a universe held to be eternal would need to be accounted for — we should still have to ask how such a universe came to be. Its endless movement must have direction and character imparted to it from some immanent ground or underlying cause. Such a self-existent and eternal World-Ground or First Cause is, by an inexorable law of thought, the necessary correlate of the finitude, or contingent character of the world. God and the world are not to be taken simply as cause and effect, for modern metaphysical thought is not content with such a mere *ens extra-mundandum* for the Ground of all possible experience. God, self-existent Cause of the ever-present world and its phenomena, is the ultimate Ground of the possibility of all that is.

14. THE END — THE DIVINE GLORY:

Such a Deity, as *causa sui*, creatively bringing forth the world out of His own potency, cannot be allowed to be an arbitrary resting-place, but a truly rational Ground, of thought. Nor can His Creation be allowed to be an aimless and mechanical universe: it is shot through with end or purpose that tends to reflect the glory of the eternal and personal God, who is its Creator in a full and real sense. But the Divine. action is not dramatic: of His working we can truly say, with ²³⁶¹⁵Isaiah 45:15, “Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself.” As creation becomes progressively disclosed to us, its glory, as revealing God, ought to excite within us an always deeper sense of the sentiment of ^{4981E}Psalms 8:1,9, “O Yahweh our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!”

See also **ANTHROPOLOGY; EARTH; WORLD.**

LITERATURE.

James Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, 1st edition, 1893; J. Iverach, *Christianity and Evolution*, 1894; S. Harris, *God the Creator and*

Lord of All, 1897; A. L. Moore, Science and the Faith, 1889; B. P. Bowne, Studies in Theism, new edition, 1902; G. P. Fisher, Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief, new edition, 1902; J. Lindsay, Recent Advances in Theistic Philosophy of Religion, 1897; A. Dorner, Religionsphilosophie, 1903; J. Lindsay, Studies in European Philosophy, 1909; O. Dykes, The Divine Worker in Creation and Providence, 1909; J. Lindsay, The Fundamental Problems of Metaphysics, 1910.

James Lindsay

CREATOR

<kre-a'-ter> ([κτιστής, *ktistes*], ~~ROM~~ 1 Peter 4:19): The distinctive characteristic of Deity, as the Creator, is that He is the Cause of the existent universe — Cause of its being, not merely of its evolution or present arrangements.

1. GOD AS CREATOR:

The doctrine of His being the Creator implies, that is to say, that He is the real and the exclusive Agent in the production of the world. For, as Herder remarked, the thought of the Creator is the most fruitful of all our ideas. As Creator, He is the Unconditioned, and the All-conditioning, Being. The universe is thus dependent upon Him, as its causative antecedent. He calls it, as Aquinas said, “according to its whole substance,” into being, without any presupposed basis. His power, as Creator, is different in kind from finite power. But the creative process is not a case of sheer almightiness, creating something out of nothing, but an expression of God, as the Absolute Reason, under the forms of time and space, causality and finite personality. In all His work, as Creator, there is no incitement from without, but it rather remains an eternal activity of self-manifestation on the part of a God who is Love.

2. PURPOSE IN CREATION:

God's free creative action is destined to realize archetypal ends and ideals, which are peculiar to Himself. For thought cannot be content with the causal category under which He called the world into being, but must run on to the teleological category, wherein He is assumed to have created with a purpose, which His directive agency will see at last fulfilled. As Creator, He is distinct from the universe, which is the product of the free action of His will. This theistic postulation of His freedom, as Creator,

rules out all theories of necessary emanation. His creative action was in no way necessarily eternal — not even necessary to His own blessedness or perfection, which must be held as already complete in Himself. To speak, as Professor James does, of “the stagnant felicity of the Absolute’s own perfection” is to misconceive the infinite plenitude of His existence, and to place Him in a position of abject and unworthy dependence upon an eternal activity of world-making.

3. RELATION TO TIME:

God’s action, as Creator, does not lower our conception of His changelessness, for it is a gratuitous assumption to suppose either that the will to create was a sudden or accidental thing, or that He could not will a change, without, in any proper sense, changing His will. Again, grave difficulties cluster around the conception of His creative thought or purpose as externalized in time, the chief source of the trouble being, as is often imperfectly realized, that, in attempting to view things as they were when time began, we are really trying to get out of, and beyond, experience, to the thinking of which time is an indispensable condition. God’s work as Creator must have taken place in time, since the world must be held as no necessary element in the Absolute Life.

4. CHRIST IN CREATION:

The self-determined action of the Divine Will, then, is to be taken as the ultimate principle of the cosmos. Not to any causal or meta-physical necessity, but to Divine or Absolute Personality, must the created world be referred. “Of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things” (⁵¹¹⁵Romans 11:36). This creative action of God is mediated by Christ — by whom “were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him” (⁵¹¹⁶Colossians 1:16).

See CREATION.

James Lindsay

CREATURE

<kre'-tur>: The word “creature,” as it occurs in the New Testament, is the translation and also the exact English equivalent of the Greek [κτίσις,

ktisis], or [κτίσμα, *ktisma*], from [κτίζω, *ktizo*], “to create.” In the Old Testament, on the other hand, it stands for words which have in the original no reference to creation, but which come from other roots. *Nephesh*, “living creature” (literally, “a breathing thing”), occurs in the accounts of the Creation and the Flood and at the close of the lists of clean and unclean animals in ^{<B146>}Leviticus 11:46. *Chay*, “living creature” (literally, “a living thing”), occurs 13 times in Ezekiel 1; 3 and 10 (*see CREATURE, LIVING*). *Sherets*, “moving creature” (literally, “a swarming thing,” generally rendered “creeping thing,” which see), occurs once in ^{<B102>}Genesis 1:20. *Ochim*, “doleful creatures,” occurs once only in ^{<B132>}Isaiah 13:21. It appears to be an onomatopoetic word referring to the mournful sounds emitted by the animals in question. From the context it is fair to suppose that owls may be the animals referred to.

See OWL; CREATION.

Alfred Ely Day

CREATURE, LIVING

([חַיָּ " , *chayyah*]; [ζῷον, *zoon*]): “Living creature” (*chayyah*) is the designation of each of the composite figures in Ezekiel’s visions (^{<B105>}Ezekiel 1:5,13 ff; 3:13; 10:15,17,20) and, the Revised Version (British and American), of the similar beings in the visions of the Apocalypse, instead of the extremely unfortunate translation of *zoon* in the King James Version by “beasts” (^{<B105>}Revelation 4:6 ff; 5:6 ff; 6:1 ff; 7:11; 14:3; 15:7; 19:4), which, however, went back to Wycliff, in whose time the word had not the low meaning which “beast,” “beastly” have with us; hence, he translates ^{<B154>}1 Corinthians 15:44, “It is sown beestli body,” meaning simply *animal* (see Trench’s *Select Glossary*); in Revelation “the beasts of the earth,” the “beasts” that came up, the notable “beast” that men worshipped, represent the Greek *therion*, “a wild beast.”

The “living creatures” in Ezekiel’s vision (^{<B105>}Ezekiel 1:5 ff) were four in number, “with the general appearance of a man, but each with four faces and four wings, and straight legs with the feet of an ox. Under their wings are human hands, and these wings are so joined that they never require to turn. The front face is that of a man; right and left of this are the faces of a lion and (of) an ox, and behind, that of an eagle out of the midst of them gleam fire, torches, lightnings, and connected with them are four wheels that can turn in every direction, called whirling wheels (^{<B102>}Ezekiel 10:12,13). Like the creatures, these are alive, covered with eyes, the sign

of intelligence; the spirit of the living creatures is in them. They are afterward discovered by the prophet to be *cherubim*” (Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 233). **See** *CHERUBIM*. In Ezekiel’s vision they seem to be the bearers of the throne and glory of God; the bearers of His presence and of His revelation (^{<209B>}Ezekiel 9:3; 10:3). They also sound forth His praise (^{<218D>}Ezekiel 3:12; 10:2). (See Schultz as above.)

The four living creatures in Revelation (4:6) are not *under* the throne but “in the midst of the throne” (the American Revised Version, margin “before”; see 7:17; compare 5:6) and “round about the throne.” They are also *cherubim*, and seem to represent the four beings that stand at the head of the four divisions of the creation; among the untamed animals the *lion*; among cattle the *calf* or *ox*; among birds the *eagle*; among all created beings the *man*. It gives “a perfect picture of true service, which should be as brave as the lion, patient as the ox, aspiring as the eagle, intelligent as man” (Milligan in the place cited.). They represent the powers of Nature — of the creation, “full of eyes” as denoting its permeation with the Divine Reason, the wings signifying its constant, ready service, and the unceasing praise the constant doing of God’s will. The imagery is founded on Ezekiel as that had been modified in apocalyptic writings and as it was exalted in the mind of the Seer of Patmos.

W. L. Walker

CREDIT

^{<kred'-it>} ([πιστεύειν, *pisteuein*]; 1 Macc 10:46 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “gave no credence”; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:6 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “trusted”; 1 Macc 1:30 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “credence”): In the modern commercial sense the noun “credit” does not occur in the canonical Scriptures or in the Apocrypha.

CREDITOR

^{<kred'-i-ter>}

(a) [hvn̄, *nosheh*], participle of [hvn̄; *nashah*]: ^{<12224>}Exodus 22:24 (English translation: 25); ^{<1701>}2 Kings 4:1; ^{<2811>}Isaiah 50:1; translated

“extortioner,” ^{<1991B>}Psalm 109:11; “taker of usury,” ^{<234D>}Isaiah 24:2 the King James Version;

(b) [hw] ה" , *malweh*], participle of [hw] ; *lawah*], ^{<234D>}Isaiah 24:2 the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version “lender”;

(c) [I [B" /dy;hVמ" , *ba'al mashsheh yadho*]: “lord of the loan of his hand,” ^{<151D>}Deuteronomy 15:2;

(d) [δανιστής, *danistes*]: ^{<174B>}Luke 7:41, “creditor” the King James Version, “lender” the Revised Version (British and American); compare further *danistos*, Sirach 29:28, “lender” the King James Version, “money-lender” the Revised Version (British and American)): In the ideal social system of the Old Testament, debts are incurred only because of poverty, and the law protected the poor debtor from his creditor, who in ^{<1225>}Exodus 22:25 is forbidden to demand interest, and in ^{<151D>}Deuteronomy 15:2 to exact payment in view of the nearness of the year of release. ^{<134B>}2 Kings 4:1 shows that the actual practice was not so considerate, and in consequence the creditor fell into bad repute. In ^{<1991B>}Psalm 109:11 he is the extortioner; in ^{<119B>}Proverbs 29:13 the oppressor is evidently the creditor, though a different word is used; compare also ^{<121D>}Proverbs 22:7. In Sirach 29:28 the importunity of the creditor is one of the hardships of the poor man of understanding. The actual practice of the Jews may be gathered from ^{<141D>}Nehemiah 5:1 ff; ^{<141B>}Jeremiah 34:8 ff; and Sirach 29:1-11.

See also DEBT.

Walter R. Betteridge

CREED; CREEDS

<kred>:

By “creed” we understand the systematic statement of religious faith; and by the creeds of the Christian church we mean the formal expression of “the faith which was delivered unto the saints.” The word is derived from the first word of the Latin versions of the Apostles’ Creed, and the name is usually applied to those formulas known as the Apostles’, the Nicene and the Athanasian creeds.

In this article we shall first indicate the Scriptural foundation and rudimentary Biblical statements upon which the distinctive dogmas of the

church are based; and, secondly, briefly describe the origin and nature of the three most important symbols of belief which have dominated Christian thought.

I. SCRIPTURAL BASIS.

There are three forms in which the religious instinct naturally expresses itself — in a ritual, a creed and a life. Men first seek to propitiate the Deity by some outward act and express their devotion in some external ceremony. Next they endeavor to explain their worship and to find a rationale of it in certain facts which they formulate into a confession; and lastly, not content with the outward act or the verbal interpretation of it, they attempt to express their religion in life.

Pagan religion first appears in the form of a rite. The worshipper was content with the proper performance of a ceremony and was not, in the earliest stage at least, concerned with an interpretation of his act. The myths, which to some extent were an attempt to rationalize ritual, may be regarded as the earliest approach to a formulated statement of belief. But inasmuch as the myths of early pagan religion are not obligatory upon the reason or the faith of the worshipper, they can scarcely be regarded as creeds. Pagan religion, strictly speaking, has no theology and having no real historical basis of facts does not possess the elements of a creed. In this respect it is distinguished from revealed religion. This latter rests upon facts, the meaning and interpretation of which are felt to be necessary to give to revelation its values and authority.

1. In the Old Testament:

Even in the Old Testament there are not wanting the germs of a creed. In the Decalogue we have the beginnings of the formulation of belief, and in the proclamation, “Hear, O Israel: Yahweh our God is one Yahweh” (~~(-ORIG)~~ Deuteronomy 6:4), we have what may be regarded as the symbol of the Old Testament faith and the earliest attempt to enunciate a doctrine.

2. In the New Testament — Gospels:

It is to the New Testament, however, we must turn to find the real indications of such a statement of belief as may be designated a creed. We must remember that Christ lived and taught for a time before any attempt was made to portray His life or to record His sayings. The earliest writings are not the Gospels, but some of the Epistles, and it is to them we must

look for any definite explanation of the facts which center in the appearance of Christ upon the earth. At the same time in the sequence of events the personality and teaching of Jesus come first, and in the relation to Him of His disciples and converts and in their personal confessions and utterances of faith we have the earliest suggestions of an expression of belief. The confession of Nathanael (~~404~~ John 1:49), “Rabbi, thou art the Son of God,” and still more the utterance of Peter (~~406~~ Matthew 16:16), “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” and the exclamation of Thomas (~~408~~ John 20:28), contain the germ of a creed. It is to be noted that all these expressions of belief have Christ as their object and give utterance with more or less explicitness to a conviction of His Divine nature and authority.

3. In the Epistles:

(1) Paul:

But while these sayings in the Gospels were no doubt taken up and incorporated in later interpretations, it is to the Epistles that we must first go, for an explanation of the facts of Christ’s person and His relation to God and man. Paul’s Epistles are really of the nature of a confession and manifesto of Christian belief. Communities of believers already existed when the apostle directed to them his earliest letters. In their oral addresses the apostles must have been accustomed not only to state facts which were familiar to their hearers, but also to draw inferences from them as to the meaning of Christ and the great truths centering in His person — His incarnation, His death and resurrection (as we may see from the recorded sermons of Peter and Paul in Acts). It is to these facts that the Epistles appeal. It was at once natural and necessary that some expression of the faith once delivered to the saints should be formulated for a body whose members were pledged to each other and united for common action, and whose bond of union was the acknowledgment of “one Lord, one faith.” Paul recognizes it as vital to the very spirit of religion that some definite profession of belief in Christ should be made: “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (~~509~~ Romans 10:9). These words would seem to imply that a confession of the Deity, the atoning death, and resurrection of Jesus was the earliest form of Christian creed.

It must also be observed that from the very first the confession of faith seems to have been connected with the administration of baptism. Already

in the story of the Ethiopian eunuch (^{<4187>}Acts 8:37 the King James Version) (a passage indeed of doubtful genuineness but attested by Irenaeus and therefore of great antiquity) we find that as a condition of baptism the convert is asked to declare his belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. The passage in 1 Timothy (6:12; compare ^{<5023>}Hebrews 10:23), “Lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses,” may refer to a confession required only of those who were being ordained: but the context leads us to infer that it was a baptismal vow asked of members not less than of ministers of the church. The probability is that the earliest form of creed reflected little more than Christ’s final command to baptize all men “into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (^{<4189>}Matthew 28:19), or perhaps simply “into the name of the Lord Jesus” (^{<4495>}Acts 19:5). The verse in ^{<4187>}Acts 8:37 the King James Version, though disputed by some, is instructive in this connection. Faith in Jesus Christ was regarded as the cardinal point of the New Revelation and may have been taken to imply a relation to the Father as well as a promise of the Holy Spirit.

It is evident that the creeds that have come down to us are mainly an expression of the doctrine of the Trinity as embodied in the original baptismal formula derived from Our Lord’s commission. Already indeed in some places of the Old Testament this doctrine is foreshadowed; but it is first clearly incorporated in the Lord’s command just mentioned and in the benediction of Paul (^{<4734>}2 Corinthians 13:14), and subsequently in the Christian doxologies. Some scholars have preferred to find traces in the later writings of the New Testament of a more definite summary of belief: as in the allusion to the form of sound words (^{<5013>}2 Timothy 1:13), the “deposit” or “good deposit” which was to be kept (^{<5050>}1 Timothy 6:20 the Revised Version, margin; ^{<5014>}2 Timothy 1:14 the Revised Version, margin); also in “the faithful words” enumerated in these epistles (^{<5015>}1 Timothy 1:15; 3:1; 4:8,9; ^{<5011>}2 Timothy 2:11); and in the remarkable passage in the beginning of Hebrews 6 in which the elementary doctrines of the Christian religion are enumerated; first on the subjective side, repentance and faith, and then objectively, the resurrection and the judgment. There are also brief summaries in several of the Pauline Epistles of what the apostle must have considered to be essential tenets. Thus for example we have the death, burial and resurrection of Christ mentioned in ^{<4198>}1 Corinthians 15:3 f; ^{<5103>}Romans 1:3 f. Such summaries or confessions of personal faith as in ^{<5023>}2 Thessalonians 2:13 f are frequent in Paul’s

writings and may correspond to statements of truth which the apostle found serviceable for catechetical purposes as he moved from one Christian community to another.

See CATECHIST.

(2) Later Writings:

It is not indeed till a much later age — the age of Irenaeus and Tertullian (175-200 AD) — that we meet with any definite summary of belief. But it cannot be doubted that these Scriptural passages to which we have referred not only served as the first forms of confession but also contributed the materials out of which the articles of the church's faith were formulated. As soon as Christian preaching and teaching were exercised there would be a felt need for explicit statement of the truths revealed in and through Jesus Christ. It may be said that all the main facts which were subsequently embodied in the creeds have their roots in the New Testament Scripture and especially in the Pauline Epistles. The only exception which might be made is in the case of the virgin birth. It does not lie within the scope of this article to comment upon the silence of the epistles on this subject. This, however, we may say, that the omissions of Paul's reference to it does not prove it untrue. It only proves at most that it was not a part of the ground upon which the Christ was commended to the first acceptance of faith. But though no direct allusion to the virgin birth occurs in Paul's writings the truth which gives spiritual value to the fact of the virgin conception, namely, God's new creation of humanity in Christ, is a vital and fundamental element in the faith both of Paul and of the whole early church. The Christian life is essentially a new creation (~~4:16~~ 2 Corinthians 5:17; ~~6:15~~ Galatians 6:15; ~~6:4~~ Romans 6:4) in Jesus Christ, the second Adam (~~5:12~~ Romans 5:12-21), who is from heaven (~~15:47~~ 1 Corinthians 15:47). Into this spiritual context the facts recorded by Matthew and Luke introduce no alien or incompatible element (compare W. Richmond, *The Creed in the Epistles of Paul*; Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*). And therefore the story of Christ's birth as we have it in the Synoptics finds a natural place in the creed of those who accept the Pauline idea of a new creation in Christ.

See VIRGIN BIRTH.

(3) Hebrews:

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the evidences of development in the main doctrines of the gospel, but however the later ages may have elaborated them, the leading tenets of the subsequent faith

of the church — the doctrine of the Trinity; our Lord's divinity and real humanity; His atoning death and resurrection; the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of the catholicity and unity of the church — stand clear and distinct in these earliest Scriptural sources.

II. HISTORICAL FORMS.

Faith implies a creed as a confession and testimony. Such a confession and testimony answers to a natural impulse of the soul. Hence, a profession of faith is at once a personal, a social and a historical testimony. A formal creed witnesses to the universality of faith, binds believers together, and unites the successive ages of the church. It is the spontaneous expression of the life and experience of the Christian society. As the purpose of this article is chiefly to indicate the Scriptural sources of the creeds rather than to discuss their origin and history, we can only briefly describe the main historical forms which have prevailed in the Christian church.

1. The Apostles' Creed:

The Apostles' Creed, in ancient times called the Roman Creed, though popularly regarded as the earliest, was probably not the first in chronological order. Its origin and growth are involved in considerable obscurity (see separate article, APOSTLES' CREED; and compare Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*).

2. The Nicene Creed:

(1) Origin, Date, Character:

The Nicene Creed, called sometimes "the Creed of the 318" from the number of bishops reputed to have been present, was authorized at the Council of Nice in 325 AD, and completed by the Council of Constantinople in 381, when the clauses which follow the mention of the Holy Ghost were added. The opinions of Arius at the beginning of the 4th century created such unrest as to call forth not only the admonition of bishops but also the intervention of the emperor Constantine, who, as a professed Christian, had become the patron of the church. The efforts of the emperor, however, had no effect in allaying the dissensions of the church at Alexandria, which, upon the banishment of Arius, spread throughout eastern Christendom. It was decided, therefore, to convoke a general council of bishops in which the Catholic doctrine should be once and for all formally declared. This, the first ecumenical council, met at

Nicea in Bithynia in 325 AD. There is no detailed record of the proceedings. “We do not know whether it lasted weeks or days” (Stanley, Lects on East Ch.). Arius; being only a presbyter, had no seat in the conclave, but was allowed to express his opinions. His chief opponent was Athanasius.

(2) “Filioque” Clause:

The controversy turned upon the nature of the Son and His relation to the Father. The word *homoousios* (“of one substance with”), used in the course of the argument with a view of disputeing the extreme orthodox position, became the battleground between the parties. The Arians violently condemned. The Sabellians or Semi-Arians to evade its full force contended for the term *homoiousios* (“of like substance”). But the majority finally adopted the former expression as the term best suited to discriminate their view of the relation of the Father and Son from the Arian view. The assent of the emperor was gained and the words “being of one substance with the Father” were incorporated into the creed. The clauses descriptive of the Holy Spirit were added or confirmed at a later council (382), and were designed to refute the Macedonian heresy which denied His equality with the Father and Son, and reduced the Holy Spirit to a level with the angels.

The phrase “proceedeth from the Father and the Son” is also of historical importance. The last three words are a later addition to the creed by western churches, formally adopted by the Council of Toledo in 589. But when the matter was referred in the 9th century to Leo III he pronounced against them as unauthorized. This interpolation, known as the Filioque, marks the difference still between the Latin and Greek churches. From the 9th century no change has been made in the Nicene Creed. It has remained, without the Filioque clause, the ecumenical symbol of the Eastern Church; and with the addition of that word it has taken its place among the three great creeds of the Western Church.

3. The Athanasian Creed:

(1) Authorship:

The Athanasian Creed, or the Symbolum Quicunque, as it is called, from its opening words, differs entirely in its origin and history from those we have just considered. It is not a gradual growth like the Apostles’ Creed, nor is it the outcome of synodical authority like the Nicene Creed. “When the

composition appears for the first time as a document of authority it is cited in its completeness and as the work of the Father whose name it has since, in the most part, borne, although it was not brought to light for many centuries after his death” (Lumby, History of the Creeds). Without going into the full and intricate evidence which has been brought forward by scholars to prove that it is incorrectly attributed to Athanasius, it is sufficient to observe that both authorship and date are uncertain. Dr. Swainson proves in the most conclusive manner that the existence of this creed cannot be traced before the age of Charlemagne, and that its origin may probably be ascribed to then existing demand for a more detailed exposition of the faith than was to be found in the Apostles’ Creed. It is nowhere mentioned at synods before the end of the 8th century, whose special business it was to discuss the very matters which were afterward embodied within it in such detail.

(2) Question of Imposture:

The question of imposture has been raised with regard to this creed, and it has been maintained by some that it was originally a forgery of the same nature as the “false decretals” and the equally famous “Donation of Constantine” (Swainson). But it may be said that the word “imposture” is incorrectly applied to “a natural and inevitable result of the working of the mind of the Western Church toward a more elaborate and detailed confession of its Trinitarian faith” (Tulloch, Encyclopedia Brit). The imposture, if there was any, consisted not in the origin of the creed but in the ascription of it to a name and a date with which it had no connection. This was done no doubt to secure for it credit and authority, and was supposed to be justified by its special doctrinal import.

(3) Value and Features:

This symbol, though too compendious and elaborate to serve the purposes of a creed, itself standing in need of exposition and explanation, has its value as representing a further stage of doctrinal development. If the Apostles’ Creed determined the nature of God and the Nicene Creed defined the character and relation of the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Athanasian Creed may be regarded as establishing the great doctrine of the Trinity. Its distinguishing features are the monitory clauses and its uncompromising statement of the value of the Christian faith. The other creeds set forth the mercies of Revelation; this adds the danger of rejecting them. The others declare the faith; this insists also on its necessity. This,

also, alone insists upon the necessity of good works (Yonge, An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed). The closing warning is based on Christ's own words: "Depart from me," etc. (~~4154~~ Matthew 25:41,46). If this creed is solemn in its admonitions, we must remember that so also are the Gospels. On the whole it is a comprehensive summary of truth, laying down the rule of faith as a foundation, following out its issues of good or evil. True belief is closely connected with right action.

With the adoption of the "Athanasian" symbol, the creed-making of the early and medieval church ceases. Of the three mentioned one only in the broadest sense, the Nicene, is Catholic. Neither the Apostles' nor the Athanasian Creed is known to the Greek or oriental church which remained faithful to the faith settled by the holy Fathers at Nicea. The two others adopted by the West are really gradual growths or consequences from it, without any definite parentage or synodic authority. But the faith as defined at Nicea and ratified by subsequent councils is the only true Catholic symbol of the universal church.

4. The Reformation Creeds:

With the Reformation a new era of creed-formation began. It will not, however, be necessary to do more than mention some of the confessions of the Reformed churches which consist mainly of elaborations of the original creeds with the addition of special articles designed to emphasize and safeguard the distinctive doctrines and ecclesiastical positions of particular branches of the church. Of this nature are the Confessions of the Lutheran church — the Augsburg Confession of 1530; the Genevese or Calvinistic of 1549 consisting of 26 articles, defining particularly the nature of the Sacraments; confessions of the Dutch church confirmed at the Synod of Dort in 1619 and known as the "Decrees of Dort"; and the famous Heidelberg Catechism. To this series of Protestant confessions must be added the 39 Articles of the Church of England and the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is the doctrinal standard not only of the churches of Scotland, but of the principal Presbyterian churches of Britain and America.

LITERATURE.

Winer, Doctrines and Confessions of Christendom (translation Clark, 1873); Lumby, History of the Creeds; Swainson, The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds (1875); Heurtley, Harmonia Symbolica (1858); Zahn, Apost. Symb.

(1892); Harnack, *Apost. Glaubensbekenntnis*; Swete, *Apostles' Creed*; Hefele, *Councils of the Church*; Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*. For exposition, and of a more popular nature, may be mentioned the works of Hooker, Barrow, and Beveridge, and especially Bishop Pearson; Westcott, *Historic Faith*; Norris, *Rudiments of Theology*; W. W. Harvey, *The Three Creeds*; J. Eyre Yonge, *An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed* (1888); Wilfred Richmond, *The Creed in the Epistles of Paul* (1909).

Arch. B. D. Alexander

CREEK

<krek>, colloq. krik ([κόλπος, *kolpos*] (^{<4073>}Acts 27:39), the Revised Version (British and American) “bay”): The spot has been identified as the traditional Bay of Paul about 8 miles Northwest of the town of Valetta in the island of Malta.

See *MELITA*.

CREEPING THING

<krep'-ing> ([^{cmr}, *remes*], [^{brv}, *sherets*]; [^ερπετόν, *herpeton*]): *Remes* and *sherets*, with the root verbs *ramas* and *sharats*, are used without any sharp distinction for insects and other small creatures. *Ramas* means clearly “to creep,” and is used even of the beasts of the forest (^{<PA0>}Psalm 104:20), while *sharats* is rather “to swarm.” But in at least one passage (^{<B144>}Leviticus 11:44), we have the noun, *sherets*, with the verb *ramas*; “with any manner of creeping thing that moveth upon the earth.” The principal passages where these words occur are the accounts of the Creation and the Flood and the references to unclean animals in Leviticus and in the vision of Peter. In the last we have the word *herpeton* as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew words (^{<4002>}Acts 10:12). Winged creeping things (*sherets ha-'oph*, ^{<B121>}Leviticus 11:20 ff), as well as the wingless, are unclean, but an exception is made in favor of the locusts, “which have legs above their feet, where-with to leap upon the earth.”

See *INSECTS*; *LOCUST*.

Alfred Ely Day

CREMATION

<kre-ma'-shun> (compare [^{tr} c; *saraph*], ^{<K715>}Joshua 7:15, etc., “shall be burnt with fire”; [^{καίω}, *kaio*], ^{<K33>}1 Corinthians 13:3, “If I give my

body to be burned,” etc.): Cremation, while the customary practice of the ancient Greeks, and not unknown among the Romans, was certainly not the ordinary mode of disposing of the dead among the Hebrews or other oriental peoples. Even among the Greeks, bodies were often buried without being burned (Thuc. i. 134,6; Plato *Phaedo* 115 E; Plut. *Lyc.* xxvii). Cicero thought that burial was the more ancient practice, though among the Romans both methods were in use in his day (Deuteronomy leg. ii.22,56). Lucian (Deuteronomy luctu xxi) expressly says that, while the Greeks burned their dead, the Persians buried them (*see BURIAL*, and compare ~~1012~~ 2 Samuel 21:12-14). In the case supposed by Amos (6:10), when it is predicted that Yahweh, in abhorrence of “the excellency of Jacob,” shall “deliver up the city,” and, “if there remain ten men in one house, that they shall die,” and “a man’s kinsman (ARVm) shall take him up, *even he that burneth him*,” etc., the suggestion seems to be that of pestilence with accompanying infection, and that this, or the special judgment of Yahweh, is why burning is preferred. When Paul (~~433B~~ 1 Corinthians 13:3) speaks of giving his body to be burned, he is simply accommodating his language to the customs of Corinth. (But see Plutarch on Zarmanochegas, and C. Beard, *The Universal Christ*.)

How far religious, or sanitary, or practical reasons were influential in deciding between the different methods, it is impossible to say. That bodies were burned in times of pestilence in the Valley of Hinnom at Jerusalem is without support (see ~~359B~~ Ezekiel 39:11-16). The “very great burning” at the burial of Asa (~~4464~~ 2 Chronicles 16:14) is not a case of cremation, but of burning spices and furniture in the king’s honor (compare ~~3645~~ Jeremiah 34:5). Nor is ~~4113D~~ 1 Kings 13:2 a case in point; it is simply a prophecy of a king who shall take the bones of men previously buried, and the priests of the high places that burn incense in false worship, and cause them to be burned on the defiled altar to further pollute it and render it abominable.

There is in the New Testament no instance of cremation, Jewish, heathen or Christian, and clearly the early Christians followed the Jewish practice of burying the dead (see Tert., *Apol.*, xlii; Minuc. Felix, *Octav.*, xxxix; Aug., *Deuteronomy civ. Dei*, i.12,13). Indeed, cremation has never been popular among Christians, owing largely, doubtless, to the natural influence of the example of the Jews, the indisputable fact that Christ was buried, the vivid hope of the resurrection and the more or less material views concerning it prevalent here and there at this time or that. While there is nothing anti-Christian in it, and much in sanitary considerations to call for it in an age of

science, it is not likely that it will ever become the prevailing practice of Christendom.

George B. Eager

CRESCENS

<kres'-enz> ([ρήσκης, *Kreskes*], “increasing”): An assistant of Paul, mentioned in ^{<5040>}2 Timothy 4:10 as having gone to Galatia. That he was one of the Seventy, and that he founded the church in Vienna in Gaul, are traditions without any trustworthy basis.

CRESCENTS

<kres'-ents> (μυνίρῃς , *saharonim*): Moon-shaped necklaces (^{<0082>}Judges 8:21,26; ^{<2388>}Isaiah 3:18).

CRETE

<kret> ([ρήτη, *Krete*], ethnic [ρήτες, *Kretes*], ^{<4021>}Acts 2:11; ^{<5012>}Titus 1:12): An island bounding the Aegean Sea on the South. It stretches from 34 degrees 50' to 35 degrees 40' North latitude and from 23 degrees 30' to 26 degrees 20' East long. With Cythera on the North and Carpathos and Rhodos on the Northeast, it forms a continuous bridge between Greece and Asia Minor. The center of the island is formed by a mountain chain rising to a height of 8,193 ft. in Mt. Ida, and fringed with low valleys beside the coast. There are no considerable rivers; the largest, the Metropole, on the South, is a tiny stream, fordable anywhere. An island of considerable extent (156 miles long, and from 7 to 30 miles broad), in several districts very fertile and possessing one or two good harbors, it seems marked out by its position for an important role in the history of the eastern Mediterranean. But never since an age which was already legendary when Greek history began has Crete occupied a dominating position among the powers of the surrounding continents. Internal dissensions, due in ancient times to the diversity of races inhabiting its soil (Eteocretans — the original inhabitants — Pelasgians, Acheans, Cydonians and Dorians), and in modern times to the fact that a large minority of the population has accepted the Ottoman religion along with Ottoman government, have kept Crete in a position of political inferiority throughout the historical period.

1. EARLY HISTORY:

Mt. Ida in Crete was famous in Greek legend as the birthplace of Zeus. The half-legendary, half-historical King Minos was said to be the son of Zeus, and to have derived from his father the wisdom to which, by a type of myth common in Greek lands, the constitution of the Cretan cities was ascribed. Minos was accepted as a historical personage by Thucydides and Aristotle, who say that he was the first dynast in Greece to establish dominion on the sea. One of his exploits was the suppression of piracy in Cretan waters, a feat which had to be repeated by the Roman Pompeius at a later period. Aristotle compares the Cretan institutions with those of Sparta; the island was said to have been colonized by Dorians from Peloponnesus (Politics ii.10). The most important cities in Crete were Knossos (whose palace has been excavated with fruitful results by Mr. Arthur Evans), Gortyna, near the Gulf of Messara, and Cydonia, with its river Iardanus. The excavations of Mr. Evans at Knossos and of the Italians at Phastos (near Fair Havens) prove that Crete was a center of Mediterranean civilization in an early age. In the Homeric poems, Crete is said to have contained an hundred cities; at that period the Cretans were still famed as daring sailors. In the classical age of Greek history they never held a leading position. They are mentioned chiefly as traders and mercenary soldiers, skilled especially in archery. During the Hellenistic period Crete remained free. Demetrius Nicator made the island his base of operations before his defeat at Azotus in 148.

2. THE JEWS IN CRETE:

In 141, the Cretan Jews were influential enough to secure the patronage of Rome. They were being oppressed by the people of Gortyna, and appealed to Rome, which granted them protection. In strengthening the position of the Jews, the Romans were copying the Seleucid policy in Asia Minor; both the Seleucids and the Romans found the Jews among their most devoted supporters in their subject states. This interference of Rome in the interest of her future partisans paved the way for her annexation of the island in the following century. From this date, there was a strong and prosperous body of Jews in Crete, and Cretans are mentioned among the strangers present at the Feast of Pentecost in ~~Acts~~ Acts 2:11. Its alliance with Mithradates the Great, and the help it gave to the Cilician pirates gave Rome the pretext she desired for making war on Crete, and the island was annexed by Metellus in 67 BC. With Cyrene on the North coast of Africa,

it was formed into a Roman province. When Augustus divided the Empire between the Senate and himself, Crete and Cyrene were sufficiently peaceful to be given to the Senate.

3. LATER HISTORY:

They formed one province till the time of Constantine, who made Crete a separate province. The Saracens annexed Crete in 823 AD, but it was recaptured for the Byzantine Empire by Nicephorus Phokas in the following century. From the 13th till the 17th century it was held by the Venetian Republic: from this period dates its modern name “Kandia,” which the Venetians gave to the Saracen capital Khandax, and afterward to the whole island. After a desperate resistance, lasting from 1645 to 1669 AD, Crete fell into the hands of the Turks, who still exercise a nominal suzerainty over the island.

4. CRETE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In ^{<1814>}1 Samuel 30:14; ^{<3516>}Ezekiel 25:16, and ^{<3115>}Zephaniah 2:5, the Philistines are described as Cherethites, which is usually taken to mean Cretans. The name is connected with Caphtor and the Caphtorim (^{<1823>}Deuteronomy 2:23; ^{<2470>}Jeremiah 47:4; ^{<3117>}Amos 9:7). The similarity between the river-names Jordan and Iardanos (Homer Odyssey iii. 292) “about whose streams the Kydones dwelt,” has suggested that. Caphtor is to be identified with Cydonia; or possibly it was the name of the whole island. Tacitus believed in an ancient connection between Crete and Palestine; the Jews, he said, were fugitives from Crete, and derived their name Iudaei from Mt. Ida (Hist. v.2). Crete is mentioned in connection with the campaign of Demetrius Nicator, referred to above, in 1 Macc 10:67.

See CAPHTOR; CHERETHITES.

5. CRETE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

Crete owes its connection with Pauline history to the accident of a gale which forced the ship carrying Paul to Rome to take shelter on the South coast of the island. In the harbor of Myra, on the coast of Lycia, the centurion in charge of Paul transferred him from the Adramyttian ship which had brought them from Caesarea, to a ship from Alexandria in Egypt, bound for Ostia with a cargo of grain. The fact that the centurion was in virtual command of the ship (^{<4271>}Acts 27:11) proves that it was one

of the vessels in the imperial transport service. Leaving Myra they came opposite Cnidus with difficulty, against a head-wind. The ordinary course from Cnidus in good weather was to steer straight for Cythera, but on this occasion the West or Northwest winds made this route impracticable, and they sailed under the lee of Crete, whose South coast would shelter them from a Northwest gale, and afford occasional protection from a West gale. They passed Salmone, the Northeast corner of Crete, with difficulty, and worked round the coast to Fair Havens, a harbor somewhat to the East of Cape Matala. The great Feast fell while they were at Fair Havens; in 59 AD it was On October 5, in the middle of the season when the equinoxes made sailing impossible. Paul advised the centurion to winter in Fair Havens, but the captain wished to reach Phoenix, a harbor farther to the West, where ships from Egypt were accustomed to put in during the stormy season. It was decided to follow the captain's advice; but on its way to Phoenix the ship was struck by a Northeast wind called Euraquilo, which rushed down from Mt. Ida. The ship was carried out to sea; it managed to run under the lee of Cauda, an island 23 miles West of Cape Matala, where the crew hauled in the boat, undergirded the ship, and slackened sail. On the fourteenth night they were driven on the coast of Malta, and wrecked. The narrative does not state that Paul landed in Crete, but as the ship lay for some time at Fair Havens (~~4278~~ Acts 27:8,9) he had plenty of opportunity to land, but not to travel inland. The centurion gave him permission to land at Sidon. Paul left Titus in Crete (~~5016~~ Titus 1:5); tradition made the latter its first bishop, and patron saint.

6. THE CRETANS:

Cretans were present, as noted above, at the Feast of Pentecost (~~4211~~ Acts 2:11). Paul's estimate of the Cretan character (~~5010~~ Titus 1:10-16) was the one current in antiquity. Paul quotes (~~5012~~ Titus 1:12) a well-known line of the Cretan poet Epimenides (who lived about 600 BC) on the mendacity of the Cretans. The sentiment was repeated by Callimachus (Hymn to Zeus 8). Other ancient witnesses to the detestation in which the Cretan character was held are Livy xlv.45, and Plutarch Aemilius section 23.

LITERATURE.

Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen, 320-30. On Crete in Greek and Roman times, consult e.g. Grote, Holm, and Mommsen. A succinct account of the prehistoric

archaeology of the island is given in Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, and Baillie, *The Sea Kings of Crete*.

W. M. Calder

CRIB

([~~sw~~bae‘*ebhuc*): “Crib” translates the Hebrew word ‘*ebhuc* exactly, as it denotes “a barred receptacle for fodder used in cowsheds and foldyards; also in fields, for beasts lying out in the winter.” The Hebrew is from a word meaning to feed (~~sb~~“ *a*; ‘*abhac*), and is used in the precise sense of the English word in ~~39:9~~ Job 39:9 of the “crib” of the wild ox, in ~~14:4~~ Proverbs 14:4, “Where no oxen are, the crib is clean,” and in ~~30:8~~ Isaiah 1:3, “The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master’s crib.”

CRICKET

<*krik’-et*> ([~~j~~ ~~6~~], *chargol*): This occurs in ~~11:22~~ Leviticus 11:22 (the King James Version “beetle”), and doubtless refers to some kind of locust or grasshopper.

See *BEETLE*; *LOCUST*; *INSECT*.

CRIER

<*kri’-er*> ([~~ar~~q; *qara*’]; compare [~~bo~~αω, *boao*]):

(1) Neither is this exact word found in English Versions of the Bible, nor a word exactly corresponding to it in the Hebrew Bible, but the character it stands for appears as “one who cries aloud,” i.e., proclaims mandates or gives public messages. In ~~1:21~~ Proverbs 1:21 it is said, “She (Wisdom) crieth in the chief place of concourse.” John the Baptist calls himself “the voice of one crying in the wilderness” (~~1:23~~ John 1:23) — like a herald going before the king.

(2) In the East today every village even has its public crier, selected for his loud or penetrating voice, and appointed to give notice of the fresh orders or mandates of the *mudir* (“governor”) or other authorities. The *muezzin* of the Moslems, who at the five appointed times of prayer mounts the minaret and calls the faithful to prayer, is another striking example. Something like the ancient “heralds” of the king were the “heralds” of the

Middle Ages in Europe who, preceded by trumpeters, made official proclamations:

George B. Eager

CRIME; CRIMES

<krim>, <krimz>: This term is used in English as the equivalent of the Hebrew [פְּשָׁעִי mishpaT], “judgment,” “verdict” (<2173> Ezekiel 7:23); [חַמְצָא zimmah], “a heinous crime” (<8811> Job 31:11); [μῦνα; ‘asham] = “a fault,” “sin” (<1230> Genesis 26:10, English Versions of the Bible “guiltiness”); and Greek [αἰτία, aitia], “case,” “cause” (<4257> Acts 25:27, the Revised Version (British and American) “charges”). In the King James Version <8188> John 18:38; 19:4,6, the rendition is “fault.” [ἑγκλημα, egklema], “indictment,” “charge” (<4256> Acts 25:16 the King James Version) is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to “matter.” A crime is a transgression against the public right; serious offense against the law; a base weakness or iniquity, all of which are regarded by the Bible as offenses against

(1) God, or

(2) man, or

(3) both. An injury to the creature is regarded as obnoxious to the Creator. Specific forms of crime are the following:

ADULTERY.

See separate article.

ASSASSINATION.

This term does not occur in the English Versions of the Bible, but, of course, is included in the more general “to kill,” or “to slay” ([gr” h; haragh] = “to smite with deadly intent” “destroy,” “kill,” “murder,” “put to death”). The law distinguished between unpremeditated and premeditated slaying, pronouncing a curse upon the latter (<1575> Deuteronomy 27:25). David expresses the deepest abhorrence of such an act (<1049> 2 Samuel 4:9-12). Instances are found recorded in <1085> Judges 3:15-22; <1087> 2 Samuel 3:27; 4:5-7; 13:28,29; 20:9,10; <1221> 2 Kings 12:20; 19:37; <2378> Isaiah 37:38. See also separate article.

BESTIALITY.

According to Webster: “unnatural connection with a beast.” This form of vice was treated by the Mosaic law as something exceedingly loathsome and abhorrent, calling for extreme language in its description and rigorous measures in its punishment. Both the beast and the guilty human were to be put to death (^{<1229>}Exodus 22:19; ^{<1823>}Leviticus 18:23; 20:15,16; ^{<1672>}Deuteronomy 27:21), in order, as the Talmud says, to obliterate all memory of the crime.

BLASPHEMY.

See separate article.

BREACH OF COVENANT.

Breach of Covenant ([**tyrBh" Ata,rr" P**; *parar 'eth ha-berith*]). — According to Poucher (HDB, article “Crimes”), this term included:

- (1) failure to observe the Day of Atonement (^{<1229>}Leviticus 23:29); work on that day (^{<1238>}Leviticus 23:28);
- (2) sacrifice of children to Moloch (^{<1818>}Leviticus 20:3);
- (3) neglect of circumcision (^{<1174>}Genesis 17:14; ^{<1196>}Exodus 4:26);
- (4) unauthorized manufacture of the holy oil (^{<1213>}Exodus 30:33);
- (5) anointing an alien therewith (^{<1213>}Exodus 30:33);
- (6) neglect of the Passover (^{<1193>}Numbers 9:13). Note also the following: ^{<1174>}Genesis 17:14; ^{<1315>}Leviticus 26:15-44; ^{<1225>}Deuteronomy 29:25; 31:16,20. Paul (^{<1131>}Romans 1:31) speaks of [**ἄσυνθετοι**, *asunthetoi*] = “Covenant — breakers.”

BREACH OF RITUAL.

A term not found in the Scriptures, but designed to cover a number of acts prohibited by the ceremonial law. They have been exhaustively enumerated by Poucher (HDB, article “Crimes”):

- (1) eating blood, whether of fowl or beast (^{<1172>}Leviticus 7:27; 17:14);
- (2) eating fat of the beast of sacrifice (^{<1175>}Leviticus 7:25);

- (3) eating leavened bread during the Passover (^{<0215>}Exodus 12:15,19);
- (4) failure to bring an offering when an animal is slaughtered for food (^{<0170>}Leviticus 17:4);
- (5) offering sacrifice while the worshipper is under the ban of uncleanness. (^{<0171>}Leviticus 7:20,21; 22:3,4,9);
- (6) making holy ointment for private use (^{<0182>}Exodus 30:32,33);
- (7) using the same for perfume (^{<0188>}Exodus 30:38);
- (8) neglect of purification in general (^{<0193>}Numbers 19:13,10);
- (9) slaughtering an animal for food away from the door of the tabernacle (^{<0170>}Leviticus 17:4,9); even the alien must comply, so that the introduction of worship at other places might be avoided;
- (10) touching holy things illegally (^{<0116>}Numbers 4:16,20 the Revised Version (British and American) “the sanctuary”). The punishment for the non-observance of these prohibitions was the “cutting off” from the transgressor’s people ([^{brQmitr}” ^{kj} nikhrath miqqerebh] = “cut off from among,” i.e. excommunicated).

BREACH OF TRUST.

See TRUST, BREACH OF.

BRIBERY.

See separate article.

BURGLARY.

This term does not occur. The corresponding act is defined as “thievery accompanied by breaking,” and it places the offender beyond protection from violence (^{<0210>}Exodus 22:2). The crime might be committed in various degrees, and to burglarize the “devoted things” was punishable by death (^{<0175>}Joshua 7:25), as was also man-stealing (^{<0216>}Exodus 21:16; ^{<0247>}Deuteronomy 24:7).

DEBT.

See separate article.

DECEPTION.

See separate article.

DISOBEDIENCE.

See separate article.

DIVINATION.

See separate article.

DRUNKENNESS.

See separate article.

EVIL SPEAKING (SLANDER).

See Speaking Evil.

FALSEHOOD.

Occurs as the rendition of [ל [מ" , *ma'al*] = "treachery," "sin," "trespass" (^{<8213>}Job 21:34); and of [רִקֵּץ, *sheqer*] = "a sham," "deceit," "lying" (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 18:13; ^{<974>}Psalm 7:14; 119:118; 144:8,11; ^{<385>}Isaiah 28:15; 57:4; 59:13; ^{<404>}Jeremiah 10:14; 13:25; ^{<370>}Hosea 7:1; ^{<321>}Micah 2:11). In every case willful perversion of the truth or preference for the untruth is at least presupposed, hence, falsehood always marks an evil disposition, enmity against truth, and hence, against God; consequently is criminal in the fullest sense.

FALSE SWEARING.

"Swearing to a lie or falsehood" ([רִקֵּץ, *sheqer*]) is mentioned in ^{<883>}Leviticus 6:3,1; 19:12; ^{<472>}Jeremiah 5:2; 7:9; ^{<304>}Hosea 10:4; ^{<384>}Zechariah 5:4. From these passages and their context, it appears that this crime was considered in the twofold sense of a wrong against

(1) the neighbor, and

(2) against God, for the oath was an appeal to God as a witness to the truthfulness of the statement; hence, to swear falsely was to represent God as supporting a false statement.

FORNICATION.

Hebrew, [**hnz**; *zanah*] = “to commit adultery,” especially of the female, and less frequently of mere fornication, seldom of involuntary ravishment; also used figuratively in the sense of idolatry, the Jewish people being regarded as the spouse of Yahweh (^{<4211>}2 Chronicles 21:11; ^{<2297>}Isaiah 23:17; ^{<2626>}Ezekiel 16:26). Once we find the derivative noun [**tWnz**]” , *taznuth*] (^{<2626>}Ezekiel 16:29). In the New Testament, with both the literal and the figurative application, we find [**πορνεία**, *porneia*], and [**πορβεύω**, *porneuo*] (^{<4052>}Matthew 5:32; 15:19; ^{<4084>}John 8:41; ^{<4452>}Acts 15:20; ^{<4681>}1 Corinthians 5:1; 6:13,18; 7:2; 10:8; ^{<4722>}2 Corinthians 12:21; ^{<4859>}Galatians 5:19; ^{<4885>}Ephesians 5:3; ^{<5085>}Colossians 3:5; ^{<5048>}1 Thessalonians 4:3; ^{<6024>}Revelation 2:14,20,21; 9:21; 14:8; 17:2,4). The intensive [**ἐκπορνεύω**, *ekporneuo*] = “to be utterly unchaste” is found in ^{<6007>}Jude 1:7. Every form of unchastity is included in the term “fornication.”

FORSWEAR.

Found only in ^{<4053>}Matthew 5:33 in the sense of committing perjury ([**ἐπιπορέω**, *epiorkeo*]).

HARLOTRY.

The avocational or at least habitual, notorious practice of unchastity. In most instances the ordinary term for unchaste living, [**hnz**; *zanah*], is employed (^{<0381>}Genesis 34:31; 38:15,24; ^{<0214>}Leviticus 21:14; ^{<0805>}Joshua 2:1 (Rahab); ^{<0700>}Judges 11:1; 16:1; ^{<1086>}1 Kings 3:16; ^{<1070>}Proverbs 7:10; 29:3; ^{<2487>}Jeremiah 5:7; ^{<3077>}Amos 7:17). For the publicly known woman of the street and the professional devotee in the pagan temple-worship, the term [**hvdq**] *kedheshah*], was employed (^{<0382>}Genesis 38:21,22 the King James Version; ^{<3044>}Hosea 4:14). The Greek [**πόρνη**, *porne*], occurs in ^{<0231>}Matthew 21:31 f; ^{<0250>}Luke 15:30; ^{<4065>}1 Corinthians 6:15,16; ^{<3813>}Hebrews 11:31; ^{<5025>}James 2:25). Figurative: Often used metaphorically of idolatry or any defection from the Divine covenant, and applied particularly to Jerusalem (^{<2022>}Isaiah 1:21); the Jewish nation (^{<2427>}Jeremiah 2:20; 3:1,6 ff; often in Ezekiel 16 and 23; ^{<3001>}Micah 1:7); Israel (^{<3045>}Hosea 4:15); Nineveh (^{<3484>}Nahum 3:4); Tyro, with reference to the various arts employed to renew her commerce (^{<2336>}Isaiah 23:16) and to her restored traffic (^{<2297>}Isaiah 23:17); and to antiChristian “Babylon” (^{<6075>}Revelation 17:5,15; 19:2). See also Fornication.

HOMICIDE.

“Manslayer” ([j x" r; *ratsach*], “to dash in pieces,” “to kill,” “to murder”; Greek [ἀνδροφόνος, *androphonos*], with the same meaning): Mentioned in ^{<0816>}Numbers 35:6,12; ^{<5009>}1 Timothy 1:9. The Hebrew law distinguished between the premeditated and the unpremeditated slaying. See separate article.

IDOLATRY.

See separate article.

ILL-TREATMENT OF PARENTS (^{<0215>}EXODUS 21:15,17;
^{<0810>}LEVITICUS 20:9; ^{<0518>}DEUTERONOMY 21:18 FF).

See below.

INJURIES TO THE PERSON (^{<0218>}EXODUS 21:18 FF;
^{<0810>}LEVITICUS 24:19 F; ^{<0511>}DEUTERONOMY 25:11).

IRREVERENCE.

Lack of respect for God or His natural representatives, the parents or governmental officers. See also Parents, Crimes against; Blasphemy.

INCEST.

Designated in Hebrew by [hMzi *zimmah*], “vice,” “wickedness,” “refined immorality” (^{<0817>}Leviticus 18:17; 20:14); also “unnatural vice,” [l b,T, i], the same word that is used to designate the unnatural commingling with beasts. Amnon’s deed is designated as [dsj , *checedh*], indicating the degradation of the tenderness natural between brothers and sisters into a tenderness of an immoral character (2 Samuel 13). The crime of sexual relation of persons within the degrees of relationship forbidden by the Levitical law, as for instance, that of Lot’s daughters with their father (^{<0193>}Genesis 19:33); the son with his father’s concubines, as for instance, Reuben (^{<0192>}Genesis 35:22), and Absalom (^{<0162>}2 Samuel 16:22; compare ^{<0101>}1 Corinthians 5:1); that of the father-in-law with his daughter-in-law (^{<0315>}Genesis 38:15 ff; compare ^{<0221>}Ezekiel 22:11); of the brother with the sister or half-sister, as for instance, Amnon (^{<0134>}2 Samuel 13:14); of the brother-in-law with the sister-in-law (^{<0143>}Matthew 14:3); with the wife’s

mother, or the wife's daughter while living in apparent marriage with the mother (^{<R14>}Leviticus 20:14; 18:17). Illicit relation with the brother's widow is designated (^{<R12>}Leviticus 20:21) as a disgraceful deed, literally, "uncleanness" (excepting the levirate marriage). Such acts were forbidden on the ground that the Jews were to avoid the evil practices of the Canaanites and the Egyptians in regard to marriage within the specified limits, because this would naturally result in breaking down the sanctity of the bonds connecting near relatives, and in throwing open the flood gates of immorality among them. It is the Divine plan that the unions based on mutual choice and love, mingled with carnality, shall become clarified more and more into the purer love of close consanguineal relations; not vice versa. Then, too, such provisions would secure higher results in training and in the production of mentally and physically healthy children, the balancing and evening up of contrasts of Nature, and the production of new and improved types. The principle on which the prohibitions are imposed seems to be this: Marriage is forbidden between any person and a direct ancestor or a direct descendant or any close relative, such as brother or sister of either himself or any of his ancestors or any of his immediate descendants.

INFANTICIDE.

This crime, in the form in which it has been and is prevalent among barbarous nations, seems to have been quite foreign to the minds of the Hebrews, for they had too lofty a conception of the value of human life, and children were considered a blessing; their absence in the home, a curse (compare ^{<R17>}Exodus 1:17,21; Psalm 127; 128). For this reason, there appeared to be no reason to prohibit it by law, except as the Israelites might be influenced to sacrifice their children to Molech when following the religious customs of the Canaanites.

See *MOLECH*.

KIDNAPPING (MAN-STEALING).

[*ἀνδραποδιστής*, *andrapodistes*] = "man-stealer," "slave-dealer" (^{<S10>}1 Timothy 1:10). This was a mortal offense; but it seems that it, like some other forms of iniquity, was unknown to the Hebrews, except as they came in contact with it through their intercourse with other nations, such as the Romans and the Greeks, whose mythology frequently alludes to such acts.

LYING, MALICE, MANSLAUGHTER, MURDER, OATH.

See separate articles.

PARENTS, CRIMES AGAINST.

The law enjoined upon the infant all the reverence toward his parents, especially the father, that he could bestow on a merely human being. The reason for this lay in the fact that the heads of families were expected to transmit the Divine law to their household, and thus to stand in the place of God. That the mother was to share this reverence practically on equal terms with the father is shown by the fact that each is mentioned separately whenever obedience and reverence are enjoined upon the child (^{<B56>}Deuteronomy 5:16). As the specific crime against Yahweh consisted in blasphemy and open rebellion against the law, so the crime against parents consisted in deliberate disobedience and stubbornness (^{<B218>}Deuteronomy 21:18). And here again both the father and the mother are directed to lay hands upon him and bring him unto the elders for punishment. How greatly such conduct was held in horror is seen in many of the Proverbs, especially 30:17. It would be hard to specify all the acts which, in view of the above, would be considered crimes against the parents, but it is evident that everything which would lower their dignity and influence or violate their sense of just recognition must be carefully avoided, as witness the curse visited upon Ham (^{<B321>}Genesis 9:20 through 27).

PERJURY.

See False Swearing; Forswear above; also article OATH.

PROPHECYING, FALSE.

By reason of his position as the recognized mouthpiece of Yahweh, the prophet's word was weighty in influence; hence, to prophesy falsely was equivalent to practicing fraud publicly. Jeremiah described the condition as "wonderful and horrible," which made such things possible (5:30,31). See also Jeremiah 23,12; 29:8,9; ^{<B223>}Ezekiel 21:23; ^{<B302>}Zechariah 10:2; ^{<B075>}Matthew 7:15; 24:11,24; ^{<B132>}Mark 13:22; ^{<B136>}Luke 6:26; ^{<B136>}Acts 13:6 (Bar-Jesus); ^{<B011>}2 Peter 2:1; ^{<B041>}1 John 4:1; ^{<B163>}Revelation 16:13; 19:20; 20:10. See also separate article.

PROSTITUTION.

Hebrew and Christian morality never condoned this practice, though the Bible recognizes its existence as a fact even among God's people. The Hebrew father was forbidden (~~<1852>~~ Leviticus 19:29) to give his daughter over to a life of shame ([**l l " j** ; *chahal*], "to profane a person, place or thing," "to pollute"). See also Fornication, Harlotry, and Whoredom below.

RAPE.

[**qz" j** ; *chazak*] = "to seize," "bind," "restrain," "conquer," "force," "ravish." The punishment for this crime was greater when the act was committed against a betrothed woman (~~<1825>~~ Deuteronomy 22:25-29). See also Seduction.

REMOVING LANDMARKS.

(~~<1894>~~ Deuteronomy 19:14).

See *LANDMARKS*.

REVILING (~~<1228>~~ EXODUS 22:28).

See *Irreverence above and article REVILE*.

ROBBERY.

[**l z" 6**; *gazel*] = "to pluck off," "strip," "rob," "take away by force or violence"; forbidden in the law and frequently referred to as despicable (~~<1893>~~ Leviticus 19:13; 26:22; ~~<1820>~~ 1 Samuel 23:1; ~~<1222>~~ Proverbs 22:22; ~~<2302>~~ Isaiah 10:2,13; 17:14; ~~<2585>~~ Ezekiel 33:15; 39:10; ~~<3088>~~ Malachi 3:8,9).

SABBATH-BREAKING.

As the Hebrew Sabbath was regarded as a day of rest, all acts absolutely unnecessary were considered a violation, a "breaking" of the Sabbath, which appears sufficiently from the commandment (~~<1218>~~ Exodus 20:8-11); and the head of the household was held responsible for the keeping of this commandment on the part of all sojourners under his roof.

No other law gave the sophisticated legalists of later Judaism so much opportunity for hair-splitting distinctions as did this. In answer to the

question what labors were forbidden, they mentioned 39 specific forms of work, and then proceeded to define what constituted each particular form. But as even these definitions would not cover all possible questions, special precepts were invented. In order that one might not be caught in the midst of unfinished labors, when the Sabbath began (at sunset), certain forms of work must not be undertaken on Friday. Thus it was forbidden to fry meat, onions or eggs, if there was not sufficient time for them to be fully cooked before evening. No bread, no cakes, must be put into the oven, if there was not sufficient time remaining for their surface to brown before night.

See SABBATH.

SEDUCTION.

[h[T; ta`ah], “to dissemble,” “seduce,” and [h[f; Ta`ah], with the same meaning; [ἀποπλανᾶω, *apoplanao*], “to lead astray”; [πλανᾶω, *planao*], “to go astray,” “deceive,” “err,” “seduce”; and [γῶης, *goes*], “a wizard,” “an impostor,” “seducer.” In all the passages in which the idea of seduction is expressed in the English the term is used not in the modern sense of a trespass against a woman’s person, but in the more general and figurative sense of leading into sin generally (^{<1210>}2 Kings 21:9; ^{<1123>}Proverbs 12:26 the King James Version.; ^{<2393>}Isaiah 19:13 the King James Version; ^{<3130>}Ezekiel 13:10; ^{<4132>}Mark 13:22 the King James Version; ^{<3183>}2 Timothy 3:13 the King James Version; ^{<6126>}1 John 2:26 the King James Version; ^{<6121>}Revelation 2:20). However, the modern English idea of the word is expressed in the law found in ^{<12216>}Exodus 22:16,17.

SLANDER.

See separate article.

SODOMY.

See Unnatural Vice.

SPEAKING EVIL.

“To bring an evil ([r; ra`) name upon” (^{<5915>}Deuteronomy 19:15; ^{<1223>}1 Kings 22:23; ^{<5843>}Psalms 34:13; 41:5; 50:19; 109:20; 140:11; ^{<1158>}Proverbs 15:28; 16:30). Evil speaking is considered a crime because it is simply the expression of the evil intents of the heart. This is brought out more clearly

in the New Testament (<4077> Matthew 7:17,18; 12:34,35; <4089> Mark 9:39; <4065> Luke 6:45). As such, evil speaking ([βλασφημία, *blasphemia*]) is represented as entirely unworthy a Christian character (<4088> Ephesians 4:31; <4044> 1 Peter 4:4,14; <6002> 2 Peter 2:2,10,12; <5041> James 4:11; <6010> Jude 1:10); and [καταλάλέω, *katalaleo*] = “babble against,” “gossip.” It will be noticed from the above that evil speaking against those in authority is designated with the same word (“blasphemy”) as raillery against God, they being considered God’s representatives on earth.

See also EVIL SPEAKING; SLANDER.

STEALING.

Hebrew [bn" 6; *ganabh*] = “to thieve” (literal, or figurative); by implication, “to deceive,” “carry away,” “secretly bring,” “steal away” (<0448> Genesis 44:8; <0205> Exodus 20:15; 21:16; 22:1; <0060> Proverbs 6:30; <3888> Zechariah 5:3; <0320> Genesis 31:20,26 f; <0056> 2 Samuel 15:6; 19:3; <8273> Job 27:20; <0097> Proverbs 9:17 (“Stolen waters are sweet”; the forbidden is attractive; compare <6007> Romans 7:7)). Greek [κλέπτω, *klepto*] = “to filch,” “steal” (<4069> Matthew 6:19,20; 19:18; <6000> John 10:10; <6021> Romans 2:21; 13:9; <4028> Ephesians 4:28). See Theft.

SUICIDE.

No special law is found against this crime, for it is included in the prohibition against killing. Contrary to the practice and the philosophy of paganism, the act was held in deep abhorrence by the Hebrews because of the high value placed on human life. It was held inexcusable that any but the most degraded and satanic should lay hands on their own lives. Only the remorse of the damned could drive one to it, as witness Saul (<0804> 1 Samuel 31:4) and Judas (<4075> Matthew 27:5).

THEFT.

Hebrew [hbn&] *genebhah*] “stealing” (concrete), “something stolen,” “theft” (<0228> Exodus 22:3,1); mentioned in connection with other wickedness (κλοπη, *klope*) in <4059> Matthew 15:19; <4071> Mark 7:21; and ([κλέμμα, *klemma*]) in <6021> Revelation 9:21. All three words are used abstractly for the act and concretely for the thing stolen.

See THIEF.

UNCHASTITY.

No other form of sin is mentioned with disapproval and threats more frequently than the various forms of carnal vice, for no other sin is more natural or widespread.

See CHASTITY; LEWDNESS; MARRIAGE.

UNNATURAL VICE (SODOMY).

Alluded to with delicacy, but positively condemned as an abomination (^{<0133>}Genesis 13:13; 19:5,7; ^{<0822>}Leviticus 18:22; 20:13). It was the specific form of wickedness through which Sodom became notorious, so that “sodomite” is the regular translation of [^{<0133>}**vdq**; *qadhesh*], “a (quasi) sacred person,” i.e. (technically) “a (male or female) devotee to licentious idolatry” (^{<0217>}Deuteronomy 23:17; ^{<1143>}1 Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; ^{<1231>}2 Kings 23:7; ^{<0364>}Job 36:14 margin). Though permitted and even encouraged in heathen cult, it was never to be tolerated in the worship of Yahweh.

USURY.

See separate article.

WITNESSING, FALSE.

The Hebrew idiom is [^{<0133>}**rqv**,^{<0133>}**d**[^{<0133>}**ē**`*edh sheqer*], “witness of a falsehood,” “lie” (^{<0206>}Exodus 20:16; ^{<0596>}Deuteronomy 19:16,18; ^{<0169>}Proverbs 6:19; 14:5,25; 19:5,9); Greek [^{<0133>}**ευδομαρτυρέω**, *pseudomartureo*], “to bring false testimony”; [^{<0133>}**μαρτυρία**, *-marturia*], “bearing of false testimony” (^{<1109>}Mark 10:19; 14:56,57). It goes without saying that the law was emphatic in its denunciation of this practice, and in order that the innocent might be protected against the lying accuser, a criminal was to be convicted only on the testimony of at least two or three witnesses, testifying to the same facts (^{<0850>}Numbers 35:30). If one be found testifying falsely, he was to be punished by suffering the penalty which would have been inflicted on him against whom he testified, had he been convicted (^{<0596>}Deuteronomy 19:16-19).

WHOREDOM.

Hebrew [^{<0133>}**hnz**; *zanah*] = “to commit adultery,” “fornication or illicit

incontinence of any kind”; and its derivative [תזנז״ת, *taznuth*] = “fornication,” “harlotry,” “whoredom”; Greek [πορνεύω, *porneuo*] (verb), and [πορνεία, *porneia*] (noun), of the same meaning. The following passages will reveal the estimate in which such uncleanness was held, and the fact that men and women given to it were held in equal abhorrence and designated by the same terms: ^{<01324>}Genesis 38:24; ^{<01325>}Leviticus 19:29; ^{<01443>}Numbers 14:33; 25:1; Ezekiel 16; 23:3,7,8,11,27,29,43; 43:7,9; ^{<01002>}Hosea 1:2; 2:4; 4:11,12; 6:10; ^{<01004>}Nahum 3:4; ^{<01052>}Matthew 5:32; ^{<01026>}Romans 1:26 f; ^{<01011>}1 Corinthians 5:1; 7:2; 10:8; ^{<01007>}Jude 1:7; ^{<01014>}Revelation 2:14,20 f; 18:9; 19:2.

Figurative: Because of the infidelity to the lifemate and to right living involved in such acts, the practice became symbolical of infidelity to God and His law, and thus served as a frequent figure of speech for Israel’s error and apostasy.

See *HARLOT*.

Frank E. Hirsch

CRIMSON

<*krim*’-z’-n>.

See *COLORS*.

CRIPPLE

<*krip*’-’-l> ([χωλός, *cholos*]): Only occurs in ^{<01448>}Acts 14:8, denoting the congenitally lame man at Lystra. In the King James Version (1611) the word is spelled “creeple.” It originally meant one whose body is bent together as in the attitude of creeping. This was probably a case of infantile paralysis.

CRISPING, PINS

<*kris*’-ping>: Pins for crising, or curling, the hair. Thus the King James Version renders Hebrew [מַיְפְיָרֵךְ } *chariTim*] (^{<01022>}Isaiah 3:22; compare Vulgate). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes more correctly “satchels” (so Qimchi (compare ^{<01023>}2 Kings 5:23); compare Arabic). Others think of girdles; still others of veils or head-bands.

CRISPUS

<kris'-pus> ([ρίσπος, *Krispos*], “curled”): One of the small number baptized by Paul among the Corinthian Christians (~~AKH4~~ 1 Corinthians 1:14). He had been ruler of the Jewish synagogue, but he “believed in the Lord with all his house”; and, following Paul, withdrew from the synagogue (~~AKH7~~ Acts 18:7,8). He seems to have been succeeded by Sosthenes (~~AKH7~~ Acts 18:17). According to tradition he became bishop of Aegina.

CRITICISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY

See *ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM*.

CRITICISM, OF THE BIBLE

<krit'-i-siz'-m>: Criticism in General

CRITICISM IN GENERAL:

So much has been said and written in recent years on “Criticism” that it is desirable that the reader should have an exact idea of what criticism is, of the methods it employs, and of the results it reaches, or believes itself to have reached, in its application to Scripture. Such a survey will show the legitimacy and indispensableness of a truly scientific criticism, at the same time that it warns against the hasty acceptance of Speculative and hypothetical constructions. Criticism is more than a description of phenomena; it implies a process of sifting, testing, proving, sometimes with the result of establishing, often with that of modifying or reversing, traditional opinions. Criticism goes wrong when used recklessly, or under the influence of some dominant theory or prepossession. A chief cause of error in its application to the record of a supernatural revelation is the assumption that nothing supernatural can happen. This is the vitiating element in much of the newer criticism, both of the Old Testament and of the New Testament.

I. DIVISIONS.

1. Lower or Textual Criticism:

Criticism of Scripture (“Biblical criticism”) is usually divided into what is called “lower or textual criticism” and “higher criticism” — the latter a phrase round which many misleading associations gather. “Lower

criticism” deals strictly with the text of Scripture, endeavoring to ascertain what the real text of each book was as it came from the hands of its author; “higher criticism” concerns itself with the resultant problems of age, authorship, sources, simple or composite character, historical worth, relation to period of origin, etc.

2. Higher Criticism:

The former — “textual criticism” — has a well-defined field in which it is possible to apply exact canons of judgment: the latter — “higher criticism” — while invaluable as an aid in the domain of Biblical introduction (date, authorship, genuineness, contents, destination, etc.), manifestly tends to widen out illimitably into regions where exact science cannot follow it, where, often, the critic’s imagination is his only law.

It was only gradually that these two branches of criticism became differentiated. “Textual criticism” for long took the lead, in association with a sober form of Biblical “introduction.” The relations now tend to be reversed. “Higher criticism,” having largely absorbed “introduction” into itself, extends its operations into the textual field, endeavoring to get behind the text of the existing sources, and to show how this “grew” from simpler beginnings to what it now is. Here, also, there is wide opening for arbitrariness. It would be wrong, however, to deny the legitimate place of “higher criticism,” or belittle the great services it is capable of rendering, because of the abuses to which it is frequently liable.

It is now necessary that these two forms of criticism should be looked at more particularly.

II. LOWER OR TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

1. Origin of the Science:

We take first lower or textual criticism. There has never been a time when criticism of Scripture — lower and higher — has been altogether absent. The Jews applied a certain criticism to their sacred writings, alike in the selection of the books, and in the settlement of the text. Examples are seen in the marginal notes to the Hebrew Scriptures ([Qere] and [Kethibh]). The Fathers of the early church compared manuscripts of the New Testament books, noting their differences, and judging of the books themselves. The Reformers, it is well known, did not accept blindly the judgments of antiquity, but availed themselves of the best light which the new learning

afforded. The materials at the disposal of scholars in that age, however, were scanty, and such as existed were not used with much thoroughness or critical discernment. As aids multiplied with progress of discovery, comparison of manuscripts and versions one with another and with patristic quotations, revealed manifold divergencies and it became apparent that, in both Old Testament and New Testament, the text in current use in the church was far from perfect. “Various readings” accumulated. Not a few of these, indeed, were obvious blunders; many had little or no support in the more ancient authorities; for others, again, authority was fairly equally divided. Some were interpolations which had no right to be in the text at all. How, in these circumstances, was the true text to be ascertained? The work was one of great delicacy, and could only be accomplished by the most painstaking induction of facts, and the strictest application of sound methods. Thus arose a science of textual criticism, which, ramifying in many directions, has attained vast dimensions, and yielded an immense body of secure knowledge in its special department.

2. Methods Employed:

The materials with which textual criticism works (*apparatus criticus*) are, as just said, chiefly manuscripts, versions (translations into other tongues), quotations and allusions in patristic writings, with lectionaries (church service-books), and similar aids. The first step is the collection and collation of the material, to which fresh discovery is constantly adding; the noting of its peculiarities, and testing of its age and value; the grouping and designation of it for reference. A next important task is the complete collection of the “various readings” and other diversities of text (omissions, interpolations, etc.), brought to light through comparison of the material, and the endeavor to assign these to their respective causes.

3. Causes of Error:

More frequently than not errors manuscripts are unintentional, and the causes giving rise to them are sufficiently obvious. Such are the carelessness of scribes, lapses of memory, similarity of sounds (in dictation), or in shape of letters (in copying), wrong dividing of words, omission of a line or clause owing to successive lines or clauses ending with the same word. Intentional changes, again, arise from insertion in the text of marginal notes or glosses, from motives of harmonizing, from the substitution of smoother for harsher or more abrupt expressions — more rarely, from dogmatic reasons.

4. *Weighing of Authorities:*

Mistakes of the above kinds can generally be detected by careful scrutiny of sources, but a large number of cases remain in which the correct reading is still doubtful. These, next, have to be dealt with by the impartial weighing and balancing of authorities; a task involving new and delicate inquiries, and the application of fresh rules. It does not suffice to reckon numbers; manuscripts and versions have themselves to be tested as respects reliability and value. Through the presence of peculiarities pointing to a common origin manuscripts come to be grouped into classes and families, and their individual testimony is correspondingly discounted. Older authorities, naturally, are preferred to younger but the possibility has to be reckoned with that a later manuscript may preserve a reading which the older manuscripts have lost. Such rules obtain as that, of two readings, preference is to be given to the more difficult, as less likely to be the result of corruption. But even this has its limits, for a reading may be difficult even to the point of unintelligibility, yet may arise from a simple blunder. As a last resort, in cases of perplexity, conjectural emendation may be admitted; only, however, as yielding probability, not certainty.

In the application of these principles an important distinction has to be made between the Old Testament and the New Testament, arising from the relative paucity of material for critical purposes in the one case, and the abundance in the other. The subject is treated here generally; for details see articles on *LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*.

(1) **The Old Testament:**

Manuscripts and Versions:

In the Old Testament, textual criticism labors under the peculiar disadvantage that, with one minute exception (a papyrus fragment of the 2nd century, giving a version of the Decalogue), all known Hebrew manuscripts are late (the oldest not going beyond the 9th century AD); further, that the manuscripts seem all to be based on one single archetype, selected by the rabbis at an early date, and thereafter adhered to by copyists with scrupulous care (compare G. A. Smith, OTJC, 69 ff; Driver, Text of Sam, xxxvii ff; Strack, however, dissents). The variations which these manuscripts present, accordingly, are slight and unimportant. For a

knowledge of the state of the text prior to the adoption of this standard, criticism is dependent on comparison with the versions — especially the *SEPTUAGINT* (which see), with the *SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH* (which see), and with parallel passages in the Old Testament itself (e.g. in Samuel, Kings, Chronicles). Frequent obscurities in the Hebrew text, with undeniable discrepancies in names and numbers, show that before the fixing of the text extensive corruption had already entered. A simple instance of mistake is in ~~238B~~ Isaiah 9:3, where the King James Version reads: “Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy.” The context shows that the “not” is out of place: the Revised Version (British and American) therefore rightly reads (with the Hebrew [Qere]: the sounds are similar), “thou hast increased their joy.” In the Septuagint the divergences are often very great in order, arrangement, and readings; there are extensive interpolations and omissions (in Jeremiah, Graf reckons that 2,700 words of the Massoretic text are omitted); evidences, where the alterations are not of design, that the Hebrew manuscripts employed by the translators often differed widely from those approved in Palestine. The Samaritan recension likewise exhibits considerable differences.

It does not follow that, where difference exists, these rival texts are to be preferred to the Massoretic. Few, since the exhaustive examination of Gesenius, would affirm the superiority of the Samaritan to the Hebrew; even in regard to the Septuagint the trend of opinion seems increasingly in favor of the text of the Massoretic (compare Skinner, “Genesis,” International Critical Commentary, xxxv-xxxvi). There is no need, however, to maintain the general superiority of the above texts to the Massoretic to be convinced that, in many instances, the Septuagint, in some cases, probably, even the Sam, has retained readings from which the Massoretic Text has departed. Old Testament criticism has, therefore, a clear field for its labors, and there can be little doubt that, in its cautious application, it has reached many sound results. Less reliance can be placed on the conjectural criticism now so largely in vogue. Dr. G.A. Smith has justly animadverted on the new textual criticism of the poetical and prophetic books, “through which it drives like a great plowshare, turning up the whole surface, and menacing not only the minor landmarks, but, in the case of the prophets, the main outlines of the field as well” (Quarterly Review, January, 1907). This, however, trenches on the domain of the higher criticism.

(2) The New Testament:

In the New Testament the materials of criticism are vastly more abundant than in the Old Testament; but, with the abundance, while a much larger area of certainty is attainable, more intricate and difficult problems also arise. The wealth of manuscripts of the whole or parts of the Greek New Testament far exceeds that existing for any other ancient writings (Nestle mentions 3,829: 127 uncials and 3,702 cursives: Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament, English translation, 34-35, 81); the manuscripts of versions (excluding the Vulgate, reckoned by thousands), are likewise very numerous.

(a) Manuscripts and Versions:

Greek manuscripts are usually divided into uncials and cursives (or minuscules) from the character of the writing; the oldest uncials go back to the 4th and 5th centuries. The five chief, that alone need be named, are the Codex Sinaiticus (4th century), the Codex Vaticanus (B, 4th century), the Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century), the Codex Ephraemi (C, 5th century), the Codex Bezae (D, Gospels and Acts, Greek and Latin, 6th century). These manuscripts again are grouped according to affinities (Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, are here chief precursors; Westcott and Hort, chief modern authority), Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus (B) going together as representing one type of text, in the opinion of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek the best (the so-called “Neutral”); Codex Bezae (D) representing a “Western” text, with marked peculiarities; A and C exhibiting mixed texts. The VSS, in turn, Syriac, Old Latin, Egyptian (originating with 2nd and 3rd centuries), present interesting problems in their relations to one another and to the Greek manuscripts Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Bezae. With the Syriac versions (Sinaitic, Curetonian, Peshitta), Tatian’s Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels, ought to be mentioned. Formerly the Peshitta was taken to be the oldest Syriac version (2nd century); now, especially since the discovery of the Lewis (Sinaitic) palimpsest, it tends to be regarded as a later revision of the older Syriac texts (probably by Rabula of Edessa, beginning of the 5th century). The Old Latin, also the old Syriac, manuscripts show marked affinities with the text of Codex Bezae (D) — the “Western” type.

(b) The Western Text:

The question chiefly exercising scholars at the present time is, accordingly, the relation of the Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in the Greek text based on Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus to the Western text represented by Codex Bezae, but now finding early support from the Old Latin and Syriac, as well as from quotations in the 2nd and 3rd Fathers. The Western text is discounted by Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek for its para-phrastic character, and “astonishing freedom” in changing, inserting and omitting (Westcott-Hort, 122 ff); yet, on internal grounds, certain important omissions in this text of the last three chapters of Luke are accepted by these authorities as representing the purer text, the rejected readings being termed “non-Western interpolations.” A newer school, however, is disposed to accept the Western readings, as, to a much larger extent than was formerly supposed, the more original; while some writers, as Blass, Nestle, in part Zahn (compare Nestle, op. cit., 324 ff), seek a solution of the difference of texts in theory of two editions (Blass, Luke and Acts; Zahn, Acts alone). This theory has not met with much acceptance, and the problems of the Western text must still be regarded as unsolved. The question is not, indeed, vital, as no important doctrine of the New Testament is affected; but it touches the genuineness of several passages to which high value is attached. E.g. the words at the Supper, “which is given for you,” etc. (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲛ~~ Luke 22:19,20, not in D), are excluded by Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek as a non-Western interpolation; while the passage on the angel and the bloody sweat (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲛ~~ Luke 22:43,14 in both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae), and the first word on the cross, “Father, forgive them,” etc. (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲛ~~ Luke 23:34, in Codex Sinaiticus, omitted by Codex **Bezae (D)** and the Sinaitic Syriac), are rejected as Western interpolations. The Revised Version (British and American) retains these passages with marginal note.

(c) Results:

As respects results, it may be said generally that the labors of a long line of scholars have given us a New Testament text on which, in nearly all essential respects, we can safely rely. Others, it is to be owned, take a less sanguine view (compare Nestle, op. cit., 227 ff). The correct reading seems undeniably settled in a large majority of cases. The the Revised Version (British and American) embodies most of the assured results; doubtful cases are noted in the margin. Among passages long known to be interpolations, now altogether removed, is that on the three witnesses in ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲛ~~ 1 John 5:8. The two longest passages noted as not belonging to the

original text are the last 12 verses of Mark (16:9-20), and the story of the woman taken in adultery (~~4075~~ John 7:53 through 8:11).

III. HIGHER CRITICISM.

The scope of the higher criticism has already been indicated. Many of the inquiries it undertakes were formerly covered by what was called Biblical introduction; the flight of the newer science, however, is bolder, and the problems it seeks to solve are more complicated and far-reaching. An important part of its work is the analysis of books, with the view of determining their component parts (e.g. the J,E,P,D, of the Pentateuch), the age, origin, and characteristics of each, their connection with external conditions and the state of belief and life of the time. The nature of its task will be better understood from a rapid survey of its procedure.

1. The Old Testament:

Higher criticism began, mainly, with the Old Testament. Already in the 2nd century, Gnostics assailed the Old Testament as the work of an inferior deity (the Demiurge), and heretical Ebionites (Clementine Recognitions and Homilies) declared it to be corrupted with false prophecy. In the 17th century Spinoza prepared the way in his Tractatus (1670) for future rationalistic attacks.

(1) Astruc and Successors.

The beginning of higher criticism in the stricter sense is commonly associated with the French physician Astruc, who, in his Conjectures, in 1753, drew attention to the fact that, in some sections of Genesis, the Divine name employed is “Elohim” (God), in others, “Yahweh.” This he accounted for by the use of distinct documents by Moses in the composition of the book. Eichhorn (1779), to whom the name “higher criticism” is due, supplemented Astruc’s theory by the correct observation that this distinction in the use of the names was accompanied by other literary peculiarities. It soon became further evident that, though the distinction in the names mostly ceased after the revelation of Yahweh to Moses (~~4076~~ Exodus 3:6), the literary peculiarities extended much farther than Gen, indeed till the end of Joshua (Bleek, 1822; Ewald, 1831; Stahelin, 1835). Instead of a “Pentateuch,” recognized as of composite authorship, there was now postulated a “Hexateuch” (*see PENTATEUCH; HEXATEUCH*). Meanwhile Deuteronomy Wette (1805-6), on grounds of style and contents, had claimed for Deuteronomy an origin not earlier than

the reign of Josiah. “Fragmentary” theories, like Vater’s, which contributed little to the general development, may be left unnoticed. A conservative school, headed by Hengstenberg (1831) and Havernick (1837), contested these conclusions of the critics, and contended for the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Bolder spirits, as Vatke (1835), anticipated the conclusions of the newer critical school in declaring that the Levitical laws were latest of all in origin. Their voices were as yet unheeded.

(2) Hupfeld.

A distinct advance on preceding theories was made by Hupfeld (1853; in part anticipated by Ilgen, 1789). Hitherto the prevailing assumption had been that there was one fundamental document — the so-called Elohist, dated usually in the age of the Judges, or the time of Saul or David — and that the Yahwistic parts were “supplementary” to this (not a separate document). It was the merit of Hupfeld to perceive that not a few of the sections in the “Elohist” document did not bear the usual literary marks of that writing, but closely resembled the “Yahwistic” sections in everything but the use of the Divine name. These portions he singled out and erected into a document by themselves (though they bear no signs of being such), while the Yahwistic parts were relieved of their “supplementary” character, and regarded as belonging to a distinct document also. There were thus now 3 documents, attributed to as many authors — the original Elohist, the 2nd or Younger Elohist (E) and the Jahwist (Jahwist). Deuteronomy, as a distinct book, was added to these, making 4 documents in all.

(3) Graf and Wellhausen.

Thus matters stood till the appearance of Graf’s work, *The Historical Books of the Old Testament*, in 1866, through which something like a revolution in the critical outlook was effected. Following in the track of Vatke, earlier, Reuss, of Strassburg, had taken up the idea that the Levitical legislation could not, as was commonly presumed, be earlier than Deuteronomy, but was, on the contrary, later — in fact, a product of the age of the exile. Graf adopted and developed this theory. He still for a time, while putting the laws late, maintained an earlier date for the Elohist narratives. He was soon led, however, to see that laws and history must go together; so the whole Elohist writing was removed from its former place, and brought down bodily to the end of the religious development. Graf, at the same time, did not regard it as an independent document. At

first theory was scouted, but gradually, through the able advocacy of Kuenen and Wellhausen — especially the latter — it secured ascendancy, and is now regarded as the critical view par excellence. Order and nomenclature of the assumed documents were now changed. The Elohist, instead of standing first, was put last under the designation P or Priestly Code; Wellhausen's symbol for this writing was Q. Its date was taken to be post-exilic. The Jahwist becomes J; the Elohist becomes E. These are placed in the 9th or 8th centuries BC (circa 850-750), but are supposed to have been combined a cent or so later (JE). Deuteronomy, identified with the law-book found in the temple in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings 22), is thought to have been written shortly before that time. The order is therefore no longer 1st Elohist-Jahwist and 2nd Elohist-D, but J and E-D-P. The whole, it is held, was finally united into the great law-book (Pent) brought by Ezra to Jerusalem from Babylon (458 BC; ^{<1076>}Ezra 7:6-10), and read by him before the people 14 years later (444 BC; Nehemiah 8).

(4) Literary and Historical Grounds of Theory.

A sketch like the above gives, of course, no proper idea of the grounds on which, apart from the distinction in the Divine names, the critical theory just described is based. The grounds are partly literary — the discrimination of documents, e.g. resting on differences of style and conception, duplicates, etc. (*see* PENTATEUCH) — but partly also historical, in accordance with the critic's conception of the development of religion and institutions in Israel. A main reliance is placed on the fact that the history, with its many sanctuaries up to the time of Deuteronomy, is in conflict with the law of that book, which recognizes only one sanctuary as legitimate (chapter 12), and equally with the Priestly Code, which throughout assumes this centralizing law. The laws of Deuteronomy and Priestly Code, therefore, cannot be early. The prophets, it is held, knew nothing of a Levitical legislation, and refused to regard the sacrificial system as Divine (^{<1077>}Jeremiah 7:22 ff).

(5) The Codes:

The code under which older Israel lived was that formulated in the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20-23), which permitted many altars (^{<1078>}Exodus 20:24 f). The law of Deuteronomy was the product of a centralizing movement on the part of the prophets, issuing in the reformation of Josiah. The Priestly Code was the work of fertile brains and pens of post-exilic priests and scribes, incorporating older usage, devising new laws, and

throwing the whole into the fictitious form of Mosaic wilderness legislation.

(6) Effects on History, etc.

The revolution wrought by these newer constructions, however, is not adequately realized till regard is had to their effects on the picture given in the Old Testament itself of Israel's history, religion and literature. It is not too much to say that this picture is nearly completely subverted. By the leaders of the school (Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Duhm, Stade, etc.) the supernatural element in the history and religion is totally eliminated; even by those who do not go so far, little is left standing. The history of the Pentateuch — indeed the history down to the time of the kings — is largely given up. Genesis is legend, Exodus hardly more trustworthy, Joshua a romance. The histories of Samuel and David are “written up” by a theocratic narrator. None of the laws — even the Decalogue — are allowed to be certainly Mosaic. Monotheism is believed to have come in with Amos and Hosea; earlier, Yahweh was a “tribal” God. Ark, tabernacle, priesthood, feasts, as depicted in the Priestly Code, are post-exilic fiction. The treatment accorded to the Pentateuch necessarily reacts on the other historical books; the prophetic literature suffers in an almost equal degree through disintegration and mutilation. It is not Isaiah alone — where the question has long been mooted of the post-exilian origin of chapters 40 through 66 (*see ISAIAH*); the critical knife is applied with scarcely less freedom to the remaining prophetic books. Few, if any, of the psalms are allowed to be preexilic. Daniel is a work of the Maccabean age.

(7) General Results.

As a general summary of the results of the movement, which it is thought “the future is not likely to reverse,” the following may be quoted from Professor A. S. Peake: “The analysis of the Pentateuch into four main documents, the identification of the law on which Josiah's reformation was based with some form of the Deuteronomic Code, the compilation of that code in the reign of Manasseh at the earliest, the fixing of the Priestly Code to a date later than Ezekiel, the highly composite character of some parts of the prophetic literature, especially the Book of Isaiah, the post-exilian origin of most of the Psalms, and large parts of the Book of Prov, the composition of Job not earlier than the exile and probably later, the Maccabean date of Daniel, and the slightly earlier date of Ecclesiastes”

("Present Movement of Biblical Science," in Manchester, Inaugural Lects, 32).

(8) Criticism of Theory.

The criticism of this elaborate theory belongs to the arts which deal with the several points involved, and is not here attempted at length (compare the present writer's *Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament*). The gains that have accrued from it on the literary side in a more exact and scholarly knowledge of the phenomena to be explained (e.g. distinction in the Divine names; distinction of P element in the Pentateuch from that known as JE) are not to be questioned; on the historical and religious sides also much has been done to quicken interest, enlarge knowledge and correct older ideas which have proved untenable — in general, to place the whole facts of the Old Testament in a clearer and more assured light. On the other hand, much even in the literary criticism is subjective, arbitrary and conjectural, while the main hypothesis of the subsequentness of the Levitical law to Ezekiel, with the general view taken of the historical and religious development in Israel, is open to the most serious exception. The Old Testament has its own account to give of the origin of its religion in the monotheism of Abraham, the covenants with the patriarchs, the legislation through Moses, which is not thus readily to be set aside in the interests of a theory resting largely on naturalistic pre-suppositions (*see BIBLE*). There is not a word in the history in Nehemiah 8 to suggest that the law introduced by Ezra was a new one; it was received without demur by a deeply divided community as the ancient law of Moses. So with the law of Deuteronomy in the time of Josiah (2 Kings 22). Its genuineness was doubted by no one. The position of theory, generally, is by no means so secure as many of its adherents suppose. Internally, it is being pushed to extremes which tend to discredit it to sober minds, and otherwise is undergoing extensive modifications. Documents are multiplied, dates lowered, authors are converted into "schools." Archaeologists, in large majority, declare against it. The facts they adduce tend to confirm the history in parts where it had been most impugned. The new Babylonian school in Germany (that of Winckler) assails it in its foundations. Recently, the successor of Kuenen in Leyden, Professor B. D. Eerdmans, formerly a supporter, has broken with theory in its entirety, and subjects the documentary hypothesis to a damaging criticism. It is too early yet to forecast results, but the opinion may be hazarded that, as in the case of the Tübingen New Testament critical school in last cent referred to below, the

prevailing critical theory of the Old Testament will experience fundamental alteration in a direction nearer to older ideas, though it is too much to expect that traditional views will ever be resuscitated in their completeness.

2. The New Testament:

Higher criticism of the New Testament may be said to begin, in a Deistic spirit, with Reimarus (Fragments, published by Lessing, 1778), and, on Hegelian lines, with Strauss (Life of Jesus, 1835). In the interests of his mythical theory, Strauss subjected every part of the gospel history to a destructive criticism.

(1) The School of Baur.

In a more systematic way, F. Baur (1826-60), founder of the famous Tübingen school, likewise proceeding from Hegel, applied a drastic criticism to all the documents of the New Testament. Strauss started with the Gospels. Baur sought firmer ground in the phenomena of the Apostolic Age. The key to Baur's theory lies in the alleged existence of Pauline and Petrine parties in the early church, in conflict with one another. The true state of matters is mirrored, he holds, not in the Book of Acts, a composition of the 2nd century, written to gloss over the differences between the original apostles and Paul, but in the four contemporary and undoubtedly genuine epistles of Paul, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Roman, and in the Book of Revelation. In these documents the church is seen rent by a schism that threatened its very existence. By and by attempts were made at conciliation, the stages of which are reflected in the Gospels and remaining writings of the New Testament. The Fourth Gospel, about 170 AD, brings up the rear. This theory, which found influential support in the scholarship of the time (Schwegler, Zeller, etc.), could not stand the test of impartial investigation, and is now on all sides discredited. Professor Bacon, in a recent work, pronounces its theory of the Johannine writings to be "as obsolete as the Ptolemaic geography" (Fourth Gospel, 20). Its influence on later criticism has, however, been considerable.

(2) Synoptic Criticism.

Meanwhile more sober scholarship was concerning itself with the intricate problem of the relations of the Synoptic Gospels. The problem is a very real one (*see GOSPELS*). The three gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke are seen on inspection to exhibit an amount of agreement in subject-matter, order, often in language, which cannot be accounted for except on theory

of some common source. Suppose the Gospels divided into sections, in 52 of these the narratives coincide, 12 more are common to Matthew and Mark, 5 to Mark and Luke, and 14 to Matthew and Luke, while 5 are peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark and 9 to Luke. The verbal agreement is greater in the recital of the words of others, particularly of words of Jesus, than in the narrative portions.

(i) Oral, Documentary, and Dependence Theories:

How is this to be explained? Three forms of theory were early propounded — the oral, the documentary, and the hypothesis of dependence of one gospel upon another. Of these theories, the oldest is the 3rd (Augustine already held that Mark was an abridgment of Matthew and Luke), and to it, in combination with the 2nd, though in reversed order (Mark being put first), it will be seen below that criticism has largely reverted. The oral theory, proposed by Gieseler (1818), has, till recently, been the favorite one in England (Westcott, Alford, etc., with Godet, Pressense, Ebrard, etc., on the Continent). In its resemblances in the three Gospels are explained by an oral tradition assumed to have attained a relatively fixed form while the apostles were yet teaching together in Jerusalem. The documentary theory took its origin with Eichhorn (1794), but in the hands of Marsh (1801), finally in Eichhorn's own (1804), received so elaborate a development as completely to discredit it. The dependence theory, in turn, went through every possible shape. Gradually, with sifting, certain combinations were eliminated (those which put Luke first, or Matthew last, or made Mark a middle term), till only two remained — Matthew, Luke, Mark (Griesbach 1789-90, Baur, etc.), and Mark, Matthew, Luke (Weisse, 1838, Wilke, 1838, etc.). The prestige of the Baur school obtained a temporary ascendancy for the former view — that which put Mark last; this, however, has now quite given way in favor of Mark's priority. There remained a division of opinion as to whether the Mark employed by the other evangelists was the canonical Mark (Weisse, Meyer, B. Weiss, etc.), or an *ur-Markus* (Holtzmann, Reuss, etc.), but the difficulties of the latter hypothesis proved so insurmountable that Holtzmann finally gave it up.

(ii) The "Logia":

It is obvious, however, that the use of Mark by the other evangelists, even if granted, does not yet completely solve the synoptical problem. There is still to be considered that large mass of matter — chiefly discourses —

common to Matthew and Luke, not to speak of the material peculiar to Luke itself. For the explanation of these sections it becomes necessary to postulate a second source, usually identified with the much-canvassed *Logia* of Papias, and designated by recent scholars (Wellhausen, etc.) Q. It is regarded as a collection of discourses, possibly by Matthew, with or without an admixture of narrative matter (B. Weiss, etc.).

(iii) Two-Source Theory:

This yields the “two-source” theory at present prevailing in synoptical criticism (for a different view, compare Zahn’s Introduction). Matthew and Luke, on this view, are not independent Gospels, but are drawn up on the basis of

(1) Mark and

(2) Q = the *Logia*, with original material on the part of Luke (*see GOSPELS*). A theory which commands the assent of so many scholars has necessarily great weight. It cannot, however, be regarded as finally established. Many grave difficulties remain; there is, besides, a *prima facie* improbability in a Gospel like Mark’s being treated in the manner supposed or included among the “attempts” which Luke’s own Gospel was designed to supersede (~~compare~~ Luke 1:1-4; compare Wright, Luke’s Gospel in Greek, xiv, xv).

(iv) Authorship — Lukan and Johannine Questions:

With criticism of the sources of the Gospels there goes, of course, the question of authorship. A powerful vindication of the Lukan authorship of the 3rd Gospel and the Book of Acts has recently come from the pen of Professor A. Harnack, who maintains that in this, as in most other points regarding early Christian literature, “tradition is right” (compare his Luke, the Physician, English translation). Outside the Synoptics, the burning question still is the authorship of the Johannine writings. Here also, however, the extreme positions of the Baur school are entirely given up (“It is perfectly apparent,” says Professor Bacon, “that Baur mistook the period of dissemination for that of origin,” *op. cit.*, 21), and powerful defenses of Johannine authorship have of late appeared (notably Sanday’s Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, and ex-Principal Drummond’s Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel).

See GOSPEL OF JOHN.

(3) **Modern “Historical-Critical” School.**

On the other hand, a new and intensely aggressive radical school has recently come to the front, the so-called “historical-critical,” which treats the text and history of the Gospels generally with a recklessness to which no limits can be put. It is even doubted if Jesus claimed to be the Messiah (Wrede). Sayings are accepted, rejected, or mutilated at pleasure. The latest phase of this school is the “Apocalyptic,” which finds the essence of Christ’s message in His insistence on the approaching end of the world (compare Schweitzer, Von Reimarus zu Wrede; English translation *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*). These excesses may be depended on to cure themselves.

(4) **Remaining Writings of the New Testament.**

For the rest of the writings on the New Testament, the trend of criticism has been in the main in a conservative direction. One by one the Pauline Epistles have been given back to the apostle — doubt chiefly still resting in certain minds on the Pastorals. The Book of Revelation is restored by most to the age of Domitian, where tradition places it. Its relation to the Fourth Gospel and to John is still in dispute, and some moderns would see in it a groundwork of Jewish apocalypse. These and kindred questions are discussed in the arts devoted to them.

LITERATURE.

Articles on Text, manuscripts, VSS, of Old Testament and New Testament in *Bible Dicts.* and *Encyclopedias*: works on Introduction to Old Testament and New Testament.

On the Old Testament.

S. Davidson, *Revision of the English Old Testament*; W. R. Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*; Wellhausen, *Prol to the Hist of Israel* (English translation); Kuenen, *The Hexateuch* (English translation); Oxford *Hexateuch according to the Revised Version* (British and American); Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament, and Bible Under Trial*; H. M. Wiener, *Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism*; W. Moller. *Are the Critics Right?* (English translation).

On the New Testament.

Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Intro; F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament; Nestle, Textual Crit of the Greek Testament (English translation); Scrivener, Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 4th edition; K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament; Ebrard, Gospel History (English translation); F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission; Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research; Schweitzer, Von Reimarus zu Wrede (English translation: The Quest of the Historical Jesus); A. S. Peake, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.

James Orr

CRITICISM

(The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis)

I. PRELIMINARY.

1. Thesis:

In ~~24172~~ Jeremiah 7:22,23 we read: “For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.” It is the contention of the present article that this statement of the prophet is correct (compare II, 5).

More specifically, it is contended that evidence can be produced from the Old Testament to show that Israel’s religion can be seen in a long period of growth; and in this growth a fixed sacrificial law, with a minutely regulated ritual obligatory on all Israelites, the culmination and not the beginning of the process. It is contended, moreover, that this conception of the development of the institutional side of the religion of the Old Testament is attained by the strictest evaluation of all the Old Testament evidence and by no a priori considerations.

2. Historical Perspective:

To be sure, one is met at once in the Old Testament by what seem to be complete denials of this point of view. In the Pentateuch we find statement after statement that a given law was due not to some late author but to

Moses himself, and there are numerous passages in the historical books (most notably in Chronicles) that speak of these laws as in effect from the earliest times. Such evidence must be paid all possible respect and must be overruled only on the most imperative considerations.

However, if for the moment the books of the Old Testament be viewed only as historical documents, it will be admitted that the possibility of overruling such evidence may well arise. And it may very well arise without calling in question in the slightest degree the good faith of the writers of questioned passages; for an acquisition of historical perspective comes very late in intellectual evolution, particularly — though not only — in the realm of religious history. Even the trained scholar has to be on his guard lest he read back the concepts of his own time into some past generation, while the non-specialist never succeeds in avoiding this error completely. For the uncultured mind, especially for the Oriental, the problem scarcely exists. That which is generally accepted and which is not obviously novel tends to be classified as that which “always has been.” A law so old that its actual source is forgotten is referred as a matter of course to some great lawgiver of the past. A custom that in a writer’s own day is universally observed by the pious must always have been observed by the pious. Even documentary evidence to the contrary is not convincing to such a writer, for that documents may be wrong is not a modern discovery. To be sure, the older document may be copied mechanically or the discrepancy may not even be noticed. But it is never surprising when we find a writer simply accrediting the pious men of old with the customs of his own day, since even documentary evidence to the contrary he felt could not be right. This is not forgery, as we understand the word, nor need there be the faintest moral reproach connected with such conduct. Quite on the contrary, such a writer may well be acting in the only sense that the conscience of any man of his generation could conceive right.

3. Inspiration and Criticism:

However, the Old Testament is not a mere collection of human documents, and another question arises. Does the acceptance of inspiration compel us to assume that in every case a writer’s ordinary historical methods were entirely overruled? The question is a rather broad one and does not relate merely to the correct transmission of historic facts. To be asked, rather, is this: Did God present to His instruments a mechanically accurate set of past facts which would give a conception of history that no one of the

sacred writer's generation could understand? Or did He suffer His revelation to find expression in terms of the current conceptions of history, much as we are accustomed to say it found expression in terms of the current conceptions of science? A full discussion of the various theological arguments involved would be quite outside the province of an article of this Encyclopedia, but reference must be made to two important Biblical arguments:

(1) In a question which thus affects the amount covered by the inspiration of the Bible, quotations from the Bible itself beg the question when adduced to show entire infallibility. So appeals to the New Testament are hardly helpful. Moreover, they prove too much. In ~~<1114>~~ Jude 1:14,15 there is a quotation from the Book of Enoch (1:9), which is made in the most formal manner possible. But will anyone maintain that this compels us to believe that our Book of Enoch was actually written by Enoch, the seventh from Adam? Yet if the quotation had been taken from an Old Testament work, precisely this would have been maintained.

(2) Far more important is the use of the Old Testament by Christ, for here a quite different authority comes in. But the question must be asked: Just how far did our Lord's use of a passage involve ratification of all the current ideas about that passage? A good answer is supplied by ~~<4006>~~ Acts 1:6,7. When He is asked, "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" we know that the pedantically "correct" answer would have been, "The kingdom never will be restored to Israel in any such sense as ye conceive of it." Yet this is precisely what Christ does not say. "It is not for you to know times or seasons." No hint was given at all that the kingdom was universal, for the disciples would find that out for themselves in good time. In order that they should be able to do God's work there was no need to bewilder them with a truth as yet altogether revolutionary. And any close student of the "Kingdom of God" passages soon realizes how often Christ uses current terminology without comment, even when it seems almost materialistic. A literal exegesis of ~~<4228>~~ Luke 22:18 would necessitate believing that grapes will grow in the world to come and that Christ will drink wine made from them, and almost certainly the disciples gathered just this idea from the words. But no one today finds them in the least a difficulty. The exact extent of the kingdom and the exact nature of the happiness in it were irrelevant to what the disciples had to do. And so it cannot be thought an injustice to treat Christ's use of the Old Testament by

exactly the same rules, all the more as nowhere, not even in ^{<41236>}Mark 12:36, does the argument turn on the original human author or the date of writing. What Christ Himself, in His inner consciousness, knew on the subject is something beyond our immediate data. But His use of the Old Testament lends no support to a Kenotic theory, not even on the wildest Old Testament critical hypotheses.

See KENOSIS.

II. THE LEGISLATION.

As is well known, among the laws of the Pentateuch there exist several well-marked groups, of which the most formal is Deuteronomy 12 through 26.

1. Groups:

Another such group is Leviticus 17 through 26 or the Holiness Code (H), and still another is ^{<1212>}Exodus 20:22 through 23:19 or the Covenant Code (CC). With this last is closely connected the Decalogue and the little compend ^{<12347>}Exodus 34:17-26. Now it will be convenient for present purposes to designate the remaining mass of Pentateuchal legislation under the non-committal symbol X.

2. Covenant Code:

In the first place, attention may be directed to Covenant Code as a whole. Whatever it was meant to be, it was not meant as a mere interim code for the period of the wanderings, either in its civil or its religious prescriptions. One piece of evidence alone is enough to show the contrary: in the laws touching settlements of disputes it is presupposed that Moses himself is not accessible. And the life assumed is agricultural. Men are living in fields with settled boundaries (^{<12216>}Exodus 22:5,6). The vine and the olive are both under cultivation (^{<12215>}Exodus 22:5,29; 23:11), under such settled circumstances that the rest of the Sabbatical year can be observed. And of the feasts, Weeks and Tabernacles are connected with the harvests (^{<12316>}Exodus 23:16). Of course, Moses may very well have given commands that looked to the future, but the present contention is simply that it was the remote and not the immediate future that is in point on this assumption. The life is Canaan and not the wilderness. But, now, the life is very primitive life. Flocks are of great importance, as is shown by the proportion of space given to laws about them. Rulers are mentioned only in

~~(1228)~~ Exodus 22:28 (*nasi'*), and judges, as settled officers, are not mentioned at all, for the very rare word in 21:22 (*palil*, ~~(1523)~~ Deuteronomy 32:31; ~~(8911)~~ Job 31:11 only) should be translated “umpire.” Indeed in ~~(1231)~~ Exodus 23:1-9 the duties of citizens, witness and judge are so intermingled as to suggest that judgment was administered by a general gathering of the people. It is taken for granted that a master has marital rights over his maidservants (21:7-11). Coined money is mentioned only in 21:32, if there. There is no attempt to define proportions exactly; compare 22:5 (“best of his own field”) and 22:29 (the amount of the gift — a tenth? — not stated). Similarly there is no precise dating of the feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles in 23:16, while the exact day in Abib (23:15) is at least not specified. Now, if this code could be isolated from the rest of the legislation, would not one refer it naturally on the above grounds alone to a time not very far either way from that of Saul?

Now, in what follows, the prescriptions of the various codes will be compared with each other in regard to the various institutions of Israel’s religion and also studied in the wider evidence of the historical books. The evidence of Chronicles, however, will be omitted for the most part, as a separate section is devoted to it (III, 1).

3 The Sanctuary:

(1) The firstling is to be with its dam seven days, but on the eighth (not later!) it is to be given to God. The offerings from the harvest and from the presses (wine and olives) are to be offered without delay (~~(1223)~~ Exodus 22:29,30). Consequently the place of offering must have been readily accessible. By what has been said above and by the mention of “presses” here, ready accessibility in Palestine is presupposed. But this implies a multiplicity of sanctuaries. And in Samuel-Kings this multiplicity of sanctuaries is exactly what is found. Samuel sacrifices in Mizpah (~~(9009)~~ 1 Samuel 7:9), in Ramah (9:12 ff), in Gilgal (11:15) and in Bethlehem (16:5). David’s family held a yearly sacrifice in Bethlehem, which David attended regularly (~~(9016)~~ 1 Samuel 20:6). Solomon received a special revelation from God at Gibeon (~~(1004)~~ 1 Kings 3:4 ff — for the account in Chronicles see III, 1). Although the heart of Asa was perfect and the way of Jehoshaphat right, yet the many altars were suffered to remain (~~(1154)~~ 1 Kings 15:14; 22:43 — again for Chronicles see III, 1). The destruction of the altars of God was to Elijah a terrible calamity (~~(1190)~~ 1 Kings 19:10). While Amos and Hosea abound in denunciations of sacrifices as substitutes for

righteousness, yet they never even intimate a duty to offer sacrifices in some other place (^{<3012>}Amos 1:2; ^{<3015>}Hosea 3:5 are irrelevant). Not even do ^{<3012>}Micah 4:2 and ^{<3012>}Isaiah 2:2 imply that Jerusalem was to have the sole right to the cult.

(2) Ezekiel is the first prophet who makes the place of sacrifice a matter of paramount importance, and this importance of the place is, in the Pentateuch, emphasized primarily in Deuteronomy. It is needless to collect the familiar evidence from Deuteronomy, but an illuminating comparison with Covenant Code is given by the laws for firstlings. No longer is the firstling given on the eighth day. It must be kept, but not worked or shorn, until the time when “year by year” it may be eaten in the chosen place (^{<1519>}Deuteronomy 15:19,20). So now the fruits of the field and the “presses” are not offered “without delay” but again “year by year,” with a provision for turning them into money if the way be too long to the sanctuary (^{<1542>}Deuteronomy 14:22-27). Deuteronomy and Covenant Code evidently have distinct conceptions — and again attention may be called to the fact that Covenant Code contains laws for Palestine, not for the wilderness. The Law of Holiness (H), Leviticus 17 through 26, is as explicit as Deuteronomy — sacrifice anywhere except at the Tent is a capital offense (^{<1718>}Leviticus 17:8,9). And the evidence of X need not be collected, but, passing out of the Pentateuch for the moment, ^{<1621>}Joshua 22:10-34 represents Israel as understanding from the first entrance into Canaan that sacrifice at any altar but the one was the worst of crimes.

(3) How is the offering of sacrifices in various places by such men as Samuel to be explained? That the worship was disorganized and the proper sanctuary could not be reached is hardly an explanation. For no disorganization of the country could be great enough to justify the offering of sacrifices in places not only unauthorized but flatly forbidden in ^{<1718>}Leviticus 17:8,9. On theory of Mosaic origin for the whole of the Pentateuchal legislation, Samuel knew as much about the clear statements of the Law as does any Jew of today, but it is clearly enough recognized by all Jews that no disorganization of the county or Divine reprobation of the Temple justifies sacrifice in any other place. A key, however, seems to be found in ^{<1518>}Deuteronomy 12:8-11, where sacrifice in various places is actually authorized until such a time as the land should be pacified and the Divine choice given to a place — a time represented in the history of Israel as about the time of David, or perhaps Solomon. This certainly does

explain the situation as it is found in Samuel-Kings. Only, it is in flat contradiction with H and X.

This point is important. ^{<5128>}Deuteronomy 12:8-11 not only represents sacrifice in various places as permitted until some later time, but it represents Moses and the Israelites as practicing the same things in the wilderness — "the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes; for ye are not as yet come," etc.; i.e.

Deuteronomy's conception was that in the wilderness Moses and the Israelites offered sacrifice wherever they thought good. This was to continue until God gave them rest from their enemies round about. Then the sacrifices were to be brought to the chosen place and to be offered nowhere else. Now, the conception in H and X is wholly different. On the mount Moses received directions for the building of the Tabernacle, with its altar. From the beginning it was a capital offense to offer sacrifices on any other altar than this (^{<1778>}Leviticus 17:8,9), which was carried everywhere on the wanderings and brought into Canaan. In the very days of Phinehas, the offering of sacrifices on a different altar was enough to make civil war justifiable (^{<1622>}Joshua 22:12). For further discussion see III, 2.

(4) The difficulties of these data are obvious but are completely satisfied by the assumption that different conceptions of past history are present. Deuteronomy belongs to a period when the unity of the sanctuary had become an established fact, but still before the memory of the many altars as comparatively legitimate was extinguished. H and X, however, belong to a considerably later day, when the unity of the sanctuary had been so long taken for granted that no pious Israelite could conceive that anything else had ever existed. The reference of the commands to Moses is altogether in oriental manner.

NOTE. — ^{<1713>}Exodus 20:24 has not been used in the above argument, but with the evidence presented there seems to be no obstacle to the translations of the EV. The familiar evidence of Judges is of course merely cumulative.

Leviticus 1 through 7 contains a list of the various kinds of sacrifices:

4. *Kinds of Sacrifice:*

(a) the sin offering and the trespass offering, very elaborately treated and obviously of the highest importance;

(b) the whole burnt offering and the peace offering; and, standing a little by itself, the meal offering. The latter is of no especial significance for the present discussion and may be neglected. Now a curious fact may be noted. In the prophetic writings before Ezekiel there is not one single reference to class (a). This is not simply the argument from silence, for sacrifices with their special names are mentioned freely and sacrificial rites described — invariably of class (b), even when presented for penitential purposes. If the offering is not burnt whole, the worshipper eats of it — it is a peace offering. ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 7:21 is a particularly significant example, but compare ^{<1004>}Amos 4:4,5; 5:22,25; ^{<883>}Hosea 8:13; 9:4; ^{<2311>}Isaiah 1:11; 22:12-14; 28:7,8; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 6:20. Turning to Samuel-Kings we find this borne out. The names of the sin and trespass offerings appear in ^{<2126>}2 Kings 12:16, but it is money that is referred to (the English Versions of the Bible should be checked with the Hebrew here), just as the golden mice appear as a trespass offering in ^{<9038>}1 Samuel 6:3 ff. And in the codes, neither Covenant Code nor Deuteronomy mentions class (a) and even in H they appear only in ^{<8921>}Leviticus 19:21,22; i.e. what in later times appear as the greatest sacrifices of Israel — by Leviticus 8 Israel's first sacrifice was a sin offering — are found only in X and are mentioned in the prophets for the first time in ^{<2479>}Ezekiel 40:39, while the other classes are mentioned frequently. It seems difficult to escape the inference that class (a) appeared relatively late in Israel's history, a point discussed more fully in IV.

5. *Sacrifice in General:*

The problem presented by ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 7:22 is a very serious one. Obviously, to say that the command to offer sacrifice was not given on the day of the Exodus but on Sinai, is quite unsatisfactory, for this would make Jeremiah quibble. He denies categorically that a command to offer sacrifice was part of the Divine Law at all. Now, if it be noted that the offering of firstlings and first-fruits was altogether distinct from the regular sacrifices, it will be seen that Jeremiah can very well presuppose Covenant Code or even Deuteronomy, both of which contain only regulative prescriptions for

sacrifice. (Whether Jeremiah actually did conceive Covenant Code and Deuteronomy as binding is another question.) But by what exegesis of the passage can Jeremiah pre-suppose X? The natural inference is that the regulations of X became obligatory on Israel after Jeremiah's day.

6. *Vestments:*

What follows is in itself an infinitesimal matter but the evidence is significant. The prohibition of steps for the altar in ^{<1218>}Exodus 20:26 is based on the fact that the ministrants were very scantily clad (compare the light clothing of pilgrims at Mecca). This is corroborated in ^{<1064>}2 Samuel 6:14,20-22, where Michal reproves David for exposing himself. But in X the priests wear rather elaborate vestments, over linen breeches (^{<1282>}Exodus 28:42). And, to call in Chronicles for the moment, this is the conception found there of David's religious zeal at the bringing in of the ark. Besides the ephod he wears a long linen robe and Michal despises him, not for exposing himself, but only for dancing (^{<1357>}1 Chronicles 15:27-29).

7. *Priests and Levites:*

(1) Covenant Code has no regulations regarding the priesthood, but of course it does not follow that this silence has any significance. However, Samuel-Kings furnish us with certain evidence. Samuel, although an Ephraimite (^{<900>}1 Samuel 1:1), offers sacrifice repeatedly (see 3, above). In ^{<1115>}2 Samuel 20:25,26 the Hebrew says that Zadok and Abiathar were *kohanim*, and also Ira the Jairite was *kohen* unto David. Exactly the same word is used for Zadok and Ira in practically the same sentence, and no one without prior conceptions would have dreamed of giving it entirely distinct translations under the circumstances, as do the King James Version and the Revised Version texts (not margins). Again in ^{<1088>}2 Samuel 8:18 it is said that David's sons were *kohanim* and in ^{<1045>}1 Kings 4:5 that Zabud was *kohen*. Now if *kohen* does not mean "priest" in these passages, they are the only cases out of a total of 750 occurrences. That the Chronicler understood the word to mean priest is shown by the fact that in his parallel to ^{<1088>}2 Samuel 8:18 (^{<1387>}1 Chronicles 18:17) he uses a different word altogether. The natural inference from these passages is that the restriction of priestly ministration to a certain line came about after Solomon's time (compare ^{<1712>}Judges 17:12,13, a Levite is desirable but not essential).

(2) In Deuteronomy the priesthood appears as limited to the sons of Levi, but it is at least safe to say that no explicit distinction is made within the

tribe. In 21:5 the priests are the “sons of Levi,” just as in 17:9; 18:1; 24:8 the term is “the priests the Levites.” In 10:8 the right to bless and in 33:8-11 the right to offer incense and sacrifice are in no ways said to be restricted to a very small proportion of the tribe. Compare ^{<3432>}Jeremiah 33:21,22 (here questions of authenticity are irrelevant). A clear distinction within the tribe of Levi appears in the prophetic writings for the first time in ^{<3440>}Ezekiel 44:10-31, where two kinds of Levites are spoken of, “the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok” (verse 15) and the Levites, simply (verse 10). No third class is recognized (compare ^{<3405>}Ezekiel 40:45,46, where the distinction is between two classes of priests). Now, the distinction between the Zadokian and non-Zadokian Levites is based by Ezekiel on one thing only, in the past the former had been faithful and the latter had not (^{<3440>}Ezekiel 44:10-15). Because the former had ministered before idols, therefore should they not come to execute the office of a priest, but perform only inferior ministrations. Now this can mean only that the non-Zadokians are excluded from priestly privileges that they once possessed. The non-Zadokians, if they had not sinned, would still have been legitimate priests in Ezekiel’s eyes, for otherwise the exclusion from the altar would be eviscerated of all meaning as a punishment; i.e. Ezekiel knows of only two kinds of Levites, both kinds originally legitimate priests, but one class now to be forbidden access to the altar because of sin. A third class of Levite, non-Aaronites, who never had had access to the altar, but who, because of their righteousness, had been blessed with the privilege to perform minor ministerial acts, is conspicuous in Ezekiel by its absence. And this absence, in the face of the immense amount of minute detail contained in Ezekiel 40 through 48, can be explained on no other hypothesis than that Ezekiel did not know of such a class. When the immense importance of the non-Aaronite Levites in Chronicles, Ezra, etc., is thought of, what other explanation can be given for their omission in Ezekiel’s elaborate regulations for the cult? To whom did Ezekiel consider the more menial work in the Temple would have fallen if the non-Zadokians had not sinned? Probably he never raised the question at all, but there is no objection to supposing that he would have assigned it to the priesthood as a whole.

(3) It is needless to collect the evidence of X. The non-Aaronite Levites appear there as ministers of the greatest importance, elaborately set apart, and with their duties and privileges accurately defined (Numbers 8, especially). Now, it is submitted that this evidence points in its most natural

interpretation to a gradual narrowing of the priestly privileges in Israel through a period of many centuries. It is natural, though by no means necessary, to identify the non-Zadokians of Ezekiel with the non-Aaronites of X. At all events it is argued that in course of time, long after the priesthood had become restricted to Levites only, a considerable proportion of the latter lost their priestly privilege. Ezekiel stood near enough to the change (that he was the actual innovator is improbable) to state the fact of the degradation and its cause. X regarded the distinction as of such long standing that it must be accredited to Moses himself. It is highly probable that evidence of the change is to be found in ^{<1516>}Deuteronomy 18:6-8, but this will not be pressed here.

8. *Dues:*

(1) In Covenant Code first-fruits are to be offered in ^{<1239>}Exodus 23:19 and a portion (perhaps a tenth, but not specified as such) of the whole harvest in 22:29. Nothing is said about their disposition. In Deuteronomy, the first-fruits of grain, wine and oil (with fleece) belong to the “priests the Levites” (18:4). And the basket of “fruit” in the beautiful rite of 26:1-11 probably had the same destination. Of the general harvest the tithe is to be dedicated, as explained at length in 14:22-29. The worshipper is to eat it himself, but shall take care to see that the Levite receives a portion. Every third year, however, the tithe is to be spent for the benefit of all who need charity, including the Levite. Note that in either case the Levite receives only a part of the tithe. In X the first-fruits are again assigned to the clergy (but now specifically to the priests — ^{<1482>}Numbers 18:12,13). But it appears that the tithe is to be given wholly to the Levites in ^{<1481>}Numbers 18:21-24. The contradiction with ^{<1542>}Deuteronomy 14:22-29 is real. That two tithes were to be paid by the worshipper may safely be assumed as impossible, as a tax of one-fifth would have been unendurable. (It may be noted, though, that in later days the very pious took this interpretation — compare Tobit 1:7 — but it is certain that no such ruling ever maintained generally.) An alternative explanation offered is that it could be assumed that the Levite would invite the worshipper to join in a feast on the tithe. Frankly, it is difficult to treat this as quite candid. In Deuteronomy the worshipper is anything rather than a mere guest at another man’s banquet. When the tithe has been brought as money, the worshipper is to spend it on anything that best pleases him, and of the Levite it is said only “thou shalt not forsake him.” Moreover, the tithe is to be consumed at the sanctuary and nowhere else (^{<1543>}Deuteronomy 14:23; compare 12:11). In Numbers

18, however, the tithe becomes the exclusive property of the Levite and it is assigned him as his source of income (verses 25-32) and so exclusively is it his that it in turn is tithed. And, far from being turned into a feast at which the worshipper shares, it need not be consumed at the sanctuary at all but may be eaten in “every place,” wherever the Levite and his family may happen to live (verse 31). It would be hard to conceive of two rules more mutually exclusive than the tithe directions in Deuteronomy and Numbers. That the livelihood provided for the Levites in Deuteronomy is pitiful is hardly in point and at all events he received more than did the widow and the orphan. But compare IV.

(2) Firstlings in Covenant Code must be offered on the eighth day (^{<0223>}Exodus 22:30), but in ^{<0519>}Deuteronomy 15:19-22 they were preserved, without being worked or shorn, until “year by year” they could be taken up to the sanctuary. (Apparently by 14:23-25 it might be converted into money in case of great distance.) Here the worshipper was to offer it and eat of it (a peace offering). But in ^{<0485>}Numbers 18:15-18 the firstling becomes the personal property of the priest and he receives the flesh of the animal, if it can be sacrificed (i.e. it is his peace offering, not the worshipper’s). There is no question of giving back a portion to the worshipper, again. Note, moreover, that in ^{<0521>}Deuteronomy 15:21-23, an animal not fit for sacrifice was eaten at home by the worshipper and so did not come in contact with the priest at all; contrast ^{<0485>}Numbers 18:15.

(3) A minor matter is found in the portion of the peace offering that went to the priest. In ^{<0583>}Deuteronomy 18:3 it is specified as the shoulder, two cheeks and maw. In X (^{<0226>}Exodus 29:26-28, etc.) this has become the breast and the right thigh — a considerably more advantageous portion.

(4) In Deuteronomy it is laid down that a Levite has no inheritance among his brethren (10:9; 12:12; 18:1) and hence, is recommended as an object of charity, like the widow and the orphan. And, like the widow and the orphan, he lives “within thy gates” (12:12, etc.), i.e. in the same cities as the rest of the Israelites. Now in X the adjurations to charity disappear, because he receives a fixed income (from the tithe), but it is said that this tithe is given the Levites in lieu of an inheritance, “Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance” (^{<0482>}Numbers 18:21-24). In another part of X, however, there is still a different conception — the Levites receive no less than forty-eight cities with ample “suburbs,” expressly said to be given them “from the inheritance” of Israel (^{<0480>}Numbers 35:1-8). So

in ^{<R232>}Leviticus 25:32-34 the houses of the Levites are “their possession among the children of Israel,” and the fields “their perpetual possession” and inalienable. Is there any natural explanation of these passages except that they represent increasing efforts to provide properly for the Levites as time went on? That the different rules represent advances within Moses’ own period cannot be taken seriously, especially as on this hypothesis the Deuteronomy laws would have been the latest. See, in addition, III.

9. Miscellaneous:

(1) Covenant Code and Deuteronomy have little mention of coined money and little attempt to define fractions exactly. Contrast the elaborate regulations of, e.g. Leviticus 27. It is not contended that the Israelites could not have had enough culture in Moses’ day to calculate so accurately, but attention must be drawn to the extreme contrast.

(2) In Covenant Code (^{<D236>}Exodus 23:16) the year begins in the fall, in H (^{<D235>}Leviticus 23:5) and X (^{<D122>}Exodus 12:2; ^{<D495>}Numbers 9:5; 28:16) it begins in the spring.

(3) ^{<F418>}Deuteronomy 16:3 explains the use of unleavened bread at the Passover as due to the haste with which the Israelites left Egypt (as in ^{<D129>}Exodus 12:39), while ^{<D125>}Exodus 12:15-20 makes this use depend on the positive command of God before the first-born were slain. And note that, in ^{<D128>}Exodus 12:18-20 is a simple repetition of 12:15-17 with a more precise dating added. For this matter of dating compare the rough statements of Covenant Code with the exactness of Leviticus 23.

(4) In Covenant Code marital rights of the master over his maidservants are taken for granted (^{<D207>}Exodus 21:7-11); in Deuteronomy (15:17) the maidservant has the same privilege of release as the manservant, with the evident assumption that slavery does not confer marital rights on the master. (It is of course gratuitous to assume that two different kinds of maidservants are meant, particularly as in both cases the maidservant is contrasted in general with the manservant in general.) Note, moreover, that in ^{<D217>}Exodus 20:17 “wife” follows “house” in the prohibition against coveting, while in ^{<R22>}Deuteronomy 5:21 “wife” precedes “house” and a different verb is used. The inference is natural that between Covenant Code and Deuteronomy woman, both as slave and as wife, had risen to a higher position.

(5) In both Covenant Code (<0206>Exodus 21:6) and Deuteronomy (15:17) life-long slavery is permitted, if the slave desires it, otherwise the slave is free at the end of the sixth year. In H (<0259>Leviticus 25:39-43), the slave serves until the Jubilee year and then goes free absolutely.

10. Summary:

Now, it is not claimed that all the discrepancies in the above lists are incapable of reconciliation, although the examples chosen are among those where reconciliation is extremely difficult. The claim is made, however, that all of this evidence is cumulative and that each successive item points more and more forcibly toward a single conclusion — that in the legislation of the Pentateuch, especially when considered in connection with the Prophets and with Samuel-Kings, there have been incorporated laws belonging to very different periods. And, for the most part, a development from the simple to the highly organized can be traced. And this conclusion explains all the facts.

11. Additional Note:

The above examples have been chosen as those where no changes in the text need be made. Of the other instances, only one need be considered — Leviticus 17. On its surface, this chapter appears to refer solely to life in the wilderness. But in 17:8,10,12,13,15 it appears that living in the midst of the Israelites are settled non-Israelites. And the “open field” of 17:5 is a contrast to city, not to tent, life. Now in 17:3-5 the question is not at all idolatry but eating of blood at an ordinary meal. An exact commentary is found on this in (<0442>1 Samuel 14:32-35, where the Israelites sin in eating the blood of animals “slain on the ground”; i.e. in both Leviticus 17 and 1 Samuel 14, at every slaying of an animal for food, some formal disposition of the blood had to be made. In (<0870>Leviticus 17:4 this is sacrificial, and the appearance of the altar in (<0445>1 Samuel 14:35 points in the same direction. Now this investing of every slaying of an animal with a sacrificial character, explains the permission of (<0520>Deuteronomy 12:20-25 to eat flesh “after all the desire of thy soul,” a permission inexplicable unless there had been an earlier contrary practice. It is to be noted, moreover, that in (<0526>Deuteronomy 12:16 the blood is to be disposed of by pouring it on the earth, the practice condemned in (<0442>1 Samuel 14:32. The conclusion is that before the legislation of Deuteronomy the Israelite offered the blood of every slain sacrificial animal at the local sanctuary. Deuteronomy’s rigid enforcement of the one sanctuary made this impossible, and so permission

was given to eat flesh at home, provided the blood was not eaten, and provided that it was disposed of in a non-sacrificial way. Now in ~~<817B>~~Leviticus 17:3-5 it becomes clear what has happened. The passage read originally something like this: ‘What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, and hath not brought it to offer it as an oblation unto Yahweh, blood shall be imputed unto that man.’ This offering was to take place at the local sanctuary. But when the passage was incorporated into the whole body of the legislation, the editor was working at a time when the legitimacy of the local sanctuaries had long been forgotten. And so references to the “camp” and “the tent of meeting” were inserted, in accordance with the only laws that the editor conceived could ever have prevailed. The discrepancies with 17:5,8, etc., were probably not observed.

It is to be understood that this passage is not used as presenting a basic argument for the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. But it is cited as an example of other passages where the text is to be considered. And, also, because the assertion is made that this particular passage is a death-blow to the “critical” hypothesis. Naturally, it is nothing of the sort.

III. THE HISTORY.

1. Chronicles:

It may be said at the outset that many of the attacks on the historic value of Chronicles have been very gravely exaggerated. But, none the less, a close comparison with Samuel-Kings shows that the Chronicler has most certainly read back into history the religious institutions of his own late day — it need not be said, with perfect innocence and sincerity. For instance, in comparing ~~<2104>~~2 Kings 11:4 with ~~<4212>~~2 Chronicles 23:2-6, we find the statement of Kings that Jehoiada brought captains of the Carites and of the guard into the house of Yahweh quite altered. In Chronicles Jehoiada summons Levites and heads of houses, with the express provision that only Levites shall enter into the house of Yahweh. So holy a priest as Jehoiada could not have acted as Kings says he did act. Similarly, the statement in ~~<1154>~~1 Kings 15:14 that Asa did not remove the high places is changed into the statement that he did remove the high places (~~<444B>~~2 Chronicles 14:3-5), and only those in (northern) Israel were left (15:17). So did Jehoshaphat (17:6), although in 20:33 the explicit statement to the contrary is copied (unnoticed?) from ~~<1224B>~~1 Kings 22:43. Such righteous kings must have

enforced the single sanctuary. The almost trivial matter of David's garb when the ark was brought into Jerusalem (contrast ^{<1061>}2 Samuel 6:20-22 with ^{<1357>}1 Chronicles 15:27-29) has been noticed already in II, 6. The important matter in Chronicles, however, is the history of the Tabernacle. In ^{<1369>}1 Chronicles 16:39-42 the Tabernacle is at Gibeon, with the full ministry surrounding it, with the exception of a detail left before the Ark in Jerusalem (compare 9:17-32). And in ^{<485>}2 Chronicles 5:5 it is brought up to Jerusalem, although the disposition made of it is not explained. Otherwise it is mentioned in ^{<1368>}1 Chronicles 6:48; 21:29; ^{<4008>}2 Chronicles 1:3. But the narrative presents some serious difficulties. Why did David build a special tent for the Ark in Jerusalem (^{<1361>}1 Chronicles 16:1), if the one Divinely appointed covering for the Ark was still standing — not to be brought to Jerusalem until its utility was past (^{<485>}2 Chronicles 5:5)? That it was too fragile to be moved can hardly be taken seriously. In the first place, this explanation is without the least support in the text. And, in the second place, it is incredible for such a solid structure of wood, silver and brass, however much repair the curtains might have needed. Moreover, this explanation will not do at all for Bezalel's brazen altar, which was still quite usable in ^{<4005>}2 Chronicles 1:5, making the construction of a new altar (4:1) altogether inexplicable. The impression is created at once that the Chronicler has injected the Tabernacle into a narrative that knew nothing of it. This is corroborated by ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 21:29,30; the altar at the floor of Ornan is explained by the difficulty of reaching the Tabernacle. But the Ark, the natural means for an inquiry of God, was in Jerusalem, with an altar by it (16:1) — why this third altar on the threshing-floor? The inaccessibility of the Tabernacle is invoked here only to solve what was a difficulty to the Chronicler. Now if ^{<4008>}2 Chronicles 1:3 be compared with ^{<1002>}1 Kings 3:2-4, the key of the whole is discovered. Kings not only does not mention the presence of the Tabernacle at Gibeon, but excludes it. Solomon's sacrificing at Gibeon is explained by saying that such was the custom of all Israel, who sacrificed in high places before the Temple was built; Solomon also sacrificed in high places and Gibeon was a great high place. This is an apology for Solomon's conduct — why should the editor of Kings have apologized for sacrifice offered at the Divinely appointed Tabernacle? The Chronicler, however, could not believe that God blessed Solomon when offering sacrifice in a way forbidden by the law of Chronicle's times, and hence, he solves the difficulty by bringing in something that is unknown to the narrative in Kings.

2. *Kings, etc.:*

Indeed, Kings mentions the Tabernacle only in ^{<1004>}1 Kings 8:4. Samuel mentions the Tabernacle as such only in ^{<1022>}1 Samuel 2:22. Judges does not mention the Tabernacle at all (18:31 is the only possibility and the word there is “house”). Now ^{<1022>}1 Samuel 2:22 is not found in the Vatican Septuagint, and the description of the Tabernacle as a tent contradicts 1:9; 3:15, where it appears as a temple or house. So it must be dropped as a gloss. Nor will it be denied that ^{<1004>}1 Kings 8:4 looks suspiciously like a gloss as well, particularly in view of the presence of Levites there, who are practically unmentioned elsewhere in Samuel-Kings. At all events, there are only these two possible mentions of what should have been the center of Israel’s worship in all of Judges-Samuel-Kings. This is not the ordinary argument from silence, it is silent about what should have been the most vital matter of all. Deuteronomy knows nothing of the Tabernacle, and, as has already been shown in II, states as clearly as language only can that in the wilderness the centralization of worship was not observed. The argument from silence alone would be conclusive here, for how could the author of Deuteronomy in his passionate advocacy of the single sanctuary fail to appeal to the single sanctuary already established by God’s decree, if he knew anything about it? But not only is there no such mention in Deuteronomy but a positive exclusion of such a sanctuary in express terms. The case would seem to be complete. The Tabernacle of X and Chronicles is an ideal structure projected back into the past, just as the temple of Ezekiel is an ideal structure projected into the future. And it is needless to appeal to the familiar argument that the Tabernacle of Exodus 26 would have been blown to pieces by the first storm. It had no provision for tent poles deeply sunk, which alone could resist the blasts of the desert.

It is impossible in the space of the present article to enter into all the corroborative evidence, but a very few important arguments may be mentioned.

3. *The Conquest:*

Simple people tend most naturally to think of heroes of the past as more and more glorious as time passes. Now Judges 1 describes the conquest of Canaan as a slow and laborious process after Joshua’s death. But in ^{<600>}Joshua 10:40-43; 11:10-23; 21:43-45 — especially 11:16-19 — Canaan was completely swept of its inhabitants by Joshua in a series of annihilatory campaigns, making Judges 1 quite impossible. Evidently the Joshua

passages cited belong to a very much later conception of the past history. The fate of Hebron is especially interesting. In ^{<0020>}Judges 1:20 Caleb takes Hebron after Joshua's death. But in Joshua 15 Caleb takes Hebron during Joshua's lifetime and at the latter's direction. In ^{<0036>}Joshua 10:36,37, however, Joshua takes Hebron personally and annihilates its inhabitants. Here are three distinct conceptions of Hebron's fate, again. But still a fourth is found in ^{<0211>}Joshua 21:11,12: it was not Caleb who received the city but the Levites. This evidently belongs to the time when the Levitical right to cities had become a commonplace, and was therefore referred to the earliest days. The accounts of the annihilation of the Canaanites arose naturally enough. According to Judges the conquest was gradual and merciful. But the Canaanites seduced Israel to idolatry repeatedly. Therefore they should have been routed out (^{<0016>}Deuteronomy 20:16-18). But Joshua was righteous and had all power. Therefore he must have rooted them out. How they suddenly reappeared again was a question that was not raised. But perhaps it may be thought a relief to understand that the ruthless campaigns of the Israelites are due to reflection and not to descriptions of what actually happened.

4. Ideas of God:

Simple people think of God quite naturally and reverently as a greater man. So in ^{<0249>}Exodus 24:9-11 we read that Moses and many others met God in the mount, they all saw Him. and ate and drank before Him. A slightly more refined point of view is in ^{<0231>}Exodus 33:11, where Moses (but no one else) sees God face to face, and ^{<0418>}Numbers 12:8, where again he (alone) sees the form of God. But in ^{<0230>}Exodus 33:20 no man, not even Moses, can see God face to face. In ^{<0015>}Deuteronomy 4:11-15 it is laid down that only darkness was seen — "ye saw no form." Perhaps Moses was thought of as an exception, but the contradiction of the concept that conceived over seventy Israelites besides Moses to have seen God is complete.

5. Priesthood:

The reading back of an official priesthood into the time of Moses can be seen in certain passages where Aaron appears predominantly. Contrast, e.g. ^{<0020>}Exodus 8:20-24; 15:23-26; 17:1-7 with 7:1-19; 16:9,10; ^{<0412>}Numbers 20:2-13. Yet despite the importance of Aaron in the latter passages, in ^{<0231>}Exodus 33:11 the minister of Moses in the Tent is Joshua, who is not a priest at all. Contrast similarly ^{<0514>}Deuteronomy 31:14,15 with

~~0278~~ Numbers 27:18-21, noting how Eleazar appears in the latter passage, although the former excludes him. At the time of X it was not thought possible that Moses could have acted without the official mediation of the official priest.

6. Summary:

Reasons of space preclude a further discussion of the other arguments here, such as the linguistic. As a matter of fact, the sections that contain the more developed concepts contain also a different vocabulary. To be repeated, however, is the fact that the argument is cumulative and that a single explanation of the differences is offered in the hypothesis of very varying dates for the various portions. Of course an exact analysis of every verse and a rigorous reconstruction of every source is not claimed to be possible. Many scholars have been carried by their enthusiasm for analysis into making preposterous dissections. But the principal lines of division are sufficiently clear. And it may be hoped the reader will not think that the acceptance of them has been dictated by any motive except that of facing the truth — least of all by any motive of a weakened faith in the power of God or a suspicion of the miraculous.

IV. RECONSTRUCTION.

1. Covenant Code:

Israel came into Canaan, after having received through the mediation of Moses a covenant relation with God and (almost certainly) some accompanying legislation. But this legislation seems not to have prescribed the ritual form that the worship of God was to take. In part, old forms were simply continued and in part new forms were gradually developed or appropriated, the emphasis of the Law at that time being on the moral and the ritual being left quite free. In especial, sacrifices were offered wherever Israelites happened to live, doubtless frequently at former Canaanite sanctuaries, now rededicated to Yahweh. The local sanctuary was the center of the life. Men went thither to learn God's will and to give a religious character to what we should call purely secular transactions (contracts, etc.). Firstlings were offered there on the eighth day, first-fruits at once, every meal of flesh food was given a sacrificial character (peace offering), and, for more solemn purposes, the whole burnt offering was offered. So the local sanctuary corresponded to our "village church"; it was the religious home of the people. Certain of these sanctuaries had an

especial dignity, above all Shiloh, where the Ark was. Later, when a united Israel had been realized, David brought the Ark to Jerusalem that the national capital might become the center of the national religious life as well, and Solomon enshrined the Ark in the Temple. So to Jerusalem there resorted naturally the best of Israel's religious leaders, and there the worship of God would be found in its purest form, normally speaking.

2. Deuteronomy:

As time went on, the progress of culture and the freer contact with other nations had bad effects as well as good. New and degrading religious practices flowed into the country and they revived old but equally degrading religious practices that had survived from the Canaanites. The priesthood at Jerusalem did not escape a taint, but the place where such rites gained the readiest foothold was of course the obscure local sanctuaries. Not the best-minded king or the most zealous prophet, could watch all the services at them all, and attempts at purging them of idolatry or idolatrous rites (Elijah, Jehu, etc.) could not effect permanent improvement. And it could not have been very long after David's own day that the idea must have begun to grow that complete prohibition of country sacrifices and the rigid centralization of everything at Jerusalem was the only measure possible. This would soon become a fixed conviction of the better class of the Jerusalem priesthood and in a few generations would be a tradition. Detailed precepts to carry this tradition into effect arose necessarily and in turn became a tradition and in course of time were regarded as Moses' work and committed to writing. In this way the legislation of Deuteronomy took form and at the time of its discovery under Josiah there is not the slightest occasion to attribute fraud to anyone engaged in the transaction. The document agreed fairly well with what was the tradition of Jerusalem, and no one at that day could distinguish between a writing a century old or even less and a writing of Moses own time. The country priests and the mass of the people were not consulted as to enforcing it, and they would not have known if they had been consulted. On any reading of the history, the reforms proceeded from a very small group, and any general "tradition of the Jews" was nonexistent.

3. Later:

(1) The reforms added to theoretical tradition the additional influence of practical experience and the idea of course dominated the minds of the more earnest among the exiles. Ezekiel, in particular, realized that only at a

single sanctuary could the worship of God be kept pure — the single sanctuary was God's will. And Ezekiel's influence was immense. Now it is to be noted that at the return only those came back who had a real enthusiasm for Jerusalem, as Babylonia was, materially speaking, a far more attractive place than the Palestine of that day. That the single sanctuary could have been questioned by any of these Jews or that they could have conceived of Moses as instituting anything of less dignity is impossible.

(2) Other reforms also had been at work. Even in Deuteronomy the more primitive note of joyousness was maintained in the sacrifices. But joyousness in simple life is often dissipation in cultured life and the peace offering could be made a debauch (~~2272~~ Isaiah 22:12-14; ~~2174~~ Proverbs 7:14). A sense of personal guilt had become far better developed and the incongruity of penitential worship with a festal meal was recognized. A very slight change was made: the portion was to be eaten by the priest instead of the worshipper — and the sin and trespass offerings emerged. The abuses were cut away by this one stroke and the peace offering proper retired into the background. And sacrifices were made the proper center of the official worship. In accord with the growing culture, proportions of gifts, dates of feasts, etc., were specified more and more exactly, the worship was surrounded with a more impressive ritual, and, in particular, the officiating priests substituted vestments suited to the better taste of the time for the old loin-cloth. Traces are left in the Old Testament of difficulties regarding the rights of the various classes of priests to minister but the matter was settled eventually in a manner that satisfied all. Priests formerly guilty of idolatry and their descendants were admitted to share in the worship and the priestly revenues, but the actual offering of sacrifice was restricted to those who had been faithful. The proper support of the clergy so formed required, in accordance with their dignity, more elaborate provisions than had been needed in the simpler times of old, but was accomplished in a manner again entirely satisfactory. The religion of no other nation could have survived the Babylonian exile intact. But Israel returned, with the elements formerly necessary but now outgrown changed into a form adapted to the new task the nation had before it — the preparation of itself and the world for the advent of Christ.

4. *Evaluation:*

This growth toward the higher, involving as it did the meeting of all kinds of obstacles, the solving of all kinds of problems, the learning when to abandon elements that had been transcended, is unique in the history of religions. And the explanation of its uniqueness can be found only in the guidance of God. And in the history as reconstructed God is seen truly as the Father, who trained His children little by little, giving them only what they were able to receive but bringing them surely to Himself. And in the documents that contain the precepts for each stage of progress God's hand can be seen no less clearly. To be sure, in the secular science of history (as in physics or astronomy) His revelation was expressed in forms that His people could understand. This alteration — and this alteration only — in our view of what is covered by Biblical inspiration is the sacrifice demanded by the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis.

LITERATURE.

This is overwhelming and reference must be made to the separate articles. The standard analysis is that of *The Oxford Hexateuch* (1900), more briefly in *The Composition of the Hexateuch* by Carpenter and Harford (Battersby) (1902). Marx, *Die Bucher Moses und Josua* (1907), is the best brief introduction. Gunkel's *Genesis* (1910) in the Nowack series, his more popular *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen* (1911), and his "Die israelitische Literatur" in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, 7 (1906), should on no account be neglected. The best treatment of the inspiration question from the standpoint of pure dogmatics is F. J. Hall's *Authority: Ecclesiastical and Biblical* (1908).

In the above discussion it has been assumed that our text of the Old Testament is at least relatively trustworthy. The reader interested in what can be done by textual reconstruction will find the opposite poles represented in the works of Wiener and of Cheyne.

Burton Scott Easton

(EDITORIAL NOTE. — The promoters of the Encyclopedia are not to be understood as endorsing all the views set forth in Dr. Easton's article (*see CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE*). It was thought right, however, that, in such a work of reference, there should be given a full and adequate presentation of so popular a theory.)

CROCODILE

<krok'-o-dil>.

See *LEVIATHAN; DRAGON*.

CROCODILE, LAND.

See *CHAMELEON*.

CROOK-BACKED

<krook'-bakt> ([^{ⲃⲉ} gibben]; [^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ}, *kurtos*]): A disqualification for the priesthood (^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} Leviticus 21:20); was probably an angular curvature of the spine, usually the result of tubercular caries of the vertebrae. It was by no means uncommon in ancient Egypt, where I have found a considerable number of spines affected with this disease. Some Talmudic authorities explain it as meaning "very dark colored," but this is unlikely.

The woman bound by the spirit of infirmity and unable to lift herself (^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} Luke 13:11-17) was affected with senile kyphosis, a chronic bone disease often found among aged men (and more frequently women) whose lives have been spent in agricultural labor. In these the vertebrae become altered in shape so that it is impossible to straighten the back. Some rabbinical authorities believed all deformities to be due to Satan, and to this our Lord seems to have alluded in his rebuke to those who caviled at His healing on the Sabbath. I have found this condition in some Egyptian skeletons, and have seen it in a Palestinian fellah. A skeleton affected with a similar curvature was found buried under the threshold of a house at Gezer, where she had evidently been offered as a foundation sacrifice.

Alex. Macalister

CROOKED

<krook'-ed> ([^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} awah], [^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} aqash], [^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} aqalqal], [^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} aqallathon], [^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} pethaltol]; [^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} skolios]): Primarily designates something that is bent, twisted or deformed (^{ⲕⲣⲱⲧⲟⲥ} Isaiah 27:1; 45:2 the King James Version).

Figurative:

(1) It designates a course of action that deviates from rectitude, especially

deceit, guile, hypocrisy (^{<1635>}Deuteronomy 32:5; ^{<1025>}Proverbs 2:15; ^{<2015>}Ecclesiastes 1:15; ^{<416>}Luke 3:5; compare ^{<3445>}Philippians 2:15);
 (2) trials (sent by God, ^{<2073>}Ecclesiastes 7:13; ^{<2819>}Lamentations 3:9);
 (3) difficulties (removed by God, ^{<2326>}Isaiah 42:16).

CROOKED SERPENT

<krook'-ed sur'-pent>.

See *ASTRONOMY*.

CROP

(1) As noun the translation of [*harimur'-ah*] (^{<816>}Leviticus 1:16), which is the crawl of a bird, especially of doves and pigeons, which had to be removed by the priest before he offered the birds as a burnt sacrifice.

(2) As a verb it is (^{<2574>}Ezekiel 17:4,22) the translation of [*tf" q; qaTaph*], which has the meaning of “cutting off,” “cutting down,” “plucking.”

CROSS

([*σταυρός, stauros*], “a cross,” “the crucifixion”; [*σκόλο, skolops*], “a stake,” “a pole”): The name is not found in the Old Testament. It is derived from the Latin word *crux*. In the Greek language it is *stauros*, but sometimes we find the word *skolops* used as its Greek equivalent. The historical writers, who transferred the events of Roman history into the Greek language, make use of these two words. No word in human language has become more universally known than this word, and that because all of the history of the world since the death of Christ has been measured by the distance which separates events from it. The symbol and principal content of the Christian religion and of Christian civilization is found in this one word.

1. FORMS OF THE CROSS:

The cross occurs in at least four different forms:

(1) the form usually seen in pictures, the *crux immissa*, in which the upright beam projected above the shorter crosspiece; this is most likely

the type of cross on which the Saviour died, as may be inferred from the inscription which was nailed above His head;

(2) the *crux commissa*, or Anthony's cross, which has the shape of the letter T;

(3) the Greek cross of later date, in which the pieces are equally long;

(4) the *crux decussata*, or Andrew's cross, which has the shape of the letter X.

2. DISCOVERY OF THE TRUE CROSS:

The early church historians Socrates (1, 17), Sozomen (2, 1), Rufinus (1, 7) and Theodoret (1, 18) all make mention of this tradition. The most significant thing is that Eusebius (Vit. Const., iii.26-28), who carries more weight than they all together, wholly omits it.

According to it, Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, in 325 AD, when she was 79 years old, discovered the true cross of Jesus by an excavation she caused to be made on the traditional spot of His grave. With the cross of the Saviour were found the two crosses of the malefactors who were crucified with Him. A miracle of healing, wrought by touching the true cross, revealed its identity. When found it was intact, even the holy nails of the crucifixion being discovered. The main part of the cross was deposited by Helena in a church erected over the spot. Of the remainder, a portion was inserted into the head of the statue of Constantine, and the balance was placed in a new church, specially erected for it at Rome and named after it Santa Croce. Small fragments of the wood of the true cross were sold, encrusted with gold and jewels, and since many among the wealthy believers were desirous of possessing such priceless relics, the miracle of the "multiplication of the cross" was devised, so that the relic suffered no diminution "et quasi intacta maneret" (Paulinus epistle 11 ad Sev). Fragments of the true cross are thus to be found in many Roman Catholic churches of many countries, all over Christendom. It is said that the East celebrated the staurosimos hemera (Crucifixion Day) on September 14, since the 4th century. The evidence for this fact is late and untrustworthy. It is certain that the West celebrated the Invention of the Cross, on May 3, since the time of Gregory the Great in the 6th century. The finding and publication of the apocryphal "Doctrina Addaei" has made it evident that the entire legend of the discovery of the cross by

Helena is but a version of the old Edessa legend, which tells of an identical discovery of the cross, under the very same circumstances, by the wife of the emperor Claudius, who had been converted to Christianity by the preaching of Peter.

3. SYMBOLICAL USES OF THE CROSS:

(1) Extra-Scriptural.

The sign of the cross was well known in the symbolics of various ancient nations. Among the Egyptians it is said to have been the symbol of divinity and eternal life, and to have been found in the temple of Serapis. It is known either in the form of the Greek cross or in the form of the letter “T”. The Spaniards found it to be well known, as a symbol, by the Mexicans and Peruvians, perhaps signifying the four elements, or the four seasons, or the four points of the compass.

(2) Scriptural.

The suffering implied in crucifixion naturally made the cross a symbol of pain, distress and burden-bearing. Thus Jesus used it Himself (~~4008~~ Matthew 10:38; 16:24). In Paulinic literature the cross stands for the preaching of the doctrine of the Atonement (~~4018~~ 1 Corinthians 1:18; ~~4014~~ Galatians 6:14; ~~4018~~ Philippians 3:18; ~~5001~~ Colossians 1:20). It expresses the bond of unity between the Jew and the Gentile (~~4016~~ Ephesians 2:16), and between the believer and Christ, and also symbolizes sanctification (~~4014~~ Galatians 5:24). The cross is the center and circumference of the preaching of the apostles and of the life of the New Testament church.

4. CRUCIFIXION:

As an instrument of death the cross was detested by the Jews. “Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree” (~~4013~~ Galatians 3:13; compare ~~4023~~ Deuteronomy 21:23), hence, it became a stumbling-block to them, for how could one accursed of God be their Messiah? Nor was the cross differently considered by the Romans. “Let the very name of the cross be far away not only from the body of a Roman citizen, but even from his thoughts, his eyes, his ears” (Cicero Pro Rabirio 5). The earliest mode of crucifixion seems to have been by impalation, the transfixion of the body lengthwise and crosswise by sharpened stakes, a mode of death-punishment still well known among the Mongol race. The usual mode of crucifixion was familiar to the Greeks, the Romans, the Egyptians, Persians

and Babylonians (Thuc. 1, 110; Herod. iii.125, 159). Alexander the Great executed two thousand Tyrian captives in this way, after the fall of the city. The Jews received this form of punishment from the Syrians and Romans (Ant., XII, v, 4; XX, vi, 2; BJ, I, iv, 6). The Roman citizen was exempt from this form of death, it being considered the death of a slave (Cicero *In Verrem* i. 5, 66; Quint. viii.4). The punishment was meted out for such crimes as treason, desertion in the face of the enemy, robbery, piracy, assassination, sedition, etc. It continued in vogue in the Roman empire till the day of Constantine, when it was abolished as an insult to Christianity. Among the Romans crucifixion was preceded by scourging, undoubtedly to hasten impending death. The victim then bore his own cross, or at least the upright beam, to the place of execution. This in itself proves that the structure was less ponderous than is commonly supposed. When he was tied to the cross nothing further was done and he was left to die from starvation. If he was nailed to the cross, at least in Judea, a stupefying drink was given him to deaden the agony. The number of nails used seems to have been indeterminate. A tablet, on which the feet rested or on which the body was partly supported, seems to have been a part of the cross to keep the wounds from tearing through the transfixed members (Iren., *Adv. haer.*, ii.42). The suffering of death by crucifixion was intense, especially in hot climates. Severe local inflammation, coupled with an insignificant bleeding of the jagged wounds, produced traumatic fever, which was aggravated the exposure to the heat of the sun, the strained of the body and insufferable thirst. The swelled about the rough nails and the torn lacerated tendons and nerves caused excruciating agony. The arteries of the head and stomach were surcharged with blood and a terrific throbbing headache ensued. The mind was confused and filled with anxiety and dread foreboding. The victim of crucifixion literally died a thousand deaths. Tetanus not rarely supervened and the rigors of the attending convulsions would tear at the wounds and add to the burden of pain, till at last the bodily forces were exhausted and the victim sank to unconsciousness and death. The sufferings were so frightful that "even among the raging passions of war pity was sometimes excited" (BJ, V, xi, 1). The length of this agony was wholly determined by the constitution of the victim, but death rarely ensued before thirty-six hours had elapsed. Instances are on record of victims of the cross who survived their terrible injuries when taken down from the cross after many hours of suspension (Josephus, *Vita*, 75). Death was sometimes hastened by breaking the legs of the victims and by a hard blow delivered under the armpit before crucifixion. *Crura fracta*

was a well-known Roman term (Cicero Phil. xiii.12). The sudden death of Christ evidently was a matter of astonishment (~~<al>~~ Mark 15:44). The peculiar symptoms mentioned by John (19:34) would seem to point to a rupture of the heart, of which the Saviour died, independent of the cross itself, or perhaps hastened by its agony.

See BLOOD AND WATER.

Henry E. Dosker

CROSSWAY

~~<kros'-wa>~~ ([qrP, perek], literally, "division"): A forking or dividing of the way. Obadiah warns Edom, "And stand thou not in the crossway, to cut off those of his that escape" (Obad 1:14). In Septuagint, "a mountain pass."

CROWN

~~<kroun>~~: The word crown in the Old Testament is a translation of five different Hebrew words, and in the New Testament of two Greek words. These express the several meanings, and must be examined to ascertain the same.

1. IN HEBREW:

The five Hebrew words are as follows:

- (1) [dqđq; qodhqodh], from [dd" q; qadhadh];
- (2) [rzer], from [rr" z; zarar];
- (3) [rzn, nezer], or [rznenezer], both from [rz" n; nazar];
- (4) [hrf{]aTarah], from [rf" [; `atar];
- (5) [rtK, kether], from [rt" K; kathar].

(1) *Qodhqodh* means "the crown of the head," and is also rendered in the King James Version "top of the head," "scalp," "pate." It comes from [qadhadh], meaning "to shrivel up," "contract," or bend the body or neck through courtesy. Both the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, in ~~<xxx>~~ Deuteronomy 28:35 and 33:16, translation it "crown" instead of "top" as in the King James Version.

Jacob in his prophecy concerning his sons says: “The blessings of thy father shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that is prince among his brethren” (^{<0426>}Genesis 49:26 the American Revised Version, margin). Other references are: ^{<0530>}Deuteronomy 33:20; ^{<0425>}2 Samuel 14:25; ^{<0807>}Job 2:7; ^{<2487>}Isaiah 3:17; ^{<2426>}Jeremiah 2:16; 48:45. Translated “scalp” in ^{<0821>}Psalms 68:21 and “pate” in ^{<0076>}Psalms 7:16.

(2) *Zer* means a “chaplet,” something spread around the top as a molding about the border, and because of its wreath-like appearance called a crown. “That which presses, binds” (BDB). Comes from [zarar], meaning “to diffuse” or “scatter.” It is used in ^{<0251>}Exodus 25:11,24,25; 30:3,1; 37:2,11,12,26,27.

(3) *Nezer* means something “set apart”; i.e. a dedication to the priesthood or the dedication of a Nazarite, hence, a chaplet or fillet as a symbol of such consecration. The word in the King James Version is rendered “crown,” “consecration,” “separation,” “hair.” Comes from [nazar], meaning “to hold aloof” from impurity, even from drink and food, more definitely, “to set apart” for sacred purposes, i.e. “to separate,” “devote,” “consecrate.” It is found in ^{<0296>}Exodus 29:6; 39:30; ^{<0809>}Leviticus 8:9; 21:12; ^{<0010>}2 Samuel 1:10; ^{<0212>}2 Kings 11:12; ^{<0431>}2 Chronicles 23:11; ^{<0829>}Psalms 89:39; 132:18; ^{<0074>}Proverbs 27:24; ^{<0096>}Zechariah 9:16.

(4) *ʾATarah* means a crown in the usual sense. Comes from *ʾaTar*, meaning “to encircle,” as in war for offense or defense; also actually and figuratively “to crown.” Rendered sometimes “to compass.” It is used in ^{<0020>}2 Samuel 12:30; ^{<0302>}1 Chronicles 20:2; Est 8:15; ^{<0809>}Job 19:9; 31:36; ^{<0208>}Psalms 21:3; ^{<0009>}Proverbs 4:9; 12:4; 14:24; 16:31; 17:6; Song 3:11; ^{<0301>}Isaiah 28:1,3,1; 62:3; ^{<0438>}Jeremiah 13:18; ^{<0556>}Lamentations 5:16; ^{<0602>}Ezekiel 16:12; 21:26; 23:42; ^{<0601>}Zechariah 6:11,14; “crowned,” Song 3:11; “crownest,” ^{<0551>}Psalms 65:11; “crowneth,” ^{<0434>}Psalms 103:4. the Revised Version (British and American) translations “crowned,” of ^{<0085>}Psalms 8:5 “hast crowned.” the American Standard Revised Version prefers to translation “crowning,” in ^{<0328>}Isaiah 23:8, “the bestower of crowns.”

(5) *Kether* means a “circlet” or “a diadem.” From *kathar*, meaning “to enclose”: as a friend, “to crown”; as an enemy, “to besiege.” Various translated “beset round,” “inclose round,” “suffer,” “compass about.” Found in Est 1:11; 2:17; 6:8; “crowned,” in ^{<0448>}Proverbs 14:18.

2. IN GREEK:

The two Greek words of the New Testament translated crown are:

(1) [στέφανος, *stephanos*], from *stepho*, and

(2) [διάδημα, *diadema*], from *diadeo*, “to bind round.”

(1) *Stephanos* means a chaplet (wreath) made of leaves or leaf-like gold, used for marriage and festive occasions, and expressing public recognition of victory in races, games and war; also figuratively as a reward for efficient Christian life and service (*see GAMES*). This symbol was more noticeable and intricate than the plain fillet. Only in the Revelation of John is *stephanos* called “golden.” The “crown of thorns” which Jesus wore was a *stephanos* (woven wreath) of thorns; the kind is not known (⁴¹⁷⁹Matthew 27:29; ⁴¹⁵⁷Mark 15:17; ⁶⁹¹²John 19:2,5). Luke makes no mention of it. Whether intended to represent royalty or victory, it was caricature crown. *Stephanos* is found in ⁴¹²⁵1 Corinthians 9:25; ⁵⁰⁰¹Philippians 4:1; ³¹²⁹1 Thessalonians 2:19; ⁵⁰⁴⁸2 Timothy 4:8; ⁵⁰¹²James 1:12; ⁴¹⁵⁴1 Peter 5:4; ⁶⁶¹⁰Revelation 2:10; 3:11; 6:2; 12:1; 14:14; plural in ⁶⁶⁰⁴Revelation 4:4,10; 9:7; “crowned” in ⁸¹¹⁵2 Timothy 2:5; ⁸¹¹⁹Hebrews 2:9; “crownedst” in ⁸¹¹⁷Hebrews 2:7.

(2) *Diadema* is the word for “diadem,” from *dia* (about) and *deo* (bound), i.e. something bound about the head. In the three places where it occurs (⁶⁶¹³Revelation 12:3; 13:1 and 19:12) both the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version translation it not “crowns” but “diadems,” thus making the proper distinction between *stephanos* and *diadema*, such as is not done either in the King James Version or the Septuagint (see Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament). According to Thayer the distinction was not observed in Hellenic Greek “Diadems” are on the dragon (⁶⁶¹³Revelation 12:3), the beast (⁶⁶¹¹Revelation 13:1) and on the Rider of the White Horse, “the Faithful and True” (⁶⁶¹²Revelation 19:12). In each case the “diadems” are symbolic of power to rule.

3. USE AND SIGNIFICANCE:

There are five uses of the crown as seen in the Scripture references studied, namely, decoration, consecration, coronation, exaltation, and remuneration.

(1) *Decoration.*

The *zer* of Ex, as far as it was a crown at all, was for ornamentation, its position not seeming to indicate any utility purpose. These wavelet, gold moldings, used in the furnishings of the tabernacle of Moses, were placed about

- (a) the table of shewbread (^{<0254>}Exodus 25:24; 37:11);
- (b) the ark of the covenant (^{<0251>}Exodus 25:11; 37:2);
- (c) the altar of incense (^{<0208>}Exodus 30:3,1; 37:26,27). The position of these crowns is a debated question among archaeologists. Their purpose other than decoration is not known. The encircling gold might signify gratitude, parity and enduring worth.

(2) *Consecration.*

The *nezer* had a twofold use as the crown of consecration:

- (a) It was placed as a frontlet on the miter of the high priest, being tied with a blue lace (^{<0298>}Exodus 39:30). The priestly crown was a flat piece of pure gold, bearing the inscription, “Holy to Yahweh,” signifying the consecration of the priest as the representative of the people (^{<0296>}Exodus 29:6; ^{<0889>}Leviticus 8:9).
- (b) Likewise the Hebrew king (^{<0212>}2 Kings 11:12) was set apart by God in wearing on his head a royal *nezer*, whether of silk or gold we do not know. It was set with jewels (^{<0896>}Zechariah 9:16) and was light enough to be taken into battle (^{<0010>}2 Samuel 1:10).

(3) *Coronation.*

The ordinary use of the crown. There were three kinds of kingly crowns used in coronation services:

- (a) The *nezer* or consecration crown, above referred to, was the only one used in crowning Hebrew kings. What seems to be an exception is in the case of Joshua, who represented both priest and king (^{<0861>}Zechariah 6:11 the American Revised Version, margin).
- (b) The *`aTarah*, and

(c) the *kether* were used in crowning foreign monarchs. No king but a Hebrew could wear a *nezer* — a “Holy to Yahweh” crown. It is recorded that David presumed to put on his own head the *`atarah* of King Malcam (~~(120)~~ 2 Samuel 12:30 the American Revised Version, margin). The *kether* or jeweled turban was the crown of the Persian king and queen (Est 1:11; 2:17; 6:8).

(4) *Exaltation.*

The *`atarah*, the *stephanos* and the *diadema* were used as crowns of exaltation. *Stephanos* was the usual crown of exaltation for victors of games, achievement in war and places of honor at feasts. The *`atarah* was worn at banquets (Song 3:11; ~~(230)~~ Isaiah 28:1,3), probably taking the form of a wreath of flowers; also as a crown of honor and victory (~~(260)~~ Ezekiel 16:12; 21:26; 23:42). *Stephanos* is the crown of exaltation bestowed upon Christ (~~(600)~~ Revelation 6:2; 14:14; ~~(800)~~ Hebrews 2:9). “Exaltation was the logical result of Christ’s humiliation” (Vincent). The Apocalyptic woman and locusts receive this emblem of exaltation (~~(600)~~ Revelation 12:1; 9:7). The symbolic dragon and beast are elevated, wearing *diadema*, (~~(600)~~ Revelation 12:3; 13:1). The conquering Christ has “upon his head many diadems” (~~(600)~~ Revelation 19:12). See further Tertullian, Deuteronomy corona.

(5) *Remuneration.*

Paul, witnessing the races and games, caught the vision of wreath-crowned victors flush with the reward of earnest endeavor. *See GAMES*. He also saw the persistent, faithful Christian at the end of his hard-won race wearing the symbolic *stephanos* of rejoicing (~~(100)~~ 1 Thessalonians 2:19 the King James Version), of righteousness (~~(200)~~ 2 Timothy 4:8), of glory (~~(100)~~ 1 Peter 5:4), of life (~~(200)~~ James 1:12; ~~(200)~~ Revelation 2:10). Paul’s fellow Christians were his joy and *stephanos* (~~(100)~~ Philippians 4:1), “of which Paul might justly make his boast” (Ellicott). Long before Paul, his Hebrew ancestors saw the *`aTarah* of glory (~~(200)~~ Proverbs 4:9) and the *`aTarah* of a good wife, children’s children, riches and a peaceful old age (~~(200)~~ Proverbs 12:4; 14:24; 16:31; 17:6). For Apocrypha references see 1 Macc 10:29; 11:35; 13:39.

William Edward Raffety

CROWN OF THORNS

<thorn> ([ἀκάνθινος στέφανος, *akanthinos stephanos*): Three of the four evangelists mention the crown of thorns, wherewith the rude Roman soldiers derided the captive Christ (<177>Matthew 27:29; <157>Mark 15:17; <392>John 19:2). All speak of the akanthine (Acanthus) crown, but there is no certainty about the peculiar plant, from the branches of which this crown of cruel mockery was plaited. The rabbinical books. mention no less than twenty-two words in the Bible signifying thorny plants, and the word *akantha* in the New Testament Greek is a generic and not a specific term. And this word or its adjective is used in the three Gospels, quoted above. It is therefore impossible definitely to determine what was the exact plant or tree, whose thorny branches were selected for this purpose. Tobler (Denkbl., 113, 179) inclines to the Spina Christi, as did Hasselquist. Its botanical name is Zizyphus Spina Christi, It is very common in the East. Its spines are small and sharp, its branches soft, round and pliable, and the leaves look like ivy, with a dark, shiny green color, making them therefore very adaptable to the purpose of the soldiers. Others have designated the Paliurus aculeatus or the Lycium horridum. Both Geikie (Life of Christ, 549) and Farrar (Life of Christ, note 625) point to the Nubk (Zizyphus lotus). Says the latter, “The Nubk struck me, as it has all travelers in Palestine, as being most suitable both for mockery and pain, since its leaves are bright and its thorns singularly strong. But though the Nubk is very common on the shores of Galilee, I saw none of it near Jerusalem.” The settlement of the question is manifestly impossible.

Henry E. Dosker

CRUCIFIXION

<kroo-si-fik’-shun>.

See CROSS; PUNISHMENTS.

CRUEL; CRUELTY

<kroo’-el>, <kroo’-el-ti> [rzkā” , ‘akhzar], “harsh,” “fierce,” [smj ; chamac], “violence”): There are various uses of the word “cruel” in the Old Testament:

(a) “the cruel (deadly) venom of asps” (<523>Deuteronomy 32:33);

(b) spoken of men of relentless hate: “They hate me with cruel hatred” (~~<12519>~~ Psalm 25:19; compare ~~<11819>~~ Proverbs 5:9; 11:17; 12:10; ~~<14123>~~ Jeremiah 6:23; 50:42);

(c) Job speaks of God’s dealings with him as “cruel” and arbitrary: “Thou art turned to be cruel to me” (~~<18121>~~ Job 30:21); conscious of his virtue, yet holding God to be the author of his sufferings, Job is driven to the conclusion that God has become his enemy and is bent upon destroying him;

(d) the “day of Yahweh” — a prophetic phrase to denote the time of God’s manifestation in judgment — is described as coming, “cruel, with wrath and fierce anger” (~~<23139>~~ Isaiah 13:9). The word “cruelty” has nearly disappeared from the Bible. In the Revised Version (British and American) it occurs only in ~~<12712>~~ Psalm 27:12. The King James Version has it in ~~<14115>~~ Genesis 49:5; ~~<19741>~~ Psalm 74:20 (the Revised Version (British and American) “violence”); ~~<15141>~~ Ezekiel 34:4 ([*ĒrP*, *perekh*], “crushing,” the Revised Version (British and American) “rigor”).

The Old Testament records many acts on the part of chosen individuals and the elect nation which are marked by gross cruelty, particularly when measured by the standards of our own age. Some of these acts are sanctioned by Scripture or even presented as commanded by God, as, for example, the sacrifice of Isaac, the extermination of the Canaanites, the authorization of the avenger of blood and of human slavery, and of retaliation for evil. Some of the deeds performed by Divinely appointed leaders of Israel are characterized by inhumanity. Samuel “hewed Agag in pieces” (~~<19153>~~ 1 Samuel 15:33). David massacred the Ammonites with great barbarity (~~<101231>~~ 2 Samuel 12:31). Elijah slew the prophets of Baal (~~<111841>~~ 1 Kings 18:40; compare ~~<111010>~~ 2 Kings 1:10; 10:25). Some of the utterances of the Psalmists breathe spirit of hate and revenge, as in the so-called imprecatory psalms (~~<141078>~~ Psalm 137:8,9; 139:21 f). This has often been a matter of great perplexity to the devout student of the Bible. He has found it difficult to reconcile such practices, which bear the stamp of Divine approval, with the highest standards of Christian morality. It is sometimes urged in justification that these deeds are permitted, but not commanded by God. But this answer hardly meets the facts of the case. We shall arrive at a truer answer if we recognize the fact, which Jesus emphasizes, that the Old Testament religion is a self-accommodation to the low moral standard of those whom it was designed to instruct. This He reiterates in the

Sermon on the Mount (^{<4152>}Matthew 5:22,28,34), and affirms in His reference to the hardness of the ancestral Jewish heart (^{<4198>}Matthew 19:8). In the Old Testament we are dealing with the childhood of the world, in which revelation is compelled to limit itself to the comprehension of its subjects. It must speak so that they can understand. It must start with them where it finds them. It must lead them along lines in which they of their own volition can walk, that character may grow step by step. A gradual development of spiritual and ethical ideals may clearly be traced in the sacred records. We must therefore read the Old Testament narratives and interpret their teaching, not according to the standards of our own age, but in the light of the age to which these narratives belong. The spirit of Elijah may not be the spirit of Christ (^{<4195>}Luke 9:55). While many of the acts of cruelty and barbarity recorded in the Old Testament are indicative of an age of a low type of morality, yet we must at the same time recognize the fact, that Israel's religion by emphasizing holy living and righteous conduct created an atmosphere favorable for the growth of high ethical ideals. Wherever this religion is seen at its best, as in the teachings of the prophets, it is the mark of the righteous man to treat human life as sacred and to refrain scrupulously from inflicting unnecessary pain. Even the Gentiles shall be brought to judgment for their barbarities and inhuman practices (^{<3000>}Amos 1:2 f; ^{<1297>}2 Kings 25:7). Among the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, predicted by the prophets, is the cessation of war with all of its attendant cruelties and horrors. The Law of Israel also reflected this tendency toward humanity, and many of its ordinances, while seemingly inhuman, really tended to mitigate prevailing barbarity. Instances of such ordinances are those referring to the maltreatment of slaves (^{<1213>}Exodus 21:20), to the Cities of Refuge (^{<4159>}Numbers 35:19 ff; compare Joshua 20), to rules of warfare (^{<1310>}Deuteronomy 20:10 f), etc. The extermination of the Canaanites is represented as a Divine judgment upon a morally corrupt civilization (^{<1516>}Genesis 15:16; ^{<1523>}Deuteronomy 12:30). It is declared necessary in order to guard the Hebrews from contamination by the sins of the Canaanites (^{<1232>}Exodus 23:32). It is not so far back, that many of the practices that are condemned by the most enlightened Christianity of our day, prevailed universally and were not thought incompatible with Christian civilization. Even our own time needs to secure a more widespread practical recognition of the principles of humanity, kindness and justice, which are professedly the law of the Christian life.

L. Kaiser

CRUMB

<krum> ([**ψίον**, *psichion*], “a little bit”): Occurs only in the New Testament, of remnants of food, scraps. Lazarus desired “to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man’s table” (<162> Luke 16:21). “Even the (little) dogs eat of the crumbs” (<157> Matthew 15:27; <107> Mark 7:28), “possibly the fragments of bread on which the guests wiped their hands (after thrusting them into the common dish), and flung to the dogs” (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, I, 476).

CRUSE

<kroos>: A small earthen vessel or flask, usually for holding liquids: [tj " P" x" , *tsappachath*]; as water, <131> 1 Samuel 26:11,12,16; <1806> 1 Kings 19:6; it being porous, the liquid is kept cool; also for holding oil, as in 1 Kings 17:12,14,16.

In <1148> 1 Kings 14:3 (“a cruse of honey”) the word [qW**BqB**" , *baqbuq*], would be better rendered “bottle,” doubtless deriving its name from the gurgling sound of issuing liquids. In <1220> 2 Kings 2:20 [tyj **Ox**] *tselochith*], is not a jar or flask, but a dish, or platter, for salt or other substances.

In the New Testament a small jar or vial, [**ἀλάβαστρον**, *alabastron*], “alabaster cruse” or flask, for holding ointment; not “box” as in the King James Version (<1317> Matthew 26:7; <1148> Mark 14:3; <107> Luke 7:37; compare <1911> 1 Samuel 10:1; <1301> 2 Kings 9:1,3, where “box” in the King James Version is used for “vial” the Revised Version (British and American)).

Edward Bagby Pollard

CRY, CRYING

<kri'-ing> ([q[**z**; *zaaq*], [q[**x**; *tsa`aq*] (and forms), [a**rq**; *qara'*], [w" **v**; *shawa'*], [h**Nr**i *rinnah*]; [**βοάω**, *boao*], [**κράζω**, *krazo*], [**φωνέω**, *phoneo*]):

Various words are translated “cry,” “crying,” etc., the chief of which are those above given; *za`aq* and *tsa`aq* denote especially a cry for help, from pain or distress, and are frequently used for crying to God, e.g. (<1123> Exodus 2:23; <1039> Judges 3:9,15; <10216> Psalm 22:5; 107:13,19; <3304> Micah 3:4); (*tsa`aq*, <1812> Exodus 8:12; 15:25; <1847> Psalm 34:17; 77:1; <3300> Isaiah 19:20; <2128> Lamentations 2:18); *qara'* (a mimetic word) has the widest signification, but is often used of appealing to God (frequently translated

“call,” “called,” etc., (^{<0394>}Genesis 39:14,15,18; 41:43; ^{<0539>}Deuteronomy 15:9; 24:15; ^{<1182>}1 Kings 18:27; ^{<0904>}Psalms 3:4; 22:2; 27:7; ^{<0102>}Proverbs 1:21; ^{<2344>}Isaiah 34:14; ^{<0402>}Jeremiah 2:2, etc.); *shawā`*, “to cry aloud” (^{<0892>}Job 29:12; 30:20,28; ^{<0906>}Psalms 18:6,41; 88:13; Jon 2:2; ^{<0900>}Habakkuk 1:2, etc.); *rinnah*, “a shouting,” whether for joy or grief (^{<1008>}1 Kings 8:28; ^{<0701>}Psalms 17:1; 61:1; 88:2; 119:169; 142:6; ^{<2344>}Isaiah 43:14 the Revised Version (British and American) “rejoicing,” etc.). Other Hebrew words are *‘anaq*, “to groan” (^{<0904>}Ezekiel 9:4; 24:17 the King James Version; 26:15 the King James Version); *hamah*, “to make a noise” (^{<0507>}Psalms 55:17 the King James Version); *rua`*, “to shout” (^{<0021>}Judges 7:21 the King James Version; ^{<0806>}Job 30:5; ^{<2923>}Isaiah 42:13, etc.); *ranan*, “to cry aloud” (^{<0802>}Psalms 84:2; ^{<2929>}Lamentations 2:19); *shoa`*, “crying” (^{<2926>}Isaiah 22:5); *teshu’oth*, “crying,” “noise” (^{<0907>}Job 39:7 the King James Version).

In the New Testament we have *boao*, “to cry,” “shout” (^{<0108>}Matthew 3:3; ^{<1008>}Mark 1:3; 15:34; ^{<0807>}Galatians 4:27, etc.); *krazo* (mimetic, the hoarse cry of the raven), “to cry out” (^{<0027>}Matthew 9:27; 14:30; 21:9; 27:50; ^{<0065>}Mark 5:5; ^{<0806>}Galatians 4:6; ^{<0600>}Revelation 6:10; 7:2, etc.); *phoneo*, “to give forth the voice,” “sound” (^{<0088>}Luke 8:8; 16:24; 23:46; ^{<0468>}Acts 16:28; ^{<0608>}Revelation 14:18 the King James Version); *anaboao*, “to cry out” (^{<0746>}Matthew 27:46; ^{<0108>}Luke 9:38); *aphiemi*, “to let go,” “to send away” (^{<0157>}Mark 15:37 the King James Version); *epiboao*, “to cry about” (anything) (Acts, 25:24); *epiphoneo*, “to give forth the voice upon” (^{<0229>}Luke 23:21 the King James Version); *kraugazo*, “to make a cry, or outcry, or clamor” (^{<0029>}Matthew 12:19; 15:22; ^{<0148>}John 11:43; 18:40; 19:6,15; ^{<0023>}Acts 22:23); *anakrazo*, “to cry out” (^{<0023>}Mark 1:23; ^{<0068>}Luke 4:33, etc.); *krauge*, “a crying out” (^{<0206>}Matthew 25:6; ^{<0239>}Acts 23:9 the King James Version; ^{<0807>}Hebrews 5:7; ^{<0208>}Revelation 21:4).

For “cry” the Revised Version (British and American) has “sound” (^{<0432>}2 Chronicles 13:12); “cry because of these things” (^{<0804>}Job 30:24 the English Revised Version); “cry out” (^{<0838>}Job 31:38; ^{<2924>}Isaiah 42:14); “call” (^{<0801>}Psalms 28:1; 61:2; 141:1); “be blind” (^{<2909>}Isaiah 29:9); “groan” (^{<2365>}Ezekiel 26:15); “pant” (^{<2001>}Joel 1:20); “cry aloud” (^{<0029>}Matthew 12:19); “clamor” (^{<0239>}Acts 23:9). Among the other changes are, “moan” for “cry aloud” (^{<0507>}Psalms 55:17); “sound an alarm” (^{<0808>}Hosea 5:8); “take your pleasure,” margin “blind yourselves.” for “cry ye out” (^{<2909>}Isaiah 29:9); “sigh, but not aloud” for “forbear to cry” (^{<2917>}Ezekiel 21:17); “shoutings” for “crying” (^{<0907>}Job 39:7); “destruction” for “crying” (^{<0108>}Proverbs 19:18, where we have instead of “let not thy soul spare for

his crying,” “set not thy heart on his destruction,” margin, Hebrew “causing him to die” (muth, “to put to death”)); “went up” for “crying aloud” (~~41158~~ Mark 15:8, different text); “cry” for “voice” (~~4142~~ Luke 1:42); for “had cried” (~~42346~~ Luke 23:46), the American Standard Revised Version has “crying.”

W. L. Walker

CRYSTAL

<kris'-tal>: In English Versions of the Bible the word is probably intended to signify rock-crystal, crystallized quartz. This the Greeks called [κρύσταλλος, *krustallos*], “ice,” believing it to have been formed from water by intense cold. Thus in ~~6016~~ Revelation 4:6; 21:11; 22:1, either “crystal” (EV) or “ice” (Greek, *krustallos*) suits the context. The word rendered “crystal” in ~~3012~~ Ezekiel 1:22 ([j r" q, *qerach*]) is ambiguous in precisely the same way (the Revised Version, margin “ice”). In ~~8387~~ Job 28:17 the context favors the King James Version “crystal,” rather than the Revised Version (British and American) “glass” ([tykWkz] *zekhukhith*). Finally, in ~~8388~~ Job 28:18 the Revised Version (British and American) reads “crystal” for the King James Version “pearls” (Hebrew *gabhish*; the weight of evidence favors the Revised Version (British and American) in spite of the parallelism suggested by the King James Version).

See also STONES, PRECIOUS.

F. K. Farr

CUB

<kub> ([bWk, *kubh*]; the King James Version Chub): The word occurs only in ~~3016~~ Ezekiel 30:5. There it is almost certainly a corruption, and we should read, as in Septuagint, “Lub,” i.e. Libya. Libya, in the earlier part of the same verse (the King James Version), is a mistr of “Put,” thus correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American).

CUBIT

<kub'-bit> ([hMa" , ‘*ammah*]; [πῆχυς, *pechus*]): The standard for measures of length among the Hebrews. They derived it from the Babylonians, but a similar measure was used in Egypt with which they must have been familiar. The length of the cubit is variously estimated,

since there seems to have been a double standard in both countries, and because we have no undisputed example of the cubit remaining to the present time. The original cubit was the length of the forearm, from the elbow to the end of the middle finger, as is implied from the derivation of the word in Hebrew and in Latin (cubitum). It seems to be referred to also in ^{<1881>}Deuteronomy 3:11: “after the cubit of a man.” But this was too indefinite for a scientific standard, and the Babylonians early adopted a more accurate method of measurement which passed to the nations of the West. They had a double standard, the so-called royal cubit and the ordinary one. From the remains of buildings in Assyria and Babylonia, the former is made out to be about 20,6 inches, and a cubit of similar length was used in Egypt and must have been known to the Hebrews. This was probably the cubit mentioned by ^{<3415>}Ezekiel 40:5 and perhaps that of Solomon’s temple, “cubits after the first measure” (^{<4483>}2 Chronicles 3:3), i.e. the ancient cubit. The ordinary cubit of commerce was shorter, and has been variously estimated at between 16 and 18 or more inches, but the evidence of the Siloam inscription and of the tombs in Palestine seems to indicate 17,6 inches as the average length. *See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES*. This was the cubit of six palms, while the longer one was of seven (^{<3415>}Ezekiel 40:5). The cubit mentioned in ^{<10816>}Judges 3:16 is from a different word in Hebrew ([^{<10816>}dmḡ, gomedh]) and was probably shorter, for Ehud girded it on his thigh under his clothing.

The New Testament references are ^{<4027>}Matthew 6:27; ^{<125>}Luke 12:25, “Which of you can add a cubit unto the measure of his life?”; ^{<18>}John 21:18, “about two hundred cubits off”; ^{<17>}Revelation 21:17, “the wall thereof, a hundred and forty and four cubits.”

H. Porter

CUCKOW

^{<1007>}<kook'-oo>, ^{<1007>}<kuk'-oo> ([^{<1007>}tj " v; shachaph]; [^{<1007>}λάρος, laros]; Latin *Cuculus canorus*): The Hebrew root from which the word *shachaph* is derived means “to be lean” and “slender,” and in older versions of the Bible was translated cuckow (cuckoo). It was mentioned twice in the Bible (^{<1116>}Leviticus 11:16, and practically the same in ^{<1415>}Deuteronomy 14:15 the King James Version “cuckoo”), in the list of unclean birds. The Latin term by which we designate the bird is very similar to the Arabic, and all names for it in different countries are so nearly the same that they prove themselves based on its double cry, “cuck-oo,” or the single note “kowk”

or “gouk.” The bird is as old as history, and interesting because the European species placed its eggs in the nests of other birds, which gave rise to much fiction concerning its habits. The European bird is a brownish gray with white bars underneath, and larger than ours, which are a beautiful olive gray, with tail feathers of irregular length touched with white, knee tufts, black or yellow bill, according to species, and beautiful sleek head and shining eyes. Our birds build their own nests, attend their young with care and are much loved for their beauty. Their food is not repulsive in any species; there never was any reason why they should have been classed among the abominations, and for these reasons scientists in search of a “lean, slender” bird of offensive diet and habit have selected the “sea-mew” (which see) which is substituted for cuckoo in the Revised Version (British and American) with good natural-history reason to sustain the change.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CUCUMBER

<ku'-kum-ber> ([*μyαVq*, *qishshu'im*]; [*σίkuος*, *sikuos*]): One of the articles of food for which Israel in the wilderness looked back with longing to Egypt (^{<Q1115>}Numbers 11:5). Cucumbers are great favorites with all the people of Palestine. Two varieties occur, *Cucumis sativus* (Arabic, *Khyar*), originally a product of Northwest India, which is smooth-skinned, whitish and of delicate flavor, and requires much water in its cultivation, and *Cucumis chate* (Arabic, *faqqus*), which is long and slender but less juicy than the former. Probably the Biblical reference is to this latter as it is a plant much grown in Egypt where it is said to attain unusual excellence.

A “garden of cucumbers” or more literally a “place of cucumbers” (*miqshdh*), is mentioned in ^{<2008>}Isaiah 1:8; Baruch 6:70. “A lodge in a garden of cucumbers” (^{<2008>}Isaiah 1:8) is the rough wooden booth erected by the owner from which he keeps guard over his ripening vegetables. It is commonly raised upon poles and, when abandoned for the season, it falls into decay and presents a dreary spectacle of tottering poles and dead leaves.

E. W. G. Masterman

CUD

See CHEW.

CULTURE

<kul'-tur>: Found only in 2 Esdras 8:6 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “give culture to our understanding,” i.e. to nourish it as seed in the ground.

CUMBER; CUMBERED

<kum'-ber>, ([καταργέω, *katargeo*], “to make idle,” [περισπάομαι, *perispaomai*], “to be drawn about,” in mind “to be distracted”): Spoken of the barren fig tree in the parable: “Cut it down; why doth it also cumber (block up, make unproductive) the ground?” (^{<2137>}Luke 13:7). Cumbered means to be over-occupied with cares or business, distracted: “But Martha was cumbered about much serving” (^{<2100>}Luke 10:40). The word cumbrance occurs only in ^{<8112>}Deuteronomy 1:12: “How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance?” ([j r" fṛTorach], “an encumbrance,” “a burden”). Compare ^{<2014>}Isaiah 1:14, where the Revised Version, margin has “cumbrance,” the Revised Version (British and American) “trouble.”

CUMI

<koo'-me>, <ku'-mi>.

See TALITHA.

CUMMIN

<kum'-in> ([ˈM& , *kammon*]; [κύμινον, *kuminon*]): The seed of the herb *Cuminum cyminum* (Natural Order *Umbelliferae*). It has carminative properties and is used for flavoring various dishes, especially during fasts. In flavor and appearance it resembles caraway, though it is less agreeable to western palates. As an illustration of Yahweh's wisdom it is said (^{<2325>}Isaiah 28:25,27) that cummin is scattered in sowing and beaten out with a rod in threshing. These facts are true in Palestine today. The Jews paid tithes of cummin (^{<4123>}Matthew 23:23) (see cut on following page).

CUN

<kun> ([ˈW& , *kun*], A, [ἐκ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν πόλεων, *ek ton eklekton poleon*], “from the chosen cities”): One of the cities of Hadarezer, king of Syria, spoiled by David (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 18:8, the King James Version

“Chun”). In the parallel passage (^{<108>}2 Samuel 8:8) its place is taken by *BEROTHAI*, which see.

CUNNING

<kun'-ing> ([^{<107>}pkj ; *chakham*], [^{<107>}bv" j ; *chashabh*]): In Bible-English “cunning” means always “wise” or “skilful”; the word does not occur in the bad sense, and it is found in the Old Testament only. The chief Hebrew words are *chakham*, “wise,” “skilful” (^{<407>}2 Chronicles 2:7 the King James Version “a man cunning to work in gold”; ^{<423>}2 Chronicles 2:13; ^{<218>}Isaiah 3:3 the King James Version, etc.); *chashabh*, “to think,” “devise,” “desire” (^{<120>}Exodus 26:1,31; 28:6,15 the King James Version, etc.). We have also *da`ath*, “knowledge” (^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:14 the King James Version); *bin*, “to be intelligent” (^{<137>}1 Chronicles 25:7 the King James Version); *machasbebeth*, “thought,” “device,” “design” (^{<1304>}Exodus 31:4; 35:33,15 the King James Version); *aman*, “artificer” (Song 7:1 the King James Version); *yadha`*, “to know,” once translated “cunning” (^{<7004>}Daniel 1:4 the King James Version).

For cunning the American Standard Revised Version gives “skilful” (^{<1304>}Exodus 31:4, etc.; ^{<218>}Isaiah 3:3 “expert”); for “cunning work” the work of the “skilful workman” (^{<120>}Exodus 26:1,31, etc., the English Revised Version “cunning workman”); for “curious,” “skilfully woven,” the English Revised Version “cunningly woven” (^{<1208>}Exodus 28:8, etc.).

W. L. Walker

CUP

(Most frequently, [^{<107>}s/K, *koc*]; four other words in one passage each; [^{<107>}potḥrion, *poterion*]): A vessel for drinking from, of a variety of material (gold, silver, earthenware), patterns (Est 1:7) and elaboration.

Figurative: By ordinary figure of speech, put sometimes for the contents of the cup, namely, for that which is drunk (^{<1159>}Matthew 26:39). In both Old Testament and New Testament applied figuratively to that which is portioned out, and of which one is to partake; most frequently used of what is sorrowful, as God’s judgments, His wrath, afflictions, etc. (^{<9106>}Psalms 11:6; 75:8; ^{<2517>}Isaiah 51:17; ^{<640>}Revelation 14:10). In a similar sense, used by Christ concerning the sufferings endured by Him (^{<107>}Matthew 26:39), and the calamities attending the confession of His

name (^{<4023>}Matthew 20:23). In the Old Testament applied also to the blessedness and joy of the children of God, and the full provision made for their wants (^{<4045>}Psalms 16:5; 23:5; 116:13; compare ^{<4047>}Jeremiah 16:7; ^{<4006>}Proverbs 31:6). All these passages refer not only to the experience of an allotted joy and sorrow, but to the fact that all others share in this experience. Within a community of those having the same interests or lot, each received his apportioned measure, just as at a feast, each cup is filled for the individual to drain at the same time that his fellow-guests are occupied in the same way.

The Holy Supper is called “the cup of the Lord” (^{<4021>}1 Corinthians 10:21), since it is the Lord who makes the feast, and tenders the cup, just as “the cup of demons” with which it is contrasted, refers to what they offer and communicate. In ^{<4025>}1 Corinthians 11:25, the cup is called “the new covenant in my blood,” i.e. it is a pledge and seal and means of imparting the blessings of the new covenant (^{<8006>}Hebrews 10:16 f) — a covenant established by the shedding of the blood of Christ. The use of the word “cup” for the sacrament shows how prominent was the part which the cup had in the Lord’s Supper in apostolic times. Not only were all commanded to drink of the wine (^{<4027>}Matthew 26:27), but the very irregularities in the Corinthian church point to its universal use (^{<4027>}1 Corinthians 11:27). Nor does the Roman church attempt to justify its withholding the cup from the laity (the communion in one form) upon conformity with apostolic practice, or upon direct Scriptural authority. This variation from the original institution is an outgrowth of the doctrines of transubstantiation and sacramental concomitance, of the attempt to transform the sacrament of the Eucharist into the sacrifice of the Mass, and of the wide separation between clergy and laity resulting from raising the ministry to the rank of a sacerdotal order. The practice was condemned by Popes Leo I (died 461) and Gelasius (died 496); but gained a firm hold in the 12th century, and was enacted into a church regulation by the Council of Constance in 1415.

See also BLESSING, CUP OF.

As to the use of cups for divination (^{<0445>}Genesis 44:5), the reference is to superstitious practice derived from the Gentiles. For various modes of divining what is unknown by the pouring of water into bowls, and making observations accordingly, see Geikie, Hours with the Bible, I, 492 f, and article DIVINATION.

H. E. Jacobs

CUPBEARER

<kup'-bar-er> ([**hqv**h" , *mashqeh*], “one giving drink”; [**οἰνοχόος**, *oinochos*]): An officer of high rank at ancient oriental courts, whose duty it was to serve the wine at the king’s table. On account of the constant fear of plots and intrigues, a person must be regarded as thoroughly trustworthy to hold this position. He must guard against poison in the king’s cup, and was sometimes required to swallow some of the wine before serving it. His confidential relations with the king often endeared him to his sovereign and also gave him a position of great influence. This officer is first mentioned in Scripture in ^{<4040>}Genesis 40:1 ff, where the Hebrew word elsewhere translated “cupbearer” is rendered “butler.” The phrase “chief of the butlers” (40:2) accords with the fact that there were often a number of such officials under one as chief (compare Xen. Hellen. vii.1, 38). Nehemiah (compare 1:11) was cupbearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, and was held in high esteem by him, as the record shows. His financial ability (^{<4048>}Nehemiah 5:8,10,14,17) would indicate that the office was a lucrative one. Cupbearers are mentioned further in ^{<4105>}1 Kings 10:5; ^{<4404>}2 Chronicles 9:4, where they, among other evidences of royal splendor, are stated to have impressed the queen of Sheba with Solomon’s glory. The title Rabshakeh (^{<2340>}Isaiah 36:2), once thought to mean “chief of the cupbearers,” is now given a different derivation and explained as “chief of the officers,” or “princes” (BDB under the word). See further on cupbearers Herod. iii.34; Xen. Cyrop. i.3, 8, 9; Josephus, Ant, XVI, viii, 1; Tobit 1:22.

Benjamin Reno Downer

CUPBOARD

<kub'-erd> ([**κυλίκιον**, *kulikion*], 1 Macc 15:32): A kind of sideboard in or on which Simon’s gold and silver vessels were displayed, and which, among other evidences of his glory, amazed the Syrian envoy Athenobius. Compare the Roman abacus, said to have been introduced into Rome from Asia.

CURDLE

<kur'-dl> ([**apq**; *qapha'*], “to congeal,” “harden,” “curdle”): Occurs in ^{<4800>}Job 10:10, “Hast thou not curdled me like cheese?” i.e. made him take solid form. “The formation of the embryo is a mystery on which the

Hebrew dwells with a deep and reverential awe: compare ^{<AD93>}Psalm 139:13-16.” These similes are often met with in the Koran and oriental poetry. See *Speaker’s Commentary* in the place cited

CURE; CURES

^{<kur>}: Represents the words [חֲהַף; *gahah*], [απεῖν” , *marpe’*], [hpr; *raphdh*]; [θεραπεύω, *therapeuo*], [ἰασις, *iasis*]. *Gahah* in ^{<AD72>}Proverbs 17:22 translated “medicine” means properly the removal of a bandage from a healed wound, and, is used figuratively in ^{<AD53>}Hosea 5:13; *marpe’*, “healing,” is used in the sense of deliverance of the city in ^{<AD16>}Jeremiah 33:6; with a negative particle in ^{<AD18>}2 Chronicles 21:18 it is used to describe the bowel disease of Jehoram as incurable. The Greek words are used of physical cures (*iasis* in ^{<AD32>}Luke 13:32) as contradistinguished from the casting out of demons as ^{<AD76>}Matthew 17:16; ^{<AD71>}Luke 7:21; ^{<AD50>}John 5:10. Cure is only used in the New Testament in the sense of physical healing; in the Old Testament usually in the sense of spiritual or national deliverance from danger.

Alex. Macalister

CURIOUS

^{<ku’-ri-us>} ([ἄβυθ ἡ” , *machashebbeth*]; [περίεργος, *periergos*]): The above Hebrew word, meaning “thought,” “device,” “design,” is translated “curious,” ^{<AD52>}Exodus 35:32 the King James Version “curious works”; the English Revised Version “cunning”; the American Standard Revised Version “skilful”; *cheshebh* (“device,” “devised work”), translated the King James Version “curious girdle,” is translated by the English Revised Version “cunningly woven band,” the American Standard Revised Version “skilfully” (^{<AD18>}Exodus 28:8,27,28; 29:5; 39:5,20,21; ^{<AD17>}Leviticus 8:7). In ^{<AD15>}Psalm 139:15 *raqam*, “embroidered,” “variegated” is used figuratively of a child in the womb, translated “curiously wrought”; “the body or the fetus is described as woven together of so many different-colored threads, like a cunning and beautiful network or tapestry” (Perowne in the place cited.). See also CURDLE. *Periergos*, “working round about,” is used of the “curious arts” of some in Ephesus who brought their books to be burned (^{<AD19>}Acts 19:19 the American Standard Revised Version “magical”).

See *ASTROLOGY 14*.

W. L. Walker

CURRENT MONEY

See *MONEY, CURRENT*.

CURSE

<*kurs*> ([**hl a**; ‘alah] (^{<0452>}Numbers 5:21,23,17, etc.), [**hram**] *me’erah*] (^{<0183>}Proverbs 3:33; ^{<0102>}Malachi 2:2, etc.), [**hl l q**] *klalah*] (^{<0172>}Genesis 27:12,13); [**κατάρα**, *katara*] (^{<0510>}Galatians 3:10,13)): This word as noun and verb renders different Hebrew words, some of them being more or less synonymous, differing only in degree of strength. It is often used in contrast with “bless” or “blessing” (^{<0512>}Deuteronomy 11:29). When a curse is pronounced against any person, we are not to understand this as a mere wish, however violent, that disaster should overtake the person in question, any more than we are to understand that a corresponding “blessing” conveys simply a wish that prosperity should be the lot of the person on whom the blessing is invoked. A curse was considered to possess an inherent power of carrying itself into effect. Prayer has been defined as a wish referred to God. Curses (or blessings) were imprecations referred to supernatural beings in whose existence and power to do good or inflict harm primitive man believed. The use of magic and spells of all kinds is based on the belief that it is possible to enlist the support of the superhuman beings with whom the universe abounds, and to persuade them to carry out the suppliant’s wishes. It has been suggested that spells were written on pieces of parchment and cast to the winds in the belief that they would find their way to their proper destination — that some demoniac being would act as postman and deliver them at the proper address. In Zechariah (5:1-3) the “flying roll,” with curses inscribed on it “goeth forth over the face of the whole land.” It would find its way into the house of every thief and perjurer. But it was not always possible to commit curses to writing, it was enough to utter them aloud. Generally the name of some deity would be coupled with such imprecations, as Goliath cursed David by his gods (^{<0174>}1 Samuel 17:43). Such curses once uttered possessed the power of self-realization. It was customary for heads of families in their declining years to bless their children, such a blessing being, not simply a paternal wish that their children should prosper in life, but a potent factor in determining their welfare (^{<0105>}Genesis 9:25). in this case Jacob seeks his father’s blessing, which was more than his father’s good wishes for his future career. Such blessings and curses were independent of moral

considerations. Before moral distinctions played any part in molding theological conceptions it was not necessary, before a spell could be effectual, that the individual against whom the spell was pronounced should be deserving, on moral grounds, of the fate which was invoked on him. It was sufficient that he should be the foe of the author of the curse. We may assume that such curses signalized the commencement of a battle. But in process of time such indiscriminate imprecations would not satisfy enlightened moral judgment. In the dramatic situation depicted in Deuteronomy (11:29; 27:12 f) the curse was placed on Mt. Ebal and the blessing, on Mr. Gerizim. But the curse was the penalty for disobedience, as the blessing was the reward for obedience. The Book of Proverbs (26:2) summarily dismisses the traditional belief — "the curse that is causeless alighteth not." "In the discourses of Jesus we find blessings and curses. They are however simply authoritative declarations of the eternal connection between right doing and happiness, wrong doing and misery" (Cheyne).

Whereas curses by ordinary persons were considered more or less efficacious — some god being always only too glad to speed them on their way to their destination — yet special persons — "holy" persons — in virtue of their special relation to Divine beings possessed special powers of pronouncing effectual curses on account of their powers of enlisting supernatural aid. Balaam, according to the narrative in Numbers (22 f), was an expert in the art. Balak was convinced that Balaam's curse would bring about the defeat of the Israelites (see Gray, "Numbers," ICC).

The term — and the thing signified — plays an important part in Paul's interpretation of the cross. In the light of the law all men are guilty. There is no acquittal through appeal to a law that commands and never forgives — prohibits and never relents. The violator of the law is under a curse. His doom has been pronounced. Escape is impossible. But on the cross Jesus Christ endured the curse — for "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (^{<4180>}Galatians 3:10,13) — and a curse that has overtaken its victim is a spent force.

See PUNISHMENTS.

Jesus commands His disciples, "Bless them that curse you" (^{<4168>}Luke 6:28; compare ^{<5124>}Romans 12:14). He Himself cursed the fruitless fig tree (^{<4112>}Mark 11:21) — a symbol of the doom of a fruitless people.

Curse as the rendering of [*purj echerem*], implies a totally different, idea.

See *ACCURSED*.

T. Lewis

CURTAIN

<kur'-t'-n>, -ten, -tin: The word ordinarily used for curtain is [h[yrj]yeri`ah]. Thus in ^{<1241>}Exodus 26:1 ff; 36:8 ff of the curtains of the tabernacle (see *TABERNACLE*); in ^{<1072>}2 Samuel 7:2; ^{<1942>}Psalms 104:2; Song 1:5; ^{<2512>}Isaiah 54:2; ^{<2441>}Jeremiah 4:20; 10:20; 49:29; ^{<3187>}Habakkuk 3:7.

Figurative: In ^{<2412>}Isaiah 40:22 (like ^{<1942>}Psalms 104:2, of the heavens), the word used is [qDðdoq], literally, “gauze.”

CUSH (1)

<kush> ([vWk, kush]):

1. THE ANCESTOR OF MANY NATIONS:

(1) The first of the sons of Ham, from whom sprang Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah and Sabtecah. He was also the father of Nimrod, who rounded Babel (Babylon) and the other great states of Shinar or Babylonia (^{<1115>}Genesis 10:6-8). The meaning of the name is uncertain.

(2) The name of the country around which the Gihon flowed (^{<1023>}Genesis 2:13), rendered “Ethiopia” in the King James Version, but in view of the distance of that country from the other rivers mentioned, this seems to be an unlikely identification.

2. A DISTRICT OF THE GARDEN OF EDEN:

Fried. Delitzsch has suggested (Wo lag das Paradies? 74 ff) that the watercourse in question is the canal Gu-hande or Arahtu, which, coming from the South, entered Babylon a little to the East of the Euphrates, and, flowing alongside the Festival-Street, entered the Euphrates to the North of Nebuchadrezzar’s palace. Koldewey (Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa, 38) regards the Gu-hande as the section of the Euphrates itself at this point. There is no indication, however, that the district which it enclosed was ever called *Kusu* or Cush, and the suppression of the final syllable of Gu-hande would remain unexplained. Moreover, the

identification of Cush with a possible Cas, for Kasdu, “Chaldea,” seems likewise improbable, especially as that name could only have been applied, in early times, to the district bordering on the Persian Gulf (*see CHALDEA*).

3. PROBABLY NOT IN ASIA MINOR:

Another theory is, that the Cush of ^{<0023>}Genesis 2:13 is the Kusu of certain Assyrian letters, where it seems to designate a district in the neighborhood of Cappadocia. This identification apparently leads us back to an ancient tradition at one time current in the East, but later forgotten, which caused the Pyramus river to assume the name of Jihun (i.e. Gihon). This stream rises in the mountains Northeast of the Gulf of Alexandretta, and, taking a southwesterly course, flows into the Mediterranean near Karatash. Though nearer than the Ethiopian Cush, this is still too far West, and therefore unsatisfactory as an identification — all the streams or waterways of the Garden of Eden ought to flow through the same district.

4. THE ETHIOPIAN CUSH:

(3) The well-known country of Cush or Ethiopia, from Syene (^{<390>}Ezekiel 29:10) southward — Egyptian Kos, Babylonian Kusu, Assyrian Kusu. This name sometimes denotes the land (^{<3111>}Isaiah 11:11; 18:1; ^{<3810>}Zephaniah 3:10; ^{<3910>}Ezekiel 29:10; ^{<3889>}Job 28:19; Est 1:1; 8:9); sometimes the people (^{<3104>}Isaiah 20:4; ^{<3419>}Jeremiah 46:9; ^{<3815>}Ezekiel 38:5); but is in many passages uncertain. Notwithstanding that the descendants of Ham are always regarded as non-Semites, the Ethiopians, Ge`ez, as they called themselves, spoke a Semitic language of special interest on account of its likeness to Himyaritic, and its illustration of certain forms in Assyro-Babylonian. These Cushites were in all probability migrants from another (more northerly) district, and akin to the Canaanites — like them, dark, but by no means black, and certainly not Negroes. W. Max Muller (*Asien und Europa*, 113 note) states that it cannot be proved whether the Egyptians had quite black neighbors (on the South). In earlier times they are represented as brown, and later as brown mingled with black, implying that negroes only came to their knowledge as a distinct and extensive race in comparatively late times. Moses' (first?) wife (^{<0411>}Numbers 12:1) was certainly therefore not a Negress, but simply a Cushite woman, probably speaking a Semitic language — prehistoric Ge`ez or Ethiopian (*see CUSHITE WOMAN*). In all probability Semitic tribes were classed as

Hamitic simply because they acknowledged the supremacy of the Hamitic Egyptians, just as the non-Sem Elamites were set down as Semites (~~<0102>~~Genesis 10:22) on account of their acknowledging Babylonian supremacy. It is doubtful whether the Hebrews, in ancient times, knew of the Negro race — they probably became acquainted with them long after the Egyptians.

5. NEGROES PROBABLY NOT INCLUDED:

In the opinion of W. Max Møller (A, und East, 112), the Egyptians, when they became acquainted with the Negroes, having no word to express this race, classed them with the *nechese*, which thereafter included the Negroes. If the Hebrew name Phinehas (*Pi-nechas*) be really Egyptian and mean “the black,” there is still no need to suppose that this meant “the Negro,” for no Israelite would have borne a name with such a signification. The treasurer of Candace queen of Meroe (~~<0102>~~Acts 8:27-39) — the Ethiopian eunuch — was an Abyssinian, not a Negro; and being an educated man, was able to read the Hebrew Scriptures in the Greek (Septuagint) version. Cush (mat Kusi, pr. Kushi) is frequently mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions in company with Melubha (*Merohha*) to indicate Ethiopia and Meroe.

See *EDEN; ETHIOPIA; TABLE OF NATIONS*.

T. G. Pinches

CUSH (2)

~~<kush>~~ ([~~ṽ~~ṽṽṽ, *kush*]; Septuagint [~~ουσει~~, *Chousei*], Psalm 7 title): A Benjamite, perhaps he that “was without cause” the “adversary” of David (compare ~~<0102>~~Psalm 7:4).

See *CUSHI*.

CUSHAN

~~<kushan>~~: In the psalm of Habakkuk (~~<0102>~~Habakkuk 3:7) “the tents of Cushan” are mentioned in an individualizing description of the effects of a theophany. Parallel is the phrase “the curtains of the land of Midian.” Septuagint renders Cushan, [~~ṽ~~ṽṽṽ, *kushan*], by [~~ιθιοπων~~, *Aithiupon*], reading perhaps [~~μυṽṽṽ~~, *kushim*], or [~~γṽṽṽ~~, *kushin*] ([~~ṽ~~ṽṽṽ, *kushin*]). The context indicates that the same land or people is intended as the Old

Testament elsewhere calls Cush, yet vaguely and not in any strict geographical usage that would limit it to Africa.

CUSHAN-RISHATHAIM

<ku'-shan-rish-a-tha'-im> ([κυιτ" [νῥι᾿ν" WK, *kushan rish`athayim*], translated, or rather interpreted, as “man from Cush, he of the twofold crime”; Septuagint [ουσαρσαθάιμ, *Chousarsathaim*], the King James Version Chushan-rishathaim): Mentioned in <1088> Judges 3:8-10 as a king of Mesopotamia who was chosen by God as his tool to chastise the Israelites for their idolatry. After Joshua's death the children of Israel soon began to affiliate themselves with the heathen peoples among whom they dwelt. This was the fertile source of all their troubles. God delivered (“sold”) them into the hands of the heathen. C.-r. is the first whose name is given in this connection. Barring this short passage in Judges nothing is known of the man. Eight years the Israelites were under his dominion, when the Lord raised up a deliverer to them, Othniel, the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother — the first of the judges.

William Baur

CUSHI

<ku'-shi>: This name represents [yvWK, *kushi*], in the original Septuagint [ουσεί, *Chousei*], [ουσί, *Chousi*]), either with or without the article. With the article (so in <10821> 2 Samuel 18:21-32 seven out of eight times, all readings supported by the Septuagint) it simply indicate that the person so designated was of the Cushite people, as in <24807> Jeremiah 38:7 ff. Its use without the article has doubtless developed out of the foregoing according to a familiar process. For the Cush of Psalm 7, title read “Cushi” with Septuagint.

(1) The messenger (the Revised Version (British and American) “the Cushite”) sent by Joab to acquaint David with the victory over Absalom. That this man was in fact a foreigner is indicated by his ignorance of a shorter path which Ahimaaz took, by his being unrecognized by the watchman who recognizes Ahimaaz, and by his ignorance, as compared with Ahimaaz, of the sentiments of David, whom he knows only as a king and not as a man. <10821> 2 Samuel 18:21 (twice, the second time without the article), <10822> 2 Samuel 18:22,23,11 (twice), <10832> 2 Samuel 18:32 (twice).

(2) The great-grandfather of Jehudi, a contemporary of Jeremiah (~~2864~~ Jeremiah 36:14). The name Jehudi itself (“a man of Judah”) is sufficient refutation of the opinion that the use of Cushi as or in lieu of a proper name “seems to show that there were but few Cushites among the Israelites.”

(3) The father of Zephaniah the prophet (~~3001~~ Zephaniah 1:1).

J. Oscar Boyd

CUSHION

<koosh’-un> ([~~π~~ροσκεφάλαιον, *proskephalaion*): In New Testament, only in ~~4068~~ Mark 4:38 the Revised Version (British and American). The word means literally, a cushion for the head (the King James Version “pillow”) but was also used of one for sitting or reclining upon, e.g. of a rower’s cushion. The article used with it in this passage suggests that it was one of the customary furnishings of the boat, and it was probably similar to the cushion placed for the comfort of passengers in the stern of modern boats on the Sea of Galilee. “Silken cushions” of ~~3082~~ Amos 3:12 the Revised Version (British and American) is a rendering of the Hebrew *demesheq* from its supposed connection with *damask*. These cushions formed the divan, often the only article of furniture in an oriental reception room. “Cushions” occurs further in the somewhat doubtful the Revised Version, margin rendering of ~~3076~~ Proverbs 7:16; 31:22.

Benjamin Reno Downer

CUSHITE

<kush’-it>: Whereas [~~y~~v~~W~~K, kushi], is elsewhere rendered Ethiopian, in ~~1082~~ 2 Samuel 18:21-32 it is rendered Cushite in the Revised Version (British and American) (*see CUSHI* and compare *CUSHITE WOMAN*). Its plural, which occurs in Zephaniah, Daniel and 2 Chronicles, also in the form [~~y~~v~~y~~v~~K~~u~~k~~ushiyim], in Amos, is uniformly translated Ethiopians, following Septuagint. The other Old Testament books use simply [~~v~~W~~K~~, *kush*], for people as well as land.

CUSHITE, (ETHIOPIAN) WOMAN

<kush’-it>: In ~~0420~~ Numbers 12:1 Moses is condemned by his sister Miriam and his brother Aaron “because of the Cushite woman [~~ty~~v~~K~~b” *hVah*;

ha-'ishshah ha-kushith] whom he had married"; and the narrator immediately adds by way of needed explanation, "for he had married a Cushite woman" ([*tyvkuhVaj* 'ishshah khushith]). Views regarding this person have been of two general classes:

(1) She is to be identified with Zipporah (^{Q121}Exodus 2:21 and elsewhere), Moses' Midianite wife, who is here called "the Gushite," either in scorn of her dark complexion (compare ^{Q133}Jeremiah 13:23) and foreign origin (so most older exegetes), or as a consequence of an erroneous notion of the late age when this apocryphal addition, "because of the Cushite," etc., was inserted in the narrative (so Wellhansen).

(2) She is a woman whom Moses took to wife after the death of Zipporah, really a Cushite (Ethiopian) by race, whether the princess of Meroe of whom Josephus (*Ant.*, II, x, 2) romances (so Targum of Jonathan), or one of the "mixed multitude" (^{Q128}Exodus 12:38; compare ^{Q114}Numbers 11:4) that accompanied the Hebrews on their wanderings (so Ewald and most). Dillmann suggests a compromise between the two classes of views, namely, that this woman is a mere "variation in the saga" from the wife elsewhere represented as Midianite, yet because of this variation she was understood by the author as distinct from Zipporah. The implication of the passage, in any case, is clearly that this connection of Moses tended to injure his prestige in the eyes of race-proud Hebrews, and, equally, that in the author's opinion such a view of the matter was obnoxious to God.

J. Oscar Boyd

CUSTODY

<*kus' -to-di*> ([*dy*; *yadh*], [*hDqB*] *pequddah*): In Est 2:3,8 bis. 14, [*yadh*], "the hand," is translated "Custody": *pequddah*, "numbering," "change"; occurs in ^{Q135}Numbers 3:36 the Revised Version (British and American) "the appointed charge," margin, Hebrew "the office of the charge."

CUSTOM (1)

<*kus' -tum*> (tax):

(a) [*Ēl h*] *halakh*], ^{Q143}Ezra 4:13,10; 7:24 the King James Version;

(b) [wl B] *belo*], ^{<15413>}Ezra 4:13, etc.;

(c) [τελώνιον, *telonion*], ^{<4199>}Matthew 9:9; ^{<4124>}Mark 2:14; ^{<4157>}Luke 5:27, “receipt of custom” the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “place of toll,” the collectors’ office;

(d) [τέλος, *telos*], ^{<4175>}Matthew 17:25 (the Revised Version (British and American) “toll”); ^{<6137>}Romans 13:7; 1 Macc 11:35 (the Revised Version (British and American) “tolls”; compare 1 Macc 10:31). The tax designated by *halakh* in ^{<15413>}Ezra 4:13, etc., is usually taken to mean a road tax, a toll, from root *halakh*, but compare Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, II, 463, which derives from root *ilku*, a command, a decree, hence, an imposed tax. *Belo* from root *yabhal* is supposed to be a tax on merchandise or produce (as distinguished from “tribute” or the tax on houses, lands and persons), usually paid in kind and levied for the support of the native or provincial government. See Ryle, *Cambridge Bible*, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, in the place cited *Telos* in New Testament and Macc is an indirect tax farmed out to the publicans.

Walter R. Betteridge

CUSTOM (2)

<*kus’-tum*> (usage): In the Old Testament, except, ^{<0335>}Genesis 31:35 where the Revised Version (British and American) renders, better, “manner” ([*Ērḏ*, *derekh*], “way”), the words translated “custom” are *choq*, *chuqqah*, “statute,” and *mishpaṭ*, “judgment.” Such passages as ^{<0713>}Judges 11:39; ^{<4321>}Jeremiah 32:11, and especially ^{<15104>}Ezra 3:4 (the King James Version “custom,” the Revised Version (British and American) “ordinance”), illustrate the difficulty of deciding upon the proper translation, in cases where “custom” might become “statute,” “usage” establish itself as “law.” In ^{<18330>}Leviticus 18:30; ^{<24108>}Jeremiah 10:3 the reference is to heathen religious practices.

In the New Testament ^{<0009>}Luke 1:9; 2:42; ^{<4164>}Acts 6:14; 15:1 (the King James Version “manner”); 16:21; 21:21; 26:3; 28:17 ([*ἔθος*, *ethos*]), and ^{<4127>}Luke 2:27 from the same Greek root, refer likewise to definitely established *religious* practices; in every case except ^{<4162>}Acts 16:21, those of the Jewish law. The Revised Version (British and American) makes the translation of *ethos* uniform, reading “custom” in ^{<0229>}Luke 22:39 (the King James Version “wont”) and in ^{<3194>}John 19:40; ^{<4256>}Acts 25:16; ^{<3105>}Hebrews

10:25 (the King James Version “manner”). Greek [εἶωθός, *eiothos*], from the same root, is rendered “custom” in ^{<4046>}Luke 4:16 by English Versions of the Bible, and by the Revised Version (British and American) also in ^{<4172>}Acts 17:2, its only other occurrence in the New Testament. In ^{<3183>}John 18:39; ^{<6116>}1 Corinthians 11:16 “custom” is the translation of Greek *sunetheia*, in the sense of “usage” rather than of “law.”

F. K. Farr

CUT; CUTTING

([^{<174>}tr" K; *karath*], [^{<174>}d" G; *gadha`*], [^{<174>}dj " K; *kachadh*], [^{<174>}j t" n; *nathach*]; [^{<174>}ἀποκόπτω, *apokopto*], [^{<174>}ἐκκόπτω, *ekkopto*]): Many Hebrew words are translated “cut.” Of these *karath*, “to cut down, out, off,” is the most frequent. As “cut off” it is used in the sense of laying or destroying (^{<1091>}Genesis 9:11; ^{<5129>}Deuteronomy 12:29; ^{<11116>}1 Kings 11:16; ^{<1918>}Psalms 101:8, etc.), also for cutting off transgressors from the community of Yahweh, which meant probably separation, or exclusion, rather than death or destruction (^{<1174>}Genesis 17:14; ^{<1215>}Exodus 12:15,19). Other words are *damam*, “to be silent,” “cease” (^{<1257>}Jeremiah 25:37 the King James Version; ^{<1482>}Jeremiah 48:2); *tsamath* “to destroy” (^{<1545>}Psalms 54:5 the King James Version; ^{<1923>}Psalms 94:23, etc.); *gadhadh*, “to cut, one’s self,” is used of the cutting of one’s flesh before heathen gods and in mourning for the dead, which was forbidden to the Israelites, (^{<1541>}Deuteronomy 14:1; ^{<1183>}1 Kings 18:28; ^{<1405>}Jeremiah 16:6; 41:5; 47:5); *sereT*, *sareTeth*, “incision,” are also used of those “cuttings of the flesh” (^{<1928>}Leviticus 19:28; compare 21:5). **See CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH.** The cutting of the hair of head and beard in mourning for the dead is referred to in ^{<1512>}Isaiah 15:2; “Every, beard is cut off” (*gadha`*), and ^{<1079>}Jeremiah 7:29, *gazaz*, “Cut off thy hair (the Revised Version, margin “thy crown”), O Jerusalem (compare ^{<1212>}Isaiah 22:12; ^{<1405>}Jeremiah 16:6; ^{<1078>}Ezekiel 7:18; ^{<1080>}Amos 8:10). This early and widespread practice was also forbidden to the Israelites as being unworthy of them in their relation to Yahweh (^{<1927>}Leviticus 19:27; ^{<1541>}Deuteronomy 14:1).

Charosheth, “carving,” “engraving,” is used for the cutting of stones (^{<1235>}Exodus 31:5; 35:33).

In the New Testament we have *apokopto* “to cut away” (^{<1093>}Mark 9:43,15; ^{<1452>}Galatians 5:12 the King James Version; **see CONCISION**); *diaprio*, “to saw through” (^{<1453>}Acts 5:33, “they were cut to the heart”); *dichotomeo*, “to cut in two” (^{<1251>}Matthew 24:51); *suntemno*, “to cut together”

(~~<4028>~~ Romans 9:28), “finishing it and cutting it short,” i.e; “making it conclusive and brief.”

Among the changes of the Revised Version (British and American) are “brought to silence” for “cut down” (~~<2457>~~ Jeremiah 25:37), also for “cut off” (~~<2495>~~ Jeremiah 49:26; 50:30); “sore wounded” for “cut in pieces” (~~<3128>~~ Zechariah 12:3); for “cut off,” “pass through” (~~<3810>~~ Job 11:10), “gone” (~~<4900>~~ Psalm 90:10); “rolled up” (~~<2382>~~ Isaiah 38:12); “cut off” for “destroy” (~~<4984>~~ Psalm 18:40; 69:4; 118:10,11,12); for “cut them in the head” (~~<3100>~~ Amos 9:1), “break them in pieces on the head of”; for “in the cutting off of my days” (~~<2380>~~ Isaiah 38:10; Hebrew *demi*, “silence,” “rest”), “noontide,” margin “Or, tranquillity” (Gesenius, Delitzsch, etc., “in the quiet of my days”); instead of, “I would that they were even cut off which trouble you” (~~<8612>~~ Galatians 5:12), the English Revised Version has “cut themselves off,” margin “mutilate themselves,” the American Standard Revised Version “go beyond circumcision,” margin, Greek: “mutilate themselves.”

W. L. Walker

CUTH; CUTHAH

~~<kuth>~~, ~~<ku'-tha>~~ ([~~t~~W~~K~~, *kuth*], [~~h~~tW~~K~~, *kuthah*]; [~~ouá~~, *Choua*], [~~ouvθá~~, *Chountha*]): The longer writing is the better of the two, and gives the Hebrew form of the name of one of the cities from which Sargon of Assyria brought colonists to fill the places of the Israelites which he deported from Samaria in 772 BC (~~<2724>~~ 2 Kings 17:24,30). Probably in consequence of their predominating numbers, the inhabitants of Samaria in general were then called *kuthiyim*, or Cutbeans.

1. THE RUINS OF CUTHAH:

From contract-tablets found at *Tel-Ibrahim* by the late Hormuzd Hassam, on which the ancient name of the place is given as *Gudua* or *Kutu*, it would seem that that is the site which has to be identified with the Biblical Cuthah. It lies to the Northeast of Babylon, and was one of the most important cities of the Babylonian empire. The explorer describes the ruins as being about 3,000 ft. in circumference and 280 ft. high, and adjoining them on the West lies a smaller mound, crowned with a sanctuary dedicated to Ibrahim (Abraham). From the nature of the ruins, Rassam came to the conclusion that the city was much more densely populated

after the fall of Babylon than in earlier times. A portion of the ruins were in a very perfect state, and suggested an unfinished building.

2. THE TEMPLE:

The great temple of the city was called *E-mes-lam*, and was dedicated to Nergal (compare ^{<2770>}2 Kings 17:30), one of whose names was Meslam-ta-ea. Both city and temple would seem to have been old Sumerian foundations, as the name Gudua and its later Sere form, *Kutu*, imply.

LITERATURE.

See Rassam, Asshur and the Land of Nimrod, 396, 409, and, for details of the worship of Nergal, PSBA, December, 1906, 203-18.

T. G. Pinches

CUTHA

<ku'-tha> ([⁰⁰⁰⁰0000, *Koutha*]; 1 Esdras 5:32, the King James Version Coutha): Head of a family of temple servants who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon; not mentioned in the canonical lists.

CUTHAH

See CUTH, CUTHAH.

CUTHEAN; CUTHITE

<ku-the'-an>, <kuth'-it>.

See CUTH; SAMARITANS.

CUTTING ASUNDER

See ASUNDER; PUNISHMENTS.

CUTTING OFF

See CONCISION; PUNISHMENTS.

CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH

([**frc**, *sereT*], [**tfrc**; *sareTeth*]): For relatives or friends to cut or beat themselves even to free blood-flowing, especially in the violence of grief in mourning for their dead (*see* **BURIAL**; **MOURNING**), was a widely prevalent custom among ancient peoples, and is well-nigh universal among uncivilized races today (see Spencer, *Prin. of Soc.*, 3rd edition, I, 163 ff). The fact is abundantly attested for most of the nations of antiquity, but there are two notable exceptions, the Egyptians (Herod. ii.61, 85; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptian* II, 374), and the Hebrews (^{<540>}Deuteronomy 14:1; ^{<520>}Leviticus 21:5). According to Plutarch (Sol. 21) Solon forbade the women of Athens to beat themselves to the effusion of blood, and the laws of the Twelve Tables, quoted by Cic. (Deuteronomy leg. ii.23) contained a like injunction. Among the ancient Arabs the forbidden practice was associated, as among the Hebrews, with the cutting off of the hair (Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, III, 160 f).

That the prohibition among the Hebrews was urgently called for is made clear by the way it is dealt with by the Law and the prophets. The Law of Holiness reads: “Ye are the children of Yahweh your God: ye shall not cut yourselves” (^{<540>}Deuteronomy 14:1), or “make any incision” ([**frc**, *sereT*]; ^{<520>}Leviticus 19:28, [**tfrc**; *sareTeth*]; Septuagint **ἐντομίζ**, *entomis*) in the flesh “for the dead.” Probably the earliest reference to the custom as actually prevalent among the Hebrews is in ^{<374>}Hosea 7:14 (ERVm). It was widely prevalent in the time of Jeremiah among his countrymen, even as among the Philistines (^{<475>}Jeremiah 47:5) and the Moabites (48:37; compare ^{<380>}Amos 8:10; ^{<2934>}Isaiah 3:24; 15:2; 22:12; ^{<3001>}Micah 1:16; ^{<4718>}Ezekiel 7:18).

In seeking for the reason or purpose underlying all such prohibitions, we may note, first, that the “cuttings” and “baldness” forbidden are alike said to be “for the dead.” Not less explicitly are they said to be incompatible with Israel’s unique relation to Yahweh — a relation at once of sonship (^{<540>}Deuteronomy 14:1) and of consecration (^{<542>}Deuteronomy 14:2). Moreover such mutilations of the body are always dealt with as forming part of the religious rites of the heathen (as of the Canaanitish Baal (^{<1188>}1 Kings 18:28) note “after their manner,” see article in HDB, under the word). Both such shedding of blood and the dedication of the hair are found in almost all countries of that day in intimate connection with the rituals of burial and the prevailing belief in the necessity of propitiating the

spirit of the deceased. The conclusion, then, seems clearly warranted that such tokens of grief were prohibited because they carried with them inevitably ideas and associations distinctly heathen in character and so incompatible with the pure religion of Yahweh, and unworthy of those who had attained to the dignity of the sons (“children”) of Yahweh.

See also MARK; STIGMATA.

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, *Hebrews Arch.*, section 23; Nowack, *Hebrews Arch.*, I, 33 f; Tylor, *Prim. Cult.*; W. R. Smith, *Rel Semitic*, Lect IX; and Comm., Knobel-Dillmann, *Ex-Leviticus* on ^{<BIBES>}Leviticus 19:28; Driver, *Deuteronomy* on 14:1; and Lightfoot, *Galatians* on 6:17.

George B. Eager

CYAMON

<si'-a-mon> (*κυάμων*, *Kuamon*, Judith 7:3): Probably identical with *JOKNEAM* (which see).

CYMBAL

<sim'-bal>.

See MUSIC.

CYPRESS

<si'-pres>.

See HOLM TREE.

CYPRIANS

<sip'-ri-ans> ([*ὀύπριοι*, *Kuprioi*]): Occurs in 2 Macc 4:29. Menelaus who was high priest at Jerusalem, and Sostratus who was governor of the citadel, were summoned by King Antiochus to appear before him. “Menelaus left his own brother Lysimachus for his deputy in the high-priesthood; and Sostratus left Crates, who was over the Cyprians.” The Cyprians were the inhabitants of the island of Cyprus. Barnabas, who was Paul’s associate on his first missionary journey, was a Cyprian (*Kuprios*;

see ~~4085~~ Acts 4:36). the Revised Version (British and American) designates him as a man of Cyprus. The governor of the island was called a Cypriarch (see 2 Macc 12:2, and compare ASIARCH).

A. W. Fortune

CYPRUS

<si'-prus> ([ὑπρος, *Kupros*):

1. NAME:

An island situated near the Northeast corner of the Levant, in an angle formed by the coasts of Cilicia and Syria. In the Old Testament it is called Kittim, after the name of its Phoenician capital Kition. The identification is expressly made by Josephus (*Ant.*, I, vi, 1) and by the Cyprian bishop Epiphanius (*Haer.*, xxx.25). In the tablets from Tell el-Amarna it is referred to as Alashia (E. Meyer, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 12, section 499), in Egyptian records as Asi, while in the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions it is named Yavnan.

2. GEOGRAPHY:

The island is the largest in the Mediterranean with the exception of Sardinia and Sicily, its area being about 3,584 square miles. It lies in 34 degrees 30'-35 degrees 41' North latitude and 32 degrees 15'-34 degrees 36' East longitude, only 46 miles distant from the nearest point of the Cilician coast and 60 miles from the Syrian. Thus from the northern shore of the island the mainland of Asia Minor is clearly visible and Mt. Lebanon can be seen from Eastern Cyprus. This close proximity to the Cilician and Syrian coasts, as well as its position on the route between Asia Minor and Egypt, proved of great importance for the history and civilization of the island. Its greatest length, including the Northeast promontory, is about 140 miles, its greatest breadth 60 miles. The Southwest portion of Cyprus is formed by a mountain complex, culminating in the peaks of Troodos (6,406 ft.), Madhari (5,305 ft.), Papofitsa (5,124 ft.) and Machaira (4,674 ft.). To the Northeast of this lies the great plain of the Mesorea, nearly 60 miles in length and 10 to 20 in breadth, in which lies the modern capital Nicosia (Lefkosia). It is watered chiefly by the Pedieus (modern Pedias), and is bounded on the North by a mountain range, which is continued to the East-Northeast in the long, narrow promontory of the Karpas, terminating in Cape Andrea, the ancient Dinaretum. Its highest peaks are

Buffavento (3,135 ft.) and Hagios Elias (3,106 ft.). The shore-plain to the North of these hills is narrow, but remarkably fertile.

3. PRODUCTS:

Cyprus is richly endowed by nature. Its fruits and flowers were famous in antiquity. Strabo, writing under Augustus, speaks of it as producing wine and oil in abundance and corn sufficient for the needs of its inhabitants (XIV, 684). The elder Pliny refers to Cyprian salt, alum, gypsum, mica, unguents, laudanum, storax, resin and precious stones, including agate, jasper, amethyst, lapis lazuli and several species of rock-crystal. His list includes the diamond (xxxvii.58) and the emerald (xxxvii.6, 66), but there is reason to believe that under these names a variety of rock-crystal and the beryl are intended. The chief source of the island's wealth, however, lay in its mines and forests. Silver is mentioned by Strabo (loc. cit.) among its products; copper, which was called by the Greeks after the name of the island, was extensively mined there from the earliest period down to the Middle Ages; iron too was found in considerable quantities from the 9th century until Roman times. Scarcely less important were the forests, which at an early date are said to have covered almost the whole island. The cypress seems to have been the principal tree, but Pliny tells of a giant cedar, 130 Roman feet in height, felled in Cyprus (xvi.203), and the island supplied timber for shipbuilding to many successive powers.

4. EARLY HISTORY:

The original inhabitants of Cyprus appear to have been a race akin to the peoples of Asia Minor. Its vast resources in copper and timber gained for it a considerable importance and wide commercial relations at a very remote period. Its wealth attracted the attention of Babylonia and Egypt, and there is reason to believe that it was conquered by Sargon I, king of Accad, and about a millennium later by Thothmes III, of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty (1501-1447 BC). But the influences which molded its civilization came from other quarters also. Excavation has shown that in Cyprus were several seats of the Minoan culture, and there can be little doubt that it was deeply influenced by Crete. The Minoan writing may well be the source of the curious Cyprian syllabic script, which continued in use for the representation of the Greek language down to the 4th century BC (A. J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, I). But the Minoan origin of the Cyprian syllabary is still doubtful, for it may have been derived from the Hittite hieroglyphs.

Phoenician influences too were at work, and the Phoenician settlements — Citium, Amathus, Paphos and others — go back to a very early date. The break-up of the Minoan civilization was followed by a “Dark Age,” but later the island received a number of Greek settlers from Arcadia and other Hellenic states, as we judge not only from Greek tradition but from the evidence of the Cyprian dialect, which is closely akin to the Arcadian. In 709 BC Sargon II of Assyria made himself master of Cyprus, and tribute was paid by its seven princes to him and to his grandson, Esarhaddon (681-667 BC). The overthrow of the Assyrian Empire probably brought with it the independence of Cyprus, but it was conquered afresh by Aahmes (Amasis) of Egypt (Herod. ii. 182) who retained it till his death in 526 BC; but in the following year the defeat of his son and successor Psamtek III (Psammenitus) by Cambyses brought the island under Persian dominion (Herod. iii.19, 91).

5. CYPRUS AND THE GREEKS:

In 501 the Greek inhabitants led by Onesilus, brother of the reigning prince of Salamis, rose in revolt against the Persians, but were decisively beaten (Herodotus v.104 ff), and in 480 we find 150 Cyprian ships in the navy with which Xerxes attacked Greece (Herod. vii.90). The attempts of Pausanias and of Cimon to win Cyprus for the Hellenic cause met with but poor success, and the withdrawal of the Athenian forces from the Levant after their great naval victory off Salamis in 449 was followed by a strong anti-Hellenic movement throughout the island led by Abdemon, prince of Citium. In 411 Euagoras ascended the throne of Salamis and set to work to assert Hellenic influence and to champion Hellenic civilization. He joined with Pharnabazus the Persian satrap and Conon the Athenian to overthrow the naval power of Sparta at the battle of Cnidus in 394, and in 387 revolted from the Persians. He was followed by his son Nicocles, to whom Isocrates addressed the famous panegyric of Euagoras and who formed the subject of an enthusiastic eulogy by the same writer. Cyprus seems later to have fallen once again under Persian rule, but after the battle of Issus (333 BC) it voluntarily gave in its submission to Alexander the Great and rendered him valuable aid at the siege of Tyre. On his death (323) it fell to the share of Ptolemy of Egypt. It was, however, seized by Demetrius Poliorcetes, who defeated Ptolemy in a hotly contested battle off Salamis in 306. But eleven years later it came into the hands of the Ptolemies and remained a province of Egypt or a separate but dependent kingdom until the intervention of Rome (compare 2 Macc 10:13). We hear of a body of

Cyprians, under the command of a certain Crates, serving among the troops of Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria and forming part of the garrison of Jerusalem about 172 BC (2 Macc 4:29). This interpretation of the passage seems preferable to that according to which Crates had been governor of Cyprus under the Ptolemies before entering the service of Antiochus.

6. CYPRUS AND ROME:

In 58 BC the Romans resolved to incorporate Cyprus in their empire and Marcus Porcius Cato was entrusted with the task of its annexation. The reigning prince, a brother of Ptolemy Auletes of Egypt, received the offer of an honorable retirement as high priest of Aphrodite at Paphos, but he preferred to end his life by poison, and treasures amounting to some 7,000 talents passed into Roman hands, together with the island, which was attached to the province of Cilicia. In the partition of the Roman empire between Senate and Emperor, Cyprus was at first (27-22 BC) an imperial province (Dio Cassius liii.12), administered by a *legatus Augusti pro praetore* or by the imperial legate of Cilicia. In 22 BC, however, it was handed over to the Senate together with southern Gaul in exchange for Dalmatia (Dio Cassius liii. 12; liv.4) and was subsequently governed by ex-praetors bearing the honorary title of proconsul and residing at Paphos. The names of about a score of these governors are known to us from ancient authors, inscriptions and coins and will be found in D. G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, App. Among them is Sergius Paulus, who was proconsul at the time of Paul's visit to Paphos in 46 or 47 AD, and we may notice that the title applied to him by the writer of the Acts (13:7) is strictly accurate.

7. CYPRUS AND THE JEWS:

The proximity of Cyprus to the Syrian coast rendered it easy of access from Palestine, and Jews had probably begun to settle there even before the time of Alexander the Great. Certainly the number of Jewish residents under the Ptolemies was considerable (1 Macc 15:23; 2 Macc 12:2) and it must have been increased later when the copper mines of the island were farmed to Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant*, XVI, iv, 5; XIX, xxvi, 28; compare *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 2628). We shall not be surprised, therefore, to find that at Salamis there was more than one synagogue at the time of Paul's visit (~~4135~~ Acts 13:5). In 116 AD the Jews of Cyprus rose in revolt and massacred no fewer than 240,000 Gentiles. Hadrian crushed the rising with great severity and drove all the Jews from

the island. Henceforth no Jew might set foot upon it, even under stress of shipwreck, on pain of death (Dio Cassius lxviii.32).

8. THE CHURCH IN CYPRUS:

In the life of the early church Cyprus played an important part. Among the Christians who fled from Judea in consequence of the persecution which followed Stephen's death were some who "travelled as far as Phoenicia, and Cyprus" (^{<4119>}Acts 11:19) preaching to the Jews only. Certain natives of Cyprus and Cyrene took a further momentous step in preaching at Antioch to the Greeks also (^{<4117>}Acts 11:20). Even before this time Joseph Barnabas, a Levite born in Cyprus (^{<4065>}Acts 4:36), was prominent in the early Christian community at Jerns, and it was in his native island that he and Paul, accompanied by Barnabas nephew, John Mark, began their first missionary journey (^{<4130>}Acts 13:4). After landing at Salamis they passed "through the whole island" to Paphos (^{<4136>}Acts 13:6), probably visiting the Jewish synagogues in its cities. The Peutinger Table tells us of two roads from Salamis to Paphos in Roman times, one of which ran inland by way of Tremithus, Tamassus and Soil, a journey of about 4 days, while the other and easier route, occupying some 3 days, ran along the south coast by way of Citium, Amathus and Curium. Whether the "early disciple," Mnason of Cyprus, was one of the converts made at this time or had previously embraced Christianity we cannot determine (^{<4016>}Acts 21:16). Barnabas and Mark revisited Cyprus later (^{<4153>}Acts 15:39), but Paul did not again land on the island, though he sighted it when, on his last journey to Jerus, he sailed south of it on his way from Patara in Lycia to Tyre (^{<4018>}Acts 21:3), and again when on his journey to Rome he sailed "under the lee of Cyprus," that is, along its northern coast, on the way from Sidon to Myra in Lycia (^{<4274>}Acts 27:4). In 401 AD the Council of Cyprus was convened, chiefly in consequence of the efforts of Theophilus of Alexandria, the inveterate opponent of Origenism, and took measures to check the reading of Origen's works. The island, which was divided into 13 bishoprics, was declared autonomous in the 5th century, after the alleged discovery of Matthew's Gospel in the tomb of Barnabas at Salamis. The bishop of Salamis was made metropolitan by the emperor Zeno with the title "archbishop of all Cyprus," and his successor, who now occupies the see of Nicosia, still enjoys the privilege of signing his name in red ink and is primate over the three other bishops of the island, those of Paphos, Kition and Kyrenia, all of whom are of metropolitan rank.

9. LATER HISTORY:

Cyprus remained in the possession of the Roman and then of the Byzantine emperors, though twice overrun and temporarily occupied by the Saracens, until 1184, when its ruler, Isaac Comnenus, broke away from Constantinople and declared himself an independent emperor. From him it was wrested in 1191 by the Crusaders under Richard I of England, who bestowed it on Guy de Lusignan, the titular king of Jerusalem, and his descendants. In 1489 it was ceded to the Venetians by Catherine Cornaro, widow of James II, the last of the Lusignan kings, and remained in their hands until it was captured by the Ottoman Turks under Sultan Selim II, who invaded and subjugated the island in 1570 and laid siege to Famagusta, which, after a heroic defense, capitulated on August 1, 1571. Since that time Cyprus has formed part of the Turkish empire, in spite of serious revolts in 1764 and 1823; since 1878, however, it has been occupied and administered by the British government, subject to an annual payment to the Sublime Porte of £92,800 and a large quantity of salt. The High Commissioner, who resides at Nicosia, is assisted by a Legislative Council of 18 members. The estimated population in 1907 was 249,250, of whom rather more than a fifth were Moslems and the remainder chiefly members of the Greek Orthodox church.

LITERATURE.

An exhaustive bibliography will be found in C. D. Cobham, *An Attempt at a Bibliography of Cyprus*, Nicosia, 4th edition, 1900. The following works may be specially mentioned: E. Oberhummer, *Aus Cypern*, Berlin, 1890-92; *Studien zur alten Geographic von Kypros*, Munich 1891; A. Sakellarios, *Ta Kupriaka*, Athens, 1890-91. References in ancient sources are collected in J. Meursius, *Cyprus*, Amsterdam, 1675, and W. Engel, *Kypros*, Berlin, 1841. For Cyprian archaeology see P. Gardner, *New Chapters in Greek History*, chapter vi, London, 1892; J. L. Myres and M. OhnefalschRichter, *Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum*, Oxford, 1899; M. O. Richter, *Kypros, die Bibel und Homer*, Berlin, 1893; D.G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, London, 1889; and J. L. Myres' article on "Cypriote Archaeology" in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th edition, VII, 697 ff. For excavations, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, IX, XI, XII, XVII, and *Excavations Cyprus*, London (British Museum), 1900; for art, G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Art in Phoenicia and Cyprus*, English translation, London, 1885; for coins, B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*, Oxford, 1911; for

inscriptions, Sammlung der griech. Dialekt-Inschriften, I, Gottingen, 1883; for the Cyprian church, J. Hackett, History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, London, 1901; for authorities on medieval and modern history, CL. D. Cobham, Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), 11th edition, VII, 701.

Marcus N. Tod

CYRAMA

<si-ra'-ma>, <sir'-a-ma>.

See *KIRAMA*.

CYRENE

<si-re'-ne> ([υρήνη, *Kurene*] "wall"):

1. LOCATION:

Cyrene was a city of Libya in North Africa, lat. 32 degrees 40' North, long. 22 degrees 15' East. It lay West of ancient Egypt, from which it was separated by a portion of the Libyan desert, and occupied the territory now belonging to Barca and Tripoli. It was situated upon an elevated plateau about 2,000 ft. above the sea, from which it was distant some 10 miles. A high range of mountains lies to the South, about 90 miles inland. This shelters the coast land from the scorching heat of the Sahara. The range drops down toward the North in a series of terrace-like elevations, thus giving to the region a great variety of climate and vegetation. The soil is fertile.

2. HISTORY:

Cyrene was originally a Greek colony rounded by Battus in 630 BC. Because of the fertility of the soil, the great variety in climate and vegetation, together with its commercial advantages in location, the city soon rose to great wealth and importance. Greater fame, however, came to it through its distinguished citizens. It was the home of Callimachus the poet, Carneacles the founder of the New Academy at Athens, and Eratosthenes the mathematician. To these must be added, from later times, the elegant ancient Christian writer Synesius. So important did this Greek colony become that, in little more than half a century, Amasis II of Egypt

formed an alliance with Cyrene, marrying a Greek lady of noble, perhaps royal, birth (Herod. ii.181). Ptolemy III (Euergetes I), 231 BC, incorporated Cyrene with Egypt. The city continued, though with much restlessness, a part of the Egyptian empire until Apion, the last of the Ptolemies, willed it to Rome. It henceforth belonged to a Roman province.

In the middle of the 7th century, the conquering Saracens took possession of Cyrene, and from that time to this it has been the habitation of wandering tribes of Arabs.

3. BIBLICAL IMPORTANCE:

Cyrene comes into importance in Biblical history through the dispersion of the Jews. Ptolemy I, son of Lagus, transported Jews to this and other cities of Libya (Josephus, CAp, II, 4) and from this time on Jews were very numerous there. By the return of the Jews of the Dispersion to the feasts at Jerusalem, Cyrenians came to have a conspicuous place in the New Testament history. "A man of Cyrene, Simon by name," was caught by the Roman soldiers and compelled to bear the cross of Jesus (~~4172~~ Matthew 27:32; compare ~~4152~~ Mark 15:21; ~~4236~~ Luke 23:26). *See* CYRENIAN. Jews from Cyrene were among those present on the day of Pentecost. Their city appears as one of the important points in the wide circle of the Dispersion described by Peter in his sermon on that occasion (~~4121~~ Acts 2:10). Cyrenian Jews were of sufficient importance in those days to have their name associated with a synagogue at Jerusalem (~~4169~~ Acts 6:9). And when the persecution arose about Stephen, some of these Jews of Cyrene who had been converted at Jerusalem, were scattered abroad and came with others to Antioch and preached the word "unto the Jews only" (~~4119~~ Acts 11:19,20 the King James Version), and one of them, Lucius, became a prophet in the early church there. In this case, as in so many others, the wise providence of God in the dispersion of the Jews in preparation for the spread of the gospel of the Messiah is seen.

4. ARCHAEOLOGY:

In the ruins of Cyrene are to be seen the remains of some beautiful buildings, and a few sculptures have been removed. The most interesting remains of the wondrous civilization of this Greek colony are in a great system of tombs, some built, but the finest cut in the solid rock of the cliff. Doric architecture and brilliant decorative painting adorn these tombs.

LITERATURE

Herodotus ii; Josephus, Apion; Thrige, Res Cyrenensium.

M. G. Kyle

CYRENIAN; CYRENIANS

<si-re'-ni-an> ([υρηναῖος, *Kurenaios*], “a native or inhabitant of Cyrene”): Two Jews of Cyrene are mentioned in the New Testament, namely, Simon (^{<4152>}Mark 15:21 and ^{<4235>}Luke 23:26 the King James Version) who was impressed to bear the Lord’s cross (^{<4152>}Mark 15:21 the Revised Version, margin), and Lucius, a Christian teacher at Antioch (^{<4131>}Acts 13:1). *See CYRENE; LUCIUS; SIMON*. For Cyrenians *see CYRENE*.

CYRENIUS

<si-re'-ni-us> ([υρήνιος, *Kurenios*], “of Cyrene”).

See QUIRNIUS.

CYRIA

<sir'-i-a> ([υρία, *Kuria*]): The word means “lady,” feminine of lord, and it is so translated in the King James Version and the text of the Revised Version (British and American) (^{<6005>}2 John 1:5 the Revised Version, margin). But it is possible that the word is a proper name, and this possibility is recognized by placing *Cyria*, the usual transliteration of the word, in the margin by the Revised Version (British and American).

CYRUS

<si'-rus> ([vr/K, *koresh*]; Old Persian *Kurus*; Babylonian *Kur(r)as*, *Kur(r)asu*; Greek [ὑρος, *Kuros*], ^{<4822>}2 Chronicles 36:22, etc.):

1. GENEALOGY OF CYRUS:

The son of the earlier Cambyses, of the royal race of the Achemenians. His genealogy, as given by himself, is as follows: “I am Cyrus, king of the host, the great king, the mighty king, king of Tindir (Babylon), king of the land of Sumeru and Akkadu, king of the four regions, son of Cambyses, the great king, king of the city Ansan, grandson of Cyrus, the great king, king

of the city Ansan, great-grandson of Sispis (*Teispes*), the great king, king of the city Ansan, the all-enduring royal seed whose sovereignty Bel and Nebo love,” etc. (WAI, V, plural 35, 20-22).

2. HIS COUNTRY, ANSAN OR ANZAN:

As, in the Babylonian inscriptions, Assan (Ansan, Anzan) is explained as Elam — the city was, in fact, the capital of that country — it is probable that Cyrus’ name was Elamite; but the meaning is doubtful. The Greek etymology connecting it with *khōr*, “the sun” in Persian, may therefore be rejected. According to Strabo, he was at first called Agradates, the name by which he was universally known being taken from that of the river Cyrus. This, however, is more likely to have been the reason why his grandfather (after whom he was probably named) was called Cyrus.

3. HIS ORIGIN (HERODOTUS):

Several versions of his birth and rise to power are recorded. Herodotus (i.95) mentions three. In that which he quotes (i.107 ff), it is said that Mandane was the daughter of the Median king Astyages, who, in consequence of a dream which he had had, foretelling the ultimate triumph of her son over his dynasty, gave her in marriage to a Persian named Cambyses, who was not one of his peers. A second dream caused him to watch for her expected offspring, and when Cyrus came into the world Astyages delivered the child to his relative, Harpagus, with orders to destroy it. Being Unwilling to do this, he handed the infant to a Shepherd named Mitradates, who, his wife having brought forth a still-born child, consented to spare the life of the infant Cyrus. Later on, in consequence of his imperious acts, Cyrus was recognized by Astyages, who came to learn the whole story, and spared him because, having once been made king by his companions in play, the Magians held the predictions concerning his ultimate royal state to have been fulfilled. The vengeance taken by Astyages upon Harpagus for his apparent disobedience to orders is well known: his son was slain, and a portion, disguised, given him to eat. Though filled with grief, Harpagus concealed his feelings, and departed with the remains of his son’s body; and Cyrus, in due course, was sent to stay with his parents, Cambyses and Mandane. Later on, Harpagus persuaded Cyrus to induce the Persians to revolt, and Astyages having blindly appointed Harpagus commander-in-chief of the Median army, the last-named went over to the side of Cyrus. The result was an easy victory

for the latter, but Astyages took care to impale the Magians who had advised him to spare his grandson. Having gathered another, but smaller, army, he took the field in person, but was defeated and captured. Cyrus, however, who became king of Media as well as of Persia, treated him honorably and well.

4. HIS ORIGIN (XENOPHON):

According to Xenophon, Cyropedia i. section 2, Cambyses, the father of Cyrus, was king of Persia. (NOTE: He may have added Persia to his dominion, but according to Cyrus himself, he was king of Ansan or Elam.) Until his 12th year, Cyrus was educated in Persia, when he was sent for, with his mother, by Astyages, to whom he at once manifested much affection. Astyages is said to have been succeeded by his son Cyaxares, and Cyrus then became his commander-in-chief, subduing, among others, the Lydians. He twice defeated the Assyrians (= Babylonians), his final conquest of the country being while the Median king was still alive. As, however, the Cyropedia is a romance, the historical details are not of any great value.

5. HIS ORIGIN (NICOLAUS OF DAMASCUS):

Nicolaus of Damascus describes Cyrus as the son of a Mardian bandit named Atradata, his mother's name being Argoste. While in service in the palace of Astyages, he was adopted by Artembarkas, cupbearer, and thus obtained prominence. Cyrus now made his bandit-father satrap of Persia, and, with base ingratitude, plotted against his king and benefactor. The preparations for a revolt having been made, he and his general Oibaras were victorious at Hyrba, but were defeated at Parsagadae, where his father Atradata was captured and later on died. Cyrus now took refuge in his mountain home, but the taunts of the women sent him and his helpers forth again, this time to victory and dominion.

6. HIS ORIGIN (CTESIAS):

Ctesias also states that there was no relationship between Cyrus and Astyages (Astyigas), who, when Cyrus conquered Media, fled to Ecbatana, and was there hidden by his daughter Amytis, and Spitamas her husband. Had not Astyages yielded, Cyrus, it is said, would have tortured them, with their children. Cyrus afterward liberated Astyages, and married his daughter Amytis, whose husband he had put to death for telling a

falsehood. The Bactrians are said to have been so satisfied at the reconciliation of Cyrus with Astyages and his daughter, that they voluntarily submitted. Cyrus is said by Ctesias to have been taken prisoner by the Sacae, but he was ransomed. He died from a wound received in battle with the Derbices, assisted by the Indians.

7. BABYLONIAN RECORDS OF HIS REIGN — THE CYLINDER OF NABONIDUS:

In the midst of so much uncertainty, it is a relief to turn to the contemporary documents of the Babylonians, which, though they do not speak of Cyrus' youth in detail, and refer only to other periods of his career in which they were more immediately interested, may nevertheless, being contemporary, be held to have an altogether special authority. According to the inscriptions, the conflict with Astyages took place in 549 BC. From the cylinder of Nabonidus we learn that the Medes had been very successful in their warlike operations, and had gone even as far afield as Haran, which they had besieged. The Babylonian King Nabonidus desired to carry out the instructions of Merodach, revealed in a dream, to restore the temple of Sin, the Moon-god, in that city. This, however, in consequence of the siege, he could not do, and it was revealed to him in a dream that the power of Astyages would be overthrown at the end of three years, which happened as predicted. "They (the gods Sin and Merodach) then caused Cyrus, king of Anzan, his (Merodach's) young servant, with his little army, to rise up against him (the Median); he destroyed the extensive Umman-manda (Medes), Istuwegu (Astyages), king of the Medes, he captured, and took (him) prisoner to his (own) land." The account of this engagement in the Babylonian Chronicle (which is, perhaps, Cyrus' own), is as follows: "(Astyages) gathered his army, and went against Cyrus, king of Ansan, to capture him, and (as for) Astyages, his army revolted against him and took him, and gave him to Cyrus."

8. THE BABYLONIAN CHRONICLE:

Cyrus went to the land of Ecbatana, his royal city. He carried off from Ecbatana silver, gold, furniture, merchandise, and took to the land of Ansan the furniture and merchandise which he had captured."

The above is the entry for the 6th year of Nabonidus, which corresponds with 549 BC; and it will be noticed that he is here called "king of Ansan." The next reference to Cyrus in the Babylonian Chronicle is the entry for

Nabonidus' 9th year (546 BC), where it is stated that "Cyrus, king of the land of Parsu (Persia) gathered his army, and crossed the Tigris below Arbela," and in the following month (Iyyar) entered the land of Is-, where someone seems to have taken a bribe, garrisoned the place, and afterward a king ruled there. The passage, however, is imperfect, and therefore obscure, but we may, perhaps, see therein some preparatory move on the part of Cyrus to obtain possession of the tract over which Nabonidus claimed dominion. The next year (545 BC) there seems to have been another move on the part of the Persians, for the Elamite governor (?) is referred to, and had apparently some dealings with the governor of Erech. All this time things seem to have been the same in Babylonia, the king's son (he is not named, but apparently Belshazzar is meant) and the soldiers remaining in Akkad (possibly used in the old sense of the word, to indicate the district around Sippar), where it was seemingly expected that the main attack would be delivered. The reference to the governor of Erech might imply that some conspiracy was on foot more to the south — a movement of which the native authorities possibly remained in ignorance.

9. THE BABYLONIAN CHRONICLE — THE CAPTURE OF BABYLON:

After a gap which leaves four years unaccounted for, we have traces of four lines which mention the goddess Ishtar of Erech, and the gods of the land of Par (?Persia) are referred to. After this comes the long entry, which, though the date is broken away, must refer to the 17th year of Nabonidus. A royal visit to a temple is referred to, and there is mention of a revolt. Certain religious ceremonies were then performed, and others omitted. In the month Tammuz, Cyrus seems to have fought a battle in Opis, and succeeded in attacking the army of Akkad situated on the Tigris. On the 14th of the month, Sippar was taken without fighting, and Nabonidus fled. On the 16th Ugbaru (Gobryas) governor of Media, entered Babylon, with the army of Cyrus, without fighting, and there Nabonidus was captured with his followers. At this time E-saggil and the temples of the land seem to have been closed, possibly to prevent the followers of Nabonidus from taking sanctuary there, or else to prevent plotters from coming forth; and on the 3rd of Marcheswan (October), Cyrus entered Babylon. "Crowds collected before him, proposing peace for the city; Cyrus, command the peace of Babylon, all of it." Gobryas, his vice-regent, then appointed governors in Babylon, and the gods whom Nabonidus had taken down to Babylon, were returned to their shrines. On the night of the

11th of Marcheswan, Ugbaru went against (some part of Babylon), and the son of the king died; and there was mourning for him from the 27th of Adar to the 3rd of Nisan (six days). There is some doubt as to whether the text speaks of the king or the son of the king, but as there is a record that Nabonidus was exiled to Carmania, it would seem most likely that the death of Belshazzar “in the night” is here referred to. The day after the completion of the mourning (the 4th of Nisan), Cambyses, son of Cyrus, performed ceremonies in the temple E-nig-had-kalamma, probably in connection with the new year’s festival, for which Cyrus had probably timed his arrival at Babylon. According to Herodotus (i.191), Babylon’ was taken during a festival, agreeing with ~~27th~~ Daniel 5:1 ff.

10. THE CYLINDER OF CYRUS:

The other inscription of Cyrus, discovered by Mr. H. Rassam at Babylon, is a kind of proclamation justifying his seizure of the crown. He states that the gods (of the various cities of Babylonia) forsook their dwellings in anger that he (Nabonidus) had made them enter within Su-anna (Babylon). Merodach, the chief divinity of Babylon, sought also a just king, the desire of his heart, whose hand he might hold — Cyrus, king of Ansan, he called his title — to all the kingdoms together (his) name was proclaimed.

The glory of Cyrus’ conquests probably appealed to the Babylonians, for Cyrus next states that Merodach placed the whole of the troops of Qutu (Media) under his feet, and the whole of the troops of the Manda (barbarians and mercenaries). He also caused his hands to hold the people of the dark head (Asiatics, including the Babylonians) — in righteousness and justice he cared for them. He commanded that he should go to his city Babylon, and walked by his side like a friend and a companion — without fighting and battle Merodach caused him to enter Su-anna. By his high command, the kings of every region from the upper sea to the lower sea (the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf), the kings of the Amorites, and the dwellers in tents, brought their valuable tribute and kissed his feet within Su-anna (Babylon). From Nineveh(?), the city Assur, Susa, Agade, the land of Esnunnak, Zamban, Me-Turnu, and Deru, to the borders of Media, the gods inhabiting them were returned to their shrines, and all the people were collected and sent back to their dwellings. He finishes by soliciting the prayers of the gods to Bel and Nebo for length of days and happiness, asking them also to appeal to Merodach on behalf of Cyrus “his worshipper,” and his son Cambyses.

11. CYRUS' HISTORY FROM GREEK SOURCES:

It was probably between the defeat of Astyages and the capture of Babylon that Cyrus defeated Croesus and conquered Lydia. After preparing to attack the Greek cities of Asia Minor, he returned to Ecbatana, taking Croesus with him. The states which had formed the Lydian empire, however, at once revolted, and had again to be reduced to submission, this time by Harpagus, his faithful general, after a determined resistance. It was at this period that Cyrus subdued the nations of Upper Asia, his next objective being Babylonia (section 9 and the two preceding paragraphs). In this connection it is noteworthy that, in the Babylonian official account, there is no mention of his engineering works preparatory to the taking of Babylon — the turning of the waters of the Gyndes into a number of channels in order to cross (Herod. i.189); the siege of Babylon, long and difficult, and the final capture of the city by changing the course of the Euphrates, enabling his army to enter by the bed of the river' (Herodotus i.190-91). There may be some foundation for this statement, but if so, the king did not boast of it — perhaps because it did not entail any real labor, for the irrigation works already in existence may have been nearly sufficient for the purpose. It seems likely that the conquest of Babylon opened the way for other military exploits. Herodotus states that he next attacked the Massagetae, who were located beyond the Araxes.

12. THE MASSAGETAE:

One-third of their army was defeated, and the son of Tomyris, the queen, captured by a stratagem; but on being freed from his bonds, he committed suicide. In another exceedingly fierce battle which followed, the Persian army was destroyed, and Cyrus himself brought his life to an end there, after a reign of 29 years. (He had ruled over Media for 11, and over Babylonia (and Assyria) for 9 years.) According to the Babylonian contract-tablets, Cambyses, his son, was associated with him on the throne during the first portion of his 1st year of rule in Babylon.

13. THE SACAE, BERBICES, ETC.:

According to Ctesias, Cyrus made war with the Bactrians and the Sacae, but was taken prisoner by the latter, and was afterward ransomed. He died from a wound received in battle with the Berbices. Diodorus agrees, in the main, with Herodotus, but relates that Cyrus was captured by the Scythian queen (apparently Tomyris), who crucified or impaled him.

14. DOUBT AS TO THE MANNER OF HIS DEATH:

It is strange that, in the case of such a celebrated ruler as Cyrus, nothing certain is known as to the manner of his death. The accounts which have come down to us seem to make it certain that he was killed in battle with some enemy, but the statements concerning his end are conflicting. This absence of any account of his death from a trustworthy source implies that Herodotus is right in indicating a terrible disaster to the Persian arms, and it is therefore probable that he fell on the field of battle — perhaps in conflict with the Massagetae, as Herodotus states. Supposing that only a few of the Persian army escaped, it may be that not one of those who saw him fall lived to tell the tale, and the world was dependent on the more or less trustworthy statements which the Massagetae made.

15. CYRUS' REPUTATION:

That he was considered to be a personage of noble character is clear from all that has come down to us concerning him, the most noteworthy being Xenophon's *Cyropedia* and *Institution of Cyrus*. The Babylonian inscriptions do not reproduce Babylonian opinion, but the fact that on the occasion of the siege of Babylon the people trusted to his honor and came forth asking peace for the city (apparently with every confidence that their request would be granted); and that the Babylonians, as a whole, were contented under his rule, may be regarded as tacit confirmation. Nabonidus, before the invasion of his territory by the Persian forces, was evidently well disposed toward him, and looked upon him, as we have seen, as "the young servant of Merodach," the patron deity of Babylon.

16. WHY DID THE BABYLONIANS ACCEPT HIM?:

It is not altogether clear, however, why the Babylonians submitted to him with so little resistance — their inscriptions contain no indication that they had real reason to be dissatisfied with the rule of Nabonidus — he seems to have been simply regarded as somewhat unorthodox in his worship of the gods; but could they expect an alien, of a different religion, to be better in that respect? Dissatisfaction on the part of the Babylonian priesthood was undoubtedly at the bottom of their discontent, however, and may be held to supply a sufficient reason, though it does not redound to the credit of Babylonian patriotism. It has been said that the success of Cyrus was in part due to the aid given him by the Jews, who, recognizing him as a monotheist like themselves, gave him more than mere sympathy; but it is

probable that he could never have conquered Babylonia had not the priests, as indicated by their own records, spread discontent among the people. It is doubtful whether we may attribute a higher motive to the priesthood, though that is not altogether impossible. The inner teaching of the Babylonian polytheistic faith was, as is now well known, monotheistic, and there may have been, among the priests, a desire to have a ruler holding that to be the true faith, and also not so inclined as Nabonidus to run counter to the people's (and the priests') prejudices. Jewish influence would, in some measure, account for this.

17. CYRUS AND THE JEWS:

If the Jews thought that they would be more sympathetically treated under Cyrus' rule, they were not disappointed. It was he who gave orders for the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem (^{<4623>}2 Chronicles 36:23; ^{<1500>}Ezra 1:2; 5:13; 6:3), restored the vessels of the House of the Lord which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away (^{<1507>}Ezra 1:7), and provided funds to bring cedar trees from Lebanon (^{<4897>}Ezra 3:7). But he also restored the temples of the Babylonians, and brought back the images of the gods to their shrines. Nevertheless the Jews evidently felt that the favors he granted them showed sympathy for them, and this it probably was which caused Isaiah (44:28) to see in him a "shepherd" of the Lord, and an anointed king (Messiah, [τῷ χριστῷ μου, *to Christo mou*], ^{<2451>}Isaiah 45:1) — a title suggesting to later writers that he was a type of Christ (Hieron., Commentary on ^{<2340>}Isaiah 44:1).

18. CYRUS IN PERSIA — HIS BAS-RELIEF:

From Persia we do not get any help as to his character, nor as to the estimation in which he was held. His only inscription extant is above his idealized bas-relief at Murghab, where he simply writes: "I am Cyrus, the Achemenian." The stone shows Cyrus standing, looking to the right, draped in a fringed garment resembling those worn by the ancient Babylonians, reaching to the feet. His hair is combed back in the Persian style, and upon his head is an elaborate Egyptian crown, two horns extending to front and back, with a uraeus serpent rising from each end, and between the serpents three vase-like objects, with discs at their bases and summits, and serrated leaves between. There is no doubt that this crown is symbolical of his dominion over Egypt, the three vase-like objects being modifications of the triple helmet-crown of the Egyptian deities. The

king is represented as four-winged in the Assyro-Babylonian style, probably as a claim to divinity in their hierarchy as well as to dominion in the lands of Merodach and Assur. In his right hand, which is raised to the level of his shoulder, he holds a kind of scepter seemingly terminating in a bird's head — in all probability also a symbol of Babylonian dominion, though the emblem of the Babylonian cities of the South was most commonly a bird with wings displayed.

T. G. Pinches

PUBLISHERS NOTES

CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at AGES Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or

omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation